

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 16-234

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

The complainants alleged a superior court judge was biased against them.

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(a).

Dated: October 12, 2016

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 October 12, 2016.

*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.

\_\_\_\_\_ : We were an appointment with \_\_\_\_\_ Attorney  
 and Arbitrator \_\_\_\_\_. When the arbitration came to a close, the  
 arbitrator explained to us that she would have to find for the plaintiff due to her  
 understanding that \_\_\_\_\_ owned said student loans. Attorney  
 \_\_\_\_\_ and arbitrator understood how we felt wronged by \_\_\_\_\_. He  
 recommended \_\_\_\_\_ to help us. Arbitrator said for us to work out some kind  
 of payment plan and she would hold off her decision until after the holidays.

We met with \_\_\_\_\_ after \_\_\_\_\_ and he said he would make some phone  
 calls to \_\_\_\_\_. He called us back and said that he believed the case would be  
 dropped along with the other pending case.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, ( \_\_\_\_\_ ) \_\_\_\_\_ received decision "  
 \_\_\_\_\_." The letter stated that if there were any attorney fees  
 that they needed to be submitted to the court. My wife called \_\_\_\_\_ and he did the  
 paper work. Remember we are not attorney's and as far as we knew \_\_\_\_\_ knew  
 what he was doing.

\_\_\_\_\_ disputed fees awarded and we needed to appear in court \_\_\_\_\_ in  
 which \_\_\_\_\_ was a no show. The \_\_\_\_\_ then got on the  
 phone and called the \_\_\_\_\_ office several times to get no one on the phone and  
 set a new court date for \_\_\_\_\_.

AGAIN we appeared on \_\_\_\_\_ in the the middle of \_\_\_\_\_ and when the time  
 came for our case number \_\_\_\_\_ made the comment "  
 \_\_\_\_\_ then realized it was himself. AGAIN  
 \_\_\_\_\_ was a no show and the \_\_\_\_\_ proceeded to contact attorney via telephone.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ was not in the office and \_\_\_\_\_ allowed \_\_\_\_\_ to represent law firm  
 telephonically.

We just feel we are treated unfairly.

A visitor at our church brought to our attention the " " and we filed the motion for this to be considered due to our financial hardship on

We received the Ruling Re: Denying Motion for summary judgement as untimely. We filed it not more than hours of us even hearing about the "

We are not lawyers.....NO ONE has explained timelines. We feel that this judge goes out of his way to pacify the plaintiff and we are not given any consideration.

Another thing, we do not want any repercussions. We just want a fair shake.