

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 17-302

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a pro tem justice of the peace retaliated against her.

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).

Commission members Art Hinshaw and Anna Mary Glaab did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: December 20, 2017

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Margaret H. Downie

Margaret H. Downie

Executive Director

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on December 20, 2017.

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

From: [Commission on Judicial Conduct](#)
To:
Cc:
Subject:
Date:

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject: Case 17-258

Commission on Judicial Conduct
1501 W. Washington St., Suite 229
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Re:

:

This letter is an addition to my complaint against . In my previous submission I complained about conducting oral argument with prejudice and discrimination against me. That oral argument session took place on . At that time I brought to his attention the fact that Plaintiff fraudulently billed me. But he interrupted me and didn't give me time to prove that it was fraud on the court committed by Plaintiff. He dismissed my counterclaim.

The trial was scheduled for .

Since that time I submitted two pleadings proving the fraud committed on the court by Plaintiff and a new oral argument was scheduled for .

On conducted Oral Argument

between me (Defendant) and the Plaintiff's attorney
. Anticipating the possibility of retaliation, I
requested jury trial and agreed to provide it. I
submitted necessary form and request.

Yesterday I received the letter that all my pleadings had been
denied. "The trial set for is vacated. The
defendant's request for a jury trial is moot" (See. Attachment).
This is retaliation and violation of the United States Constitution.
According to A.R.S. 12-1176. Demand for jury; trial procedure: B.
If the plaintiff does not request a jury, the defendant may do so
on appearing and the request shall be granted.

used to be a criminal defense attorney. He keeps
defending criminals.

Please, take into consideration this new development and impose
the proper sanctions upon .

Sincerely,