

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 18-120

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a pro tem superior court judge denied him due process and improperly dismissed his 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(a).

Dated: June 27, 2018

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on June 27, 2018.

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

Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct

1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229

Phoenix, AZ 85007

(602) 452-3200

Email us at cjc@courts.az.gov

Dear Sirs, our case was reviewed by a Family Law Commissioner / Pro Tempore Judge

. Please see our statement below. We request remedy in our case to be heard by an elected judge. Our due process was denied by this judge. The clerk's offices never notify us who the judge was assigned to our case, and we never had our right for a change of this judge. If you need our filed case and witness contact information I am glad to send it to you.

Sincerely,

is misrepresenting themselves stating in their motion that they, the is representing the plaintiffs. This miscarriage of who they represent needs to be reprimanded by the court. The Plaintiffs are excising our rights as "Pro Se".

Furthermore, the plaintiffs in this case are asking for the court to RULE ON "The Rule of law" as well as following of legal bylaws governing an organization.

Governing Bylaws, for organizations this power is not unilateral or absolute; it must be exercised under the authority of Bylaws and followed.

Furthermore, the defendant's point of conflict involves an intrusion of *ultra vires*, by not following state statutes and the

You'll see e-mail (included in the brief filed) elucidation on not willing to follow governed by State Statues.

Restoring the status quo ante to the Plaintiffs, along with the responsibilities over the and the with a balance of \$ without further interference.

The court never gave us a reason for the dismissal. Furthermore, the office of the clerk after many phone calls and personal appearance to the clerk's office continued to not give the plaintiffs the Judges name till the day after of the dismissal. They just kept telling no Judge was assigned. Which come to find out this Judge Pro-Tempore was assigned to the case back in

Plaintiffs will file a complaint with Arizona State Attorney General on this case and the Due process the Plaintiffs did not received in this matter.