

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 18-214

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge delayed ruling on a motion and was biased against her in a forfeiture proceeding.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if a judicial officer 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 a judicial officer's rulings. In addition, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judicial officer 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 member Art Hinshaw did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: October 18, 2018

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on October 18, 2018.

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

VIA ELECTRONIC DELIVERY**VIA US MAIL**

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

1501 West Washington Street Suite 229

Phoenix Arizona 85007

Re:

Judge:

Location:

Case:

Associated:

Attorney's:

I understand that the commission cannot reverse court decisions or assign a new judge. I affirm under penalty of perjury that the following allegations contained in the attached document are true.

Dated this day of

Judge _____ delayed making a ruling on a *Motion to Appoint Counsel* and *Motion to for an Order to Show Cause* filed _____. I emailed her assistant inquiring if she needed anything else from me and when can I expect a hearing to be scheduled. She emailed me back and stated:

When she did finally make the ruling, (_____) she did so on the date the Mandate was issued in the Appeal. She purposely waited for the expiration of the Mandate to rule. Had she appointed me counsel, he/she would have known a reconsideration could be filed. She declared the *Motion to Appoint Counsel* as Moot because she knows that my rights are being violated but at the same time she knew she couldn't order counsel and risk allowing me to be heard.

Her ruling had dates out of order for the sole purpose of trying to make it look like her ruling was justified. She determined that the issue had already been litigated. She stated Judge ruled on the issue. Judge ruled that . How can she consider that litigated? I specifically requested a *Motion for an Order to Show Cause* on property not included in any . I had a right to be heard. I filed a Reconsideration stating that the I was requesting a hearing on was not included i and that Judge gave no explanation as to why he ruled the way he did on I was not requesting a hearing on. Her ruling was again to with no explanation.

She willfully denied me that right because she is aware of the in the not being reported and handled correctly pursuant to RICO statutes. She is being completely bias towards me to protect the .

Her statement in the *Order* regarding being made available on shows she is aware of the improper handling of the currency in case .