

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 19-127

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

July 31, 2019

The Complainant alleged a superior court commissioner improperly changed the ruling of a superior court judge.

The role of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine whether a judicial officer has engaged in conduct that violates the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct or Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution. There must be clear and convincing evidence of such a violation in order for the Commission to take disciplinary action against a judicial officer.

The Commission does not have jurisdiction to overturn, amend, or remand a judicial officer's legal rulings. The Commission reviewed all relevant available information and concluded there was not clear and convincing evidence of ethical misconduct in this matter. The complaint is therefore dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Commission members Diane M. Johnsen and Christopher P. Staring did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on July 31, 2019.

2019-127

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Judge's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

Mr. Filed A & Lawsuit in the County  
Court, on THE SUIT WAS ASSIGNED TO  
Honorable on Hon. ISSUED  
A notice of intent to Dismiss for lack of service. THE NOTICE  
warns 'ARE NOT SERVED THE SUMMONS/COMPLAINT  
PUR TO: RULE 4(i) THE CASE MUST BE DISMISSED.

MR PROVIDED PROOF OF SERVICE UPON Hon. SHE  
THEN GRANTED RULE 4(i) - SERVICE ON DEFENDANT'S WAS  
COMPLETED AS WARNED, THERE-BY, NOT DISMISSING THE ACTION  
( ) Hon. DECIDED THE MATTER IS  
READY FOR A DEFAULT HEARING BECAUSE THE DEFENDANT'S FAILED TO  
ANSWER, THE DEFAULT COMMISSIONER ASSIGNED WAS Hon.

Hon on ORDERED THE DEFENDANT'S HAD NOT  
BEEN SERVED, AT THESE REQUEST DONE  
Hon. (MISCONDUCT) HAS SET FORTH NEW LAW. A PARTY CAN  
OP FROM ONE JUDGE TO THE NEXT IN THE SAME COURT ON THE SAME  
ISSUE/GET THE JUDGMENT CALL THAT THEY WOULD LIKE!

THE OLD LAW IS A JUDGE OF THE County COURT DOES NOT  
HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO REVIEW THE ACTION OF A FELLOW JUDICIAL OFFICER OF THE  
County Court, SEE: e.g. Lodge  
County, in & For County

A COURT JUDGE LACKS JURISDICTION TO REVIEW JUDGMENT OF A JUDGE WITH  
THE SAME JURISDICTION. RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT MUST COME FROM THE COURT OF  
JOB. COURT.

