

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 19-166

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

September 4, 2019

The Complainant alleged a justice of the peace did not afford her the right to be heard in an eviction proceeding.

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 Gus Aragón and Roger D. Barton did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on September 4, 2019.

Public confidence is eroded by improper conduct and conduct that creates the appearance of impropriety. The JP's actions on \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ are in violation of Article 6.1 Section 4 of the Arizona Constitution whereas his conduct is prejudicial to the administration of justice brings the judicial office into dispute. The bench failed to uphold and apply the law, and perform all duties of judicial office fairly and impartiality. This goes beyond good faith error of fact or law and violated Rules Of Judicial Conduct 2.2. this rule. However, a pattern of legal error or an intentional disregard of the law constitutes misconduct.

It is not a violation of this rule for a judge to make reasonable accommodations to ensure self-represented litigants the opportunity to have their matters fairly heard.

\_\_\_\_\_ is the attorney of record for many morning actions. On \_\_\_\_\_ Google maps says it is a \_\_\_\_\_ Although I was listed docket, I wasn't called until \_\_\_\_\_ after The JP kept asking " \_\_\_\_\_ and failed to repond to my " \_\_\_\_\_ in reply to the query. I believe the JP gave an inordinate amount of time to defendants prior to my appearance, He asked one defendant a closed answer question \_\_\_\_\_ times in an open ended off procedure manner. \_\_\_\_\_ where she answered

Whereas I was not allowed to make verbal motions as per \_\_\_\_\_ give affirmative defenses, any defense of specific(s) regards defense & Counter Claim contract laws-cause , demand jury trial, nor move for dismissal - failure of process - lack of Claim - substantiate & Demand Counter Claims with applicable statutes or lose right of cause nor request Continuance to exercise Discovery I was not allowed to CounterClaim 33-1376.B

Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct RULE 2.6. Ensuring the Right to Be Heard (A) A judge shall accord to every person who has a legal interest in a proceeding, or that person's lawyer, the right to be heard according to law.

I answered Rules of Evidence 106 Remainder of the Writings and was not allowed to introduced into evidence the remainder of evidence.

Alongside of myself Ms \_\_\_\_\_ appeared but wasn't allowed to testify. Ms \_\_\_\_\_ is a \_\_\_\_\_ Specialist assigned to me via her position at \_\_\_\_\_ Ms \_\_\_\_\_ was not allowed to testify but She did say the reason for eviction is the Client no longer accepting vouchers, in violation of Title **24 CFR 982.310 (a) Grounds. (4) Rules of Procedure of Eviction Action RPEA 4(f) Compliance with Laws and Regulation** Governing Subsidized Rent. The parties shall comply with all federal and state laws and regulations. **In violation of 24 CFR 982.451-(b).** i) The part of the rent to owner which is paid by the tenant may not be more than

- (A) The rent to owner; minus
- (B) The housing assistance payment to the owner

(iii) The family is not responsible for payment of the portion of rent to owner covered by the housing The JP ordered that I pay the part of rent that is the housing assistance payment to the owner. Yet the amount ordered and adjudged included the housing assistance payment.

**I attempted to have in evidence papers that prove the validity of above and Ms \_\_\_\_\_ attempted to give testimony but was denied**

*This is in regards \_\_\_\_\_ center, \_\_\_\_\_ County, Arizona. Thank You*