State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 21-305
Judge:	
Complainant:	

ORDER

March 23, 2022

The Complainant alleged that a pro tem justice of the peace made an incorrect legal ruling, and had a conflict of interest in hearing his matter.

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 Commission Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Commission members Denise K. Aguilar and Delia R. Neal did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on March 23, 2022.

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

2021-305

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name:	Judge's Name:
words what you believe the judge did that const names, dates, times, and places that will help the c	the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own titutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the ommission understand your concerns. Additional pages may vant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper rds.
	Mediator should be of sound-mind and free of "Conflicts
of Interests". On Friday	acted as a "Justice of the Peace"
on my small claims case. Since, then I have lear	
	riginal small claims complaint, I included photo evidence
of the 2" front suspension leveling kit installed by	In the
	roduct data sheet for a 3" spacer he claims to have
	he Court prior to the hearing, I included a product data
sheet for the 2" spacer ACTUALLY installed on m	
sheet specifically states "	For reference, the had
only miles and was in impeccable condition	
	installed according to manufacturers instructions. In my
,	ce submitted in the original complaint proved the 2"
•	ROSS NEGLIGENCE" and/or "GROSS INCOMPETENCE"
	een TWO (2") and THREE (3") suspension leveling
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	but I can not help you understand" is applicable. I
acknowledge that this may be a minor detail, but	
	Upon review of the recording, you will will be amazed
	ail or differences, or possibly had prior intentions to ignore
	issing this claim with prejudice". I understand that her
other part-time gigs including	, etc. may task her time,
	erwise make if difficult for her to understand the details
	te that a public servant thinks they can profit from multiple
gigs while grossly completing the "municipal resp	
standards of the LAW. It baffles me that	County employs a person to act as a Justice of the
Peace when that person gets paid by to be	•
be impartial. As a law-abiding taxpayer, I assume	
	e impartial, understand (comprehend) and fairly rule on
the facts. I hereby substantively ACCUSE	of GROSS NEGLIGENCE and/or INCOMPETENCY in
	having many CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, since she
profits form which sells advertisements, an	
	feel the responsibility to continue bringing awareness to
,	old the LAW. Upon submission of this Complaint to this
Commission; I will also be delivering a copy to the	e County Board of Supervisors, State of Arizona
Conce and the State of Anzona	

	☐ Corrected
▼ This matter was heard by the Court on this date:	
Plaintiff(s) appeared 🗵 in person 🗌 failed to ap	pear
Defendant(s) appeared 🗵 in person 🗌 failed to app	pear
Plaintiff Claim	3
 Judgment is entered upon default with hearing 	without hearing
Judgment is entered upon agreement of the parties.	
☐ IT IS ORDERED granting judgment to:	1 (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1
☐ Plaintiff(s)	☐ Defendant(s)
\$ Principal Amount	\$Court Costs
\$ Accrued interest, if any	party to
\$ Court Costs	
\$ TOTAL	
With interest thereon at the rate of % per annum	on principal amount from the date of judgment until paid in full.
With interest on court cost of % per annum from t	
☑ IT IS ORDERED dismissing this claim ☑ with prejudent	dice
Counterclaim	
☐ Judgment is entered upon default ☐ with hearing	☐ without hearing
Judgment is entered upon agreement of the parties.	
☐ IT IS ORDERED granting judgment to:	
☐ Plaintiff(s)	Defendant(s)
\$ Court Costs	\$ Principal Amount
	\$ Accrued interest, if any
	\$ Court Cost
	\$ TOTAL

. V Di		
m the X Plaintiff	☐ Defendant	
bject to this case beir		Hearing Officer. I request that this case be heard in the
rsuant to ARSCP 12	a), a party may reque	est that a justice of the peace, rather than a hearing officer, decide the law east 15 calendar days before the hearing date.
alty must make this	request in whiching at le	sast 10 balendar days before the meaning date.
ate		
	Signature	
L CERTIEV tha	t I delivered / mailed a co	ony of this document to:
I CERTIFY that	t I delivered / mailed a co	copy of this document to: y

Defendant(s)

- ANSWER (RESPONSE) TO PLAINTIFFS ANSWER

response states in part "3) I have attached all pertinent information from the part vendor showing proper application, quality of the parts used and no claim or warning that the upper control arms are to be replaced when using this kit". also attached a screen print from ebay.com showing a Motofab brand 3" front leveling kit for

did NOT install a 3" spacer, they installed a 2" spacer. This is substantiated with the picture including a tape measure point of reference included in my original complaint.

The picture shows a non-branded 2" spacer.

A search on <u>ebay.com</u> for Motofab branded 2" front leveling kit for kit has the following in bold print marked with asterisk on both sides of the alert.

The fact that the wrong part was installed is not a "proper application". Installing the part that caused the upper ball joint to fail or break after only miles. This is proof that the work was completed improperly. As a consumer, is it too much to ask "Please do not install parts on my vehicles suspension that the parts manufacturer alerts you

Case Number

In regards to "quality of the parts used", the 2 spacers were removed and given back to me from ; they do not have a single brandname, logo or part number on them.

In regards to "no claim or warning that the upper control arms are to be replaced when using this kit"; they did NOT install the 3" spacers. They installed the 2" spacers with the warning "Does not fit Why would a "kit" that states "does not fit" also state any alert about needing to replace control arms?

As stated in my original complaint, seems to lack the attention to detail and expertise needed to install suspension modifications. They do NOT even know what part they installed.

Additionally, in my original complaint, I started that

told me the front leveling kit was improperly installed. To clarify the expertise of , they have an aftermarket department that also installs from leveling kits; they have the experience to determine proper installations versus improper installations.

Attachments (Exhibits):

<u>ebay.com</u> Motofab brand 2" front leveling kit for '.

screen print.

THE COMMISSION'S POLICY IS TO POST ONLY THE FIRST FIVE PAGES OF ANY DISMISSED COMPLAINT ON ITS WEBSITE.

FOR ACCESS TO THE
REMAINDER OF THE
COMPLAINT IN THIS MATTER,
PLEASE MAKE YOUR REQUEST
IN WRITING TO THE
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL
CONDUCT AND REFERENCE
THE COMMISSION CASE
NUMBER IN YOUR REQUEST.