

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 21-358

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

April 7, 2022

The Complainant alleged an appellate court judge failed to investigate attorney misconduct.

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 member Christopher W. Ames did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on April 7, 2022.

COURT OF ARIZONA

	)	Arizona	Court
	)	No.	
Petitioner,	)		
	)		
v.	)		
	)		
STATE OF ARIZONA,	)	<b>FILED</b>	
	)		
Respondent.	)		
	)		

---

O R D E R

On \_\_\_\_\_, Petitioner \_\_\_\_\_ filed a "Motion to Appeal Prior Decision of \_\_\_\_\_ by Justice \_\_\_\_\_". Petitioner claims that the State Bar failed comply with Rule 53(b)(2)(A).

On \_\_\_\_\_, the Court entered an order closing and reopening it as a State Bar case, \_\_\_\_\_ In this Court entered an order dismissing the proceeding noting that the State Bar had reviewed and dismissed Petitioner's \_\_\_\_\_ bar complaints and that Petitioner had neither named nor served the State Bar of Arizona in bringing his action. Also, Petitioner had not established any failure by the State Bar to comply with Rule 53 or 55.

Petitioner still has not named nor served the State Bar of Arizona in this proceeding. Also, Rule 53(b)(2)(A) authorizes bar counsel to notify a complainant of a dismissal prior to a screening investigation by telephone and provides that a complainant may

request that decision be reviewed by bar counsel. Petitioner has established no basis to reconsider the dismissal of this proceeding. Therefore,

**IT IS ORDERED** the motion is denied.

As both of these proceedings are closed,

**IT IS ORDERED** the Clerk shall not accept any additional filings in these matters.

DATED this

On [redacted] I asked the ARIZONA [redacted] COURT to investigate several violations of A.R.S. Rule 42.

The ARIZONA [redacted] COURT on [redacted] the Honorable Judge ORDERED Petitioner to file a [redacted] Complaint under [redacted] referring to I think to A.R.S Rule 53 or 55, if this is correct, the HONORABLE [redacted] did not read and/or understand the motion, that was filed originally. I did file an original complaint with the [redacted] that was denied by [redacted] (SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT "G") After [redacted] original ruling on the original complaint, I did file an appeal pursuant to A.R.S. 55, this appeal was also denied. The Motior [redacted] was filed to investigate the alleged violations of Attorney [redacted] and [redacted] pursuant to A.R.S. 42.

On [redacted] petitioner filed with the ARIZONA [redacted] COURT a "MOTION TO APPEAL PRIOR DECISION OF

On [redacted] the honorable JUDGE [redacted] denied petitioners motion, referring to [redacted] JUDGE [redacted] denied previous ruling, and ordered the clerk, "TO NOT ACCEPT ANY ADDITIONAL FILLINGS IN THESE MATTERS" SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT

In closing I want to express my concern with the entire JUDICIAL SYSTEM, everything in the original pleadings has been consistent, EXAMPLE

Lease Address:

Sewer Problem:

the attorney that I hired [redacted], which I paid over [redacted] apparently didn't know this ,the arbitrator [redacted] apparently didn't care, then [redacted] completely ignored the attached complaint and now the ARIZONA [redacted] COURT, pursuant to A,R,S. Rule 42 have continued to skirt the EVIDENCE and the HONORABLE [redacted] ARIZONA [redacted] COURT, now has notified the clerk "NOT TO ACCEPT ANY ADDITIONAL FILLINGS IN THESE MATTERS"

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED thi

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

In [redacted] I leased a commercial property at [redacted] In [redacted]  
[redacted], there was a sewer problem at

[redacted] Witch caused the sewer to backup on my leased property, SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT "A"

In [redacted], I hired attorney [redacted] Attorney, to represent my company in relationship  
To this matter.

On [redacted] Mr [redacted] ruled that "while the plumbing blockage WAS  
NOT the tenants fault, it was the tenants clear responsibility to fix, repair and maintain under the lease".  
SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT "A" AND "B", SECTION 1 PARAGRAPH 12, AWARD OF ARBITRATOR.

The Arbitrators decision was based on ??????? who knows???? Be assured IT WAS NOT BASED ON  
EVIDENCE and/or TESTIMONY.

On [redacted] I filed a complaint with the [redacted], this Complaint [redacted] was  
denied on [redacted] (NOTE this complaint was [redacted] pages and  
included, pictures, diagrams, copy of our lease, the brief was in DETAIL regarding this alleged violation  
of our lease and CLEARLY SHOWED (beyond any question) that we DID NOT VIOLATE OUR LEASE.  
(SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT "C"

We appealed the decision of the [redacted] pursuant to A.R.S. Rule 53 B 2 A, and that appeal was  
Denied. (SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT "D")

On [redacted], I sent to the ARIZONS [redacted] COURT and to EACH JUDGE with the ARIZONA  
[redacted] COURT a copy of the brief that was submitted to the [redacted] (SEE ATTACHED  
EXHIBIT "E"

On [redacted] we received a letter from [redacted] Attorney, stating that  
Under the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct, the  
of the court may not answer correspondence or address  
individual concerns outside the context of formal cases.  
(SEE ATTACHED EXHIBIT "F"

However, A.R.S. Rule 42, specifically states that the ARIZONA [redacted] COURT shall investigate matters  
Brought to their attention. The brief that was submitted demonstrates numerous violations of this Rule,  
Yet the Court ignored all violations presented.

COURT OF ARIZONA

	)	Arizona	Court
	)		
Petitioner,	)		
	)		
v.	)		
	)		
STATE OF ARIZONA,	)	<b>FILED</b>	
	)		
Respondent.	)		
	)		

---

O R D E R

On \_\_\_\_\_, Petitioner \_\_\_\_\_ filed a "Motion to Appeal Prior Decision of \_\_\_\_\_ by Justice \_\_\_\_\_." Petitioner claims that the State Bar failed comply with Rule 53(b)(2)(A).

On \_\_\_\_\_ the Court entered an order closing and reopening it as a \_\_\_\_\_ case, \_\_\_\_\_. In this Court entered an order dismissing the proceeding noting that the \_\_\_\_\_ had reviewed and dismissed Petitioner's complaints and that Petitioner had neither named nor served the \_\_\_\_\_ in bringing his action. Also, Petitioner had not established any failure by the \_\_\_\_\_ to comply with Rule 53 or 55.

Petitioner still has not named nor served the \_\_\_\_\_ in this proceeding. Also, Rule 53(b)(2)(A) authorizes counsel to notify a complainant of a dismissal prior to a screening investigation by telephone and provides that a complainant may

**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.**