State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 22-486

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

July 10, 2023

The complainant alleged a justice of the peace pro tem failed to follow proper procedures in a civil case.

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 Colleen E. Concannon and Scott C. Silva did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on July 10, 2023.

CONFIDENTIAL Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct 1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2022-486

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.

Jurisdiction was not given or established. The judgement was made before defendants notarized written responds was filed due to clerical error. (The court does not receive faxes but provides a fax number). On behalf of Arizona Civil Proceeding without both parties' documents, judgment should have been postponed. I asked the court to set aside this order due to deprivation of rights, by constitutional law any party shall be liable to the party injured in the court of law, with a set aside motion and it's continually been pushed back due to lack of other parties' participation. (Plaintiff, and a judge to see the motion).

Judge also implied that I did not know my rights when I tried to make a statement in court and did not let the plaintiff defend his case, Judge took control of the entire proceeding. Also going against these laws.

Relief from Judgement or Order, Rule 15 (17B ARS a. (1)), Rule 4.2 Relief from Judgement or Order, Rule 15 (17 B ARS a. (3) b. & c.) Deprivation of Rights under Color Law (USC 18 242) Concealment, etc.- (USC 2071) Clerk is to File- (USC 18 2071) Without prejudice- (UCC 1-308)

2

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

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.

The judgement was made before both parties documents where file by clerk.

Rule 15. (17B ARS, a. (1), Rule 4.2(1).

Rule 15. (17B ARS, a. (3) b. and c.

Rule 16 Rules of Procedurce, Rule 60(a)(b), (d)(1)(2)

Judge granted judgement to plaintiff and knew of that my written answer was not filed due to the clerk not being able to file because they provided fax and phone number on summons, but does not accept faxes. Plantiff was provided my written respond but claims that he did not know of my documents.

USC 18 242- Deprivation of Rights under Color law

USC 2017- Concealment, etc.

USC 42 1983- Civil Action of Deprivation of Rights

I filed a motion to set aside judgement and Precint did not know how to file, which pushed back my motion back and writs have been made by company.

3