

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 07-008

Complainant: No. 1299610323A

Judge: No. 1299610323B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge.

The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Dated: March 23, 2007.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on March 23, 2007.

This order may not be used as a basis for disqualification of a judge.

CJC-07-008

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] SMALL CLAIMS Ct. [REDACTED]

BACKGROUND

Plaintiff stated he played pro-football & baseball 50 yrs. ago + following, he had many medical procedures + 26 surgeries. He mentioned this, because he has the experience to speak about clinic & hospital security. In [REDACTED] he had a G.I series

done at [redacted] you get a
dressing room across from lockers & you put
your items in the locker & keep the key. I
lost nothing. On [redacted] I had hernia
surgery at [redacted] two ladies
attended me. they put my items in a bag
with my name on it & the bag was put into
a room & another lady had the key. I lost nothing.
In all my clinic & hospital experiences,
I never lost anything. At [redacted]
[redacted] I gave my watch to a lady
attendant & it was not returned.

Please read the letter I wrote
to [redacted]: Index, Ex. 1.

Ex. 2 is [redacted] answer.

Ex 3. Statement of [redacted] Ex 4.

statement of [redacted]. Both the

statement of [redacted]

were not sworn to before a notary
republic & not signed before same.

Plaintiff offers Exhibits 5 & 6 which
were sworn to & signed before a
notary.

Concerning the statements by [redacted]

[redacted], they both rely on [redacted]

[redacted] for their incomes + they do what they are told to do, or else. they are biased witnesses.

Concerning the statement by [redacted]

she never examined* my hands, wrists +

arms + she couldn't see the watch

because plaintiff wears it under the left

splint. He doesn't wear the watch around

his wrist. for the record, plaintiff doesn't

wear splints. He wears padding over his

-4-

* examined

wrists, arms + elbows. (Ex 3.)

Concerning the statement by

the pad became loose on the L. arm + plaintiff lifted it to put it in place + secure it + the watch showed, then asked him to remove it.

Please see exhibit 1A for the complaint + answer. I refer you to pg. 2 of the Doctor's answer, + para 2. Plaintiff never received a call from the center + never saw or signed the preprocedure call sheet. At the center, they don't do things

properly. In all his med. experiences, he was questioned in person before the procedure & signed & dated the form.

there are other people in [] Az. with the name [] & they are listed in the bk. the nurse never called me, nor did she leave a message & at the hearing, she never stated, she called. If she called another [] in [] Az., it would be understandable that questions would not be answered.

I refer you to pg. 3. of the prepro
6

CJC-07-008

call sheet, item 9. It states: things not to wear/bring: a. Valuables, excessive jewelry, lotions, tight clothing, high heel. to plaintiff, it reads as a directive to the ladies. It says nothing about a watch which most people wear & a watch is not considered excessive jewelry. However, it is not pertinent, because plaintiff never received the call.

there are listings in the phone bk. for Az. & one is

7
* five (5)

& another is

[redacted]

[redacted]

Plaintiff is listed

at

[redacted]

Plaintiff's name

is sublisted under

[redacted]

& can be easily missed. People have

told plaintiff, "I can't find your no. in

the bk."

THE HEARING

the hearing officer,

[redacted]

arrived a few minutes late & in

plaintiff's opinion, he appeared dis-

sheveled & in a hurry. He didn't introduce

himself & [] asked,

"what should we call you?" []

is a young man; I would guess around

35. He said, "I have an appointment &

can only stay a half hr." He was intimidated

by the doctor & not at all polite to

plaintiff. the hearing was 20 minutes.

He asked plaintiff to begin & not an

cath was administered to any party.

After plaintiff spoke for 5 minutes,

[] asked, "Are you suing the doc-

tor for mal-practice?" It was obvious, he

had not read the material submitted to the ct. by either party. As plaintiff spoke, [] read the last survey read by plaintiff, by Princeton U. in Princeton, N.J. is as follows: 96 students were given a pg. to read & they were given a test. Next, a prof. lectured to them & they were given a test. Following, they were given a pg. to read & as they read, a prof. gave a lecture. they were then given a test on the pg. they read & the lecture. then scores dropped in half.

After plaintiff spoke for eight minutes, [] interrupted & said, "I can stop you, but you can't stop me; are you done? Plaintiff said, "no." [] said, "How much do you have?" Plaintiff said, "20 minutes" & [] said, "you have to finish quickly." Plaintiff was not given time to present his case. He was stopped by []

[] then spoke for the defense, however, she was so nervous, I couldn't

understand her. she spoke only for a few minutes & said nothing about calling plaintiff.

[redacted] then said, "if a gunman went into the center & robbed you & [redacted] he would not be responsible for your loss. This statement had nothing to do with the case & [redacted] found for the defendant.

[redacted] didn't read any of the material sent to the ct. &

had no idea what the case was +

didn't care. He only wanted to
get to his appointment. He left

the hearing room + flew out the door.

His conduct was outrageous + his

decision was not based on the facts

+ the law.

