

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 10-028

Complainant: No. 1384710849A

Judge: No. 1384710849B

ORDER

The complainant alleged the judge made errors during a hearing and issued an improper ruling that intimidated him into relinquishing his right to a re-hearing. The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found that the issues raised involve an administrative law judge. Since the commission has no jurisdiction over administrative law judges, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: April 19, 2010.

FOR THE COMMISSION

\s\ Keith Stott

Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed
to the complainant and the judge
on April 19, 2010.

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

2010-028

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name: _____ Judge's name: _____ Date: 1 FEB 10

Instructions: Describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes misconduct. Please provide all of the important names, dates, times and places related to your complaint. You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to explain your complaint, and you may attach additional pages. Do not write on the back of any page. You may attach copies of any documents you believe will help us understand your complaint.

25 AUG 09. JUDICIAL CONDUCT. FAILED TO HAVE QUALIFIED PERSONNEL OR ARIZONA REGISTRAR OF CONTRACTORS (ROC) PRESENT AT HEARING. THE PRESENCE OF A ROC COULD HAVE VERIFIED AND CLARIFIED INFORMATION PRESENTED. WHAT WERE QUALIFICATIONS OF THE "JUDGE"? ROC SHOULD HAVE HANDLED THIS HEARING.

25 AUG 09. JUDICIAL CONDUCT. THE "JUDGE" ALLOWED THE RESPONDENT, UNDER OATH, TO MISREPRESENT AND EVADE THE TRUTH IN THE HEARING, THIS WITHOUT PUNISHMENT OR REPRIMAND. ANYONE WHO PERUSED THE FACTS OF THE COMPLAINT WOULD OR SHOULD KNOW THE RESPONDENT WASN'T TELLING THE TRUTH. ISN'T THIS A SERIOUS OFFENSE??

11 SEP 09 JUDICIAL CONDUCT. UNCONSCIONABLE DECISION. FOR WHATEVER REASON THE "JUDGE" DEEMED IT HONORABLE TO IGNORE ALL PERTINENT FACTS OF THE COMPLAINT. DURING THE ENTIRE VERY SHORT HEARING THE "JUDGE" DID NOT ASK A SINGLE RELEVANT QUESTION PERTAINING TO THE COMPLAINT, UNTIL THE VERY END OF THE HEARING. HE ASKED ME A QUESTION, I GAVE A NO ANSWER. ON THIS HE BASED HIS DECISION - [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. SHOULDN'T THE HEARING "JUDGE" BE MORE ACTIVE IN THE PROCESS? I FIND IT AMAZING THE "JUDGE" WASN'T THE LEAST INTERESTED TO KNOW WHY I ANSWERED NO. NOT ONE SINGLE RELEVANT QUESTION!!

20 OCT 09. JUDICIAL CONDUCT. THREATENING AND INTIMIDATING CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE 'JUDGE'. THIS CORRESPONDENCE CAUSED ME TO RELINQUISH MY RIGHTS TO A REHEARING. I CAVED TO THE INTIMIDATION AND REQUESTED A TERMINATION OF ALL ACTIONS PERTAINING TO THE REHEARING. I DID WHAT I WAS EXPECTED TO DO.

A JUDGE SHOULD NOT HAVE THE RIGHT TO MAKE A PERSON FEEL THREATENED OR INTIMIDATED — NOT EVER!! THIS 'JUDGE' DID.

IF I HAD MADE TRUTHFUL COMMENTS RELATIVE TO HIS JUDGEMANSHIP OR IGNORED HIS THREAT — WHERE WOULD I BE TODAY??