

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 10-281

Complainant: No. 1403810530A

Judge: No. 1403810530B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a justice of the peace failed to respond adequately or promptly to her letters and e-mails requesting permission to submit evidence via e-mail and complaining about the conduct of the hearing officer who handled her case. The commission reviewed the matter along with the recording of the proceeding and found no evidence of ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: December 28, 2010.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott

Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on December 28, 2010.

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

Judge was sent a FED Ex or some sort of express mail (to respond to) approximately a week and a half to two weeks before my case was to be heard. I had telephoned the court house was led to believe a judge would listen to the case. Technically, no judge prevailed.

I found out during the telephone conversation with the North Valley Court house (long distance from California in August of 2010) that I would not be able to use electronic mail as visual evidence. I wanted use electronic mail in order to show how Dr. Turner damaged correctly (APA) formatted visuals so that, by APA standards, the ones she had damaged or *miscorrected* could not be submitted. I had to give her several lessons on APA over the phone because she seemed wholly unfamiliar with citations.

The clerk at the North Valley Courthouse told me to write a letter to Judge refused to respond to my express mail before the trial, so I had to make copies of my papers that I had sent to Dr. Turner. Four weeks after the trial, he told me I could send hard copies, which I had already been told on the telephone I could do by the clerk. This demonstrated carelessness and apathy toward the public in a procedural setting: he was sent a FED EX shortly after I received notification of the trial date, and he dragged his feet, so to speak, responding-and he also would not be bothered with electronic mail.

He refused to respond to any of the points I made regarding the lack of procedure during the hearing:

- 1) A hearing officer who berated me before the cameras were on.
- 2) A hearing officer who would not berate a blond defendant who was accompanied by a codefendant (prior to the camera being turned on).
- 3) The hearing officer had demanded I check in on arrival. No one was in the queue to check me although I was on time. The defendant arrived quite late and the judge said none of this to her or her business partner.
- 4) A hearing officer who refused to address any of my concerns.
- 5) The hearing officer harassed me, referring to my evidence as *telephone books*.
- 6) A hearing officer who refused to address the defendant who committed perjury claiming she had no notice of owning me at least \$800.00 when the notice was written and sent by her and she personally had placed it in front of her.
- 7) At one point I wanted the hearing officer to look at the points I had made so that the defendant could address these rather than enunciate a practiced series of false statements she had composed for the hearing. The hearing officer was very dramatic, and emphatically told me over and over again, for at least a one minted period to not say anything. The hearing was a drama without truth by those in Surprise, Arizona.
- 8) A hearing officer insisted on staying and speaking with the defendant a long time after I was told to leave, but I was unable to overhear words or their conversation.
- 9) Judge refused to comment of the transportation issue (for a town that should have a decent transportation system and a people who have the right to use a responsible transformation system) or any issue that is a public and civic concern.
- 10) When I sent a letter for reconsideration of the motion because of the lack of procedure and abuse prior to and throughout the hearing, and the points that were overlooked, Judge response was to check box next to the word

denied, and would not address any of my concerns (reflecting the same posturing/apathy of the hearing officer).

These are the tip of the iceberg related to a lack of procedure, apathy, and civic responsibility denoting a lack of training and standards in the Surprise Arizona Court House. Thank you for your attention in this matter.

With kind regards,