

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-103

Complainant: No. 0189810345A

Judge: No. 0189810345B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge failed to rule within 60 days.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judge engaged in conduct that violated the provisions of Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution or the Code of Judicial Conduct and, if so, to take appropriate disciplinary action. The purpose and authority of the commission is limited to this mission.

After reviewing the information provided by the complainant and the electronic history of the case, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judge did not violate the Code in this case. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: June 26, 2012.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George Riemer

George A. Riemer
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed
to the complainant and the judge
on June 26, 2012.

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

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

APR 25 2012

April 24th, 2012

Complaint against Judge _____ for failure to adhere to the 60 day rule
 CIV2008

On 02/02/2011 Judge _____ granted Defendants' motions for summary judgment.

On 02/03/2011, Defendants lodged a proposed written form of judgment dismissing the
 _____ Forth Amended Tort Complaint for Abuse of Process with 54(b) language.

On 02/11/2011, _____ filed Judgment Dismissing _____ Forth Amended Complaint
 for Abuse of Process with 54(b) language.

On 03/24/2011 Judge _____ signed the judgment after lining out the 54(b) language.

On 01/24/2012, Plaintiff's Request for Ruling on Inclusion of Rule 54(b) Language

On 02/10/2012, Defendants' Response to the _____ Request for Ruling on Inclusion of
 Rule 54(b) Language.

On 02/22/2012 Plaintiff's Reply to Defendants Response to Request for Rule 54(b) Language

Bankruptcy Judge _____ 09/01/2005 Memorandum Decision found bad faith by defendants
 and set an evidentiary hearing for 1/31/2005 which resulted in the 06/02/2006 Memorandum
 Decision (Sanctions). _____ claimed misconduct by defendants including perjury and
 suborning of perjury. Judge _____ Decisions both were confirmed by the BAP 6/7/2007
 followed with the final BAP ruling 8/13/2009.

There are numerous cases stating that perjury and suborning perjury are an element of abuse of
 process and; as to the malicious prosecution claims neither of which accrue until the appeals
 process has been completed. _____ filed our tort complaint August 8th, 2007, some seven
 months prior the 03/13/2008 BAP affirmance of Judge _____ Memorandum Decisions.

Respectfully,