

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-123

Complainant: No. 1442110016A

Judge: No. 1442110016B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a justice of the peace demonstrated bias by refusing to disqualify himself from his case and abused his discretion by unfairly refusing to grant a continuance of his trial.

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 judge's response, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judge did not violate the Code in this case. The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of the judge's ruling. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: August 16, 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 August 16, 2012.

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

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**2012-123****COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE****Your name:****Judge's name:****Date:** 5-14-12

Instructions: You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Please describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times and places that will help us understand your concerns. You may attach additional pages but not original court documents. Print or type on one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your files.

During the proceeding of CR2010 in
Justice Court Judge knowingly and will-
fully denied defendant of his right to a fair trial.
The judge did so by denying defendants right
to counsel and by not reviewing motion until
during or after proceedings, rendering said
motions valueless.

Defendant believes that the majority of
employees located at
maintain a business relationship with the
alleged victims in this case. These employees
may include the judge and his staff and other
people in the building that have influence here.
Other judges at this location have admitted so.

Judge the Superior Court of
did rule that the defendant was denied his right
to a fair trial.

alleged victim's mother () did tell
defendant that her daughter does business with
"most of those people at the Courthouse".

Complainant in this matter thinks this matter
should be looked into, so as to protect others
in the future from such an egregious act
as is denying the right of the people
to a fair trial.

(Attach additional sheets as needed)