

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 21-074

Judges:

Complainant:

ORDER

July 7, 2021

The Complainant alleged a pro tem superior court judge had a conflict of interest, did not afford a party an opportunity to be heard, and made erroneous rulings in a civil matter. The complainant also alleged a superior court judge failed to appropriately supervise staff and made erroneous rulings in several civil matters.

The role of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine whether a judicial officer has engaged in conduct that violates the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct or Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution. There must be clear and convincing evidence of such a violation in order for the Commission to take disciplinary action against a judicial officer.

The Commission does not have jurisdiction to overturn, amend, or remand a judicial officer's legal rulings. The Commission reviewed all relevant available information and concluded there was not clear and convincing evidence of ethical misconduct in this matter. The complaint is therefore dismissed pursuant to Commission Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Commission members Denise K. Aguilar, Christopher W. Ames, Michael J. Brown and Delia R. Neal did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on July 7, 2021.

Table of Contents

Comp
2021-074

1. Cover Sheet
2. Main letter to Judge County Court.
3. separate Complaint files- I brought to the court
Over violations Never opened or wrongly dismissed. Extreme
Untimeliness. (Exhibit A)
4. Exhibit B- Rule 2,12 -13- Cannon LAW
5. Exhibit C Above cases confused with an earlier case
6. Exhibit D- Order Dismissing three of above cases, without justification
7. Exhibit E. Order by Court displaying complete ignorance of the issue.
8. Exhibit F - Copies of the multiple of the area. NO HOA
9. Exhibit G - Transcripts of Case proving Ignorance of the case by
Judge and complete ignorance of Non-disclosure of important
material facts by Plaintiffs regarding other more updated Deception to the
court.
10. Exhibit H Documents proving compliance by Defendants but Judge
ineptness to understand the case, documents and
rules. Could not rule and left it up to the Plaintiffs. Sign of Favortism and
Incompetence.
11. Exhibit I- Defendants Motion to set aside Ignored by Judge
12. Exhibit J - Beneficiary of trust showing a relative to Judge in the
A party to a person involved
as a Plaintiff in the suit
13. Exhibit K. Warranty deeds of the described above.
Showing the first deed taking title as *Husband and Wife*. The A
new Deed changing Title to: *Wife and Husband*. Proving a mental disorder

of Severe Ego Mania of that Plaintiff. A cause for concern for proper judgment.

14. Exhibit I- Showing the most updated version of the _____ of the area. And
in Accordance with the recent _____ County _____ Ordinances.

ARS STATUTES.

A.R.S § 33-1817 Indicates by common law principle _____ approval of property
owners who vote is the minimum requirement to change the _____ legally for a
Community.

A.R.S § 33-1227 A minimum of _____ of Voters to change _____ applies
only to _____ In Arizona'

A.R.S § 33-261- Rule against Perpetuities. *"The common law rule known as rule
against perpetuities shall hereafter be applicable to all property of every kind and
nature and estates and other interests therein, whether personal or mixed, legal or
equitable by way of trust or otherwise"*. That means that a line that reads *"Run-
ning with the land"* in any _____ is trumped by Arizona law.

From The Desk Of

State of Arizona
Commision on Judicial Conduct
1501 W. Washington ST. suite 229
Phoenix AZa., 85007

**Prejudice Bias, Incompetence, Disregard for the Law.
Favortism is the Law of the County**

/s/

Date: _____

From The Desk of

To Judge _____
Court of _____ County

Judge _____

In reviewing your order of dismissal on _____ of the _____ cases I filed, I feel you are just as confused as Mr. _____ when he filed his _____. You stated in all _____ cases; _____ and _____ that they were not served properly. On the contrary they were. To be sure of this I went down to the Court, reviewed the files, found all the paper work in order. A step by step procedure of proper service requires the following.:

Step (1).- Filling the Complaint. _____ copies. by the Plaintiff. The Clerk of the Court stamps them. They were stamped and dated. **(see Exhibit A)**

Step (2). The Summons is signed by the clerk of the Court and sent along with the complaint. In accordance with rule ACRP 4.1(b)(i). to the parties ,(defendants). It can be sent by process server or someone else other than the plaintiff. Certified mail may be used if approved by the court. They were approved by the Clerk of the Court. The Clerk of the court affirmed the fact of mailing as long as they get a copy of the green certificate of mailing. They did and are in the file. ARCP 4.1 (k) (2). If you are not accepting this way of service than you should make it very clear to the Clerks of the Court. They would not say it could be done by Certified mail if you did not approve it first. This proves by dismissing these cases, you are in violation of Judiciary Code of Conduct. Canon 2:12 Supervisory Duties (A) (B) (C) and Canon 2:5 Competence. and Article 6 § 11 AZ. Constitution. Duties of Presiding Judge.

(Exhibit B.

Step 3. Wait for a response by the defendants for

Step 4. If no Response, an Affidavit for Default and Entry of Default is mailed. a certificate of mailing. accompanies the Entry of Default, either on the default document or by attachment.

This was done.

Step (5) - Plaintiff Waits another for a response as indicated in the Default document. If still no response the court proceeds with Step (6) - Default hearing. The court has the obligation and responsibility at this point to proceed with or without a hearing..Usually with. In other words, it's in the Courts ball-park to inform all parties. You did not do this. Instead you dismissed them. They were in default and you did not do what you were suppose to do as Judge. You also made a statement in the order that I did not ask for an extension.. At the point, step 5, It was not I who would ask for an extension, why would I? That would be the Defendants who would ask that. Therefore, It appears you are confused thinking I was the defendant and referring to case

I can only assume this means you cursorily read through everything and did not get it right. You also. put the cases, together with now moot due to the new legally updated and recorded Why?

case has nothing to do with the other. I filed separate suits each independent of the other. Each needs to respond on their own, not as a group. I did not file these for a group. I would have filed only complaint for all if that was the case. Their so called Response as a group captioned, ' dated speaks as a group constantly referring to case response for all. is not an acceptable or proper response. they are, independently still in default. You as a Judge should know that. You don't combine separate cases. This proves your confusion and or incompetence. You are very inexperienced with procedure and documents.

Complaints:

and were all filed and served the very same way as the other. Yet, is not dismissed and the other were. All being equal how do you account for that? Here's what I

**THE COMMISSION'S POLICY IS
TO POST ONLY THE FIRST FIVE
PAGES OF ANY DISMISSED
COMPLAINT ON ITS WEBSITE.**

**FOR ACCESS TO THE
REMAINDER OF THE
COMPLAINT IN THIS MATTER,
PLEASE MAKE YOUR REQUEST
IN WRITING TO THE
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL
CONDUCT AND REFERENCE
THE COMMISSION CASE
NUMBER IN YOUR REQUEST.**