

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 10-037

Complainant: No. 1385810552A

Judge: No. 1385810552B

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge made erroneous evidentiary rulings. The commission reviewed the complaint and found no evidence to suggest a pattern of rulings that would constitute misconduct. Therefore, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: April 20, 2010.

FOR THE COMMISSION

\s\ Keith Stott

Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on April 20, 2010.

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**2010-037****COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE**

Your Name: _____

Judge's Name: _____

Date: 02/04/10

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.

During Jury Selection on 01-27-09, admonish the jury to not
lend any supposed inference on her part toward any particular side in
regards to sustaining or over-ruling any objections by either side, be
it the State or the Defense. Yet, as the State was presenting its case,
the State's witnesses were all asked and summarily allowed to give
testimony regarding their respective training in identifying suspects and
in identifying illicit drugs. But when defense counsel attempted to
determine the procedure for conducting controlled buys as undercover
officers on cross examination, the State objected, and the objection
was sustained.

Also, during presentation of the State's case, the Officers
were allowed to give testimony about what they heard from
unknown-unidentified officers, which is hearsay, but when objected
to, the objection was over-ruled. had previously admonished
the jury to lend no more or no less weight to an Officer's
testimony as they would any other witness, yet it appears
that in this instance, she did not take her own advice!

(Attach additional sheets as needed.)