

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 10-095

Complainant: No. 1390410223A

Judge: No. 1390410223B

ORDER

The complainant alleged, in part, that a superior court judge violated court procedures and improperly removed the name of a party from his pleadings. The commission reviewed the complaint and found no evidence of ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: June 14, 2010.

FOR THE COMMISSION

\s\ Keith Stott

Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed
to the complainant and the judge
on June 14, 2010.

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

2010-095

MOTION TO SUBMIT COMPLAINT

I

RESPECTFULLY REQUEST

TO SUBMIT EVIDENCE TO START PROCEEDINGS AGAINST

, CLERK OF COURT FOR SUPERIOR COURT

OF ARIZONA MARICOPA COUNTY. FOR VIOLATIONS OF RULES

OF COURT PROCEDURE. AND HONORABLE

FOR 03/11/2010 MINUTE ENTRY [MOTION TO DISMISS

FOR LACK OF SERVICE], EVIDENCE IS DOMESTIC RETURN

RECEIPTS FROM THE POST OFFICE. RECEIPT # ALL 7009-

0820-0002-8617-9827 / RECEIPT # ALL 7009-0820-

0002-0963-1902, EVIDENCE 'EXHIBIT A'; 'EXHIBIT B'

'EXHIBIT A¹'.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV

03/11/2010

on behalf of _____

Phoenix, Arizona 85021.

Therefore, it appears arguable that service was made on

Apartments, however, the

file contains no indication that any entity known as defendant, Consolidated Asset Management, Inc. was ever served with process in this action.

Accordingly, defendant Consolidated Asset Management, Inc.'s motion is well taken and must be granted.

Plaintiff's Motion to Prove Disbarment, Motion to Request Default Re Plaintiff's Favor is DENIED.

This court does not have the authority to disbar attorneys and because there has been no proper service, there is no basis on which to grant plaintiff a default.

* CALIFORNIA WALK APTS / CONSOLIDATED ASSET
MANAGEMENT ARE SAME & ADDRESS

PROOF: JUSTICE BY CLERK'S AND COURT IS/HAS
TAKEN AWAY FAIR TRIAL RIGHTS ACT DUE
TO GENDER DISCRIMINATION / RACIAL
DISCRIMINATION / HATE CRIME ACT!

PROOF: OFFICE OF CLERK'S CONSPIRED TO TAKE
NAME OFF OF ORIGINAL PLEA SO THAT
JUDGE COULD BLINDLY MAKE A DECISION!

NOTE: 2ND CASE THAT CLERK'S REMOVED