

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 11-012

Complainant: No. 1410010599A

Judge: No. 1410010599B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge issued a verdict in her case that contained several errors. The commission reviewed the matter and found no evidence of ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The allegations involve legal issues that are outside the jurisdiction of the commission. Accordingly, the commission dismissed the complaint pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: April 12, 2011.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott

Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on April 12, 2011.

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

2011-012

January 11, 2011

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

VIA FACSIMILE

Commission on Judicial Conduct
STATE OF ARIZONA
1501 West Washington Street, Suite 229
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Via Fax (602)452-3201

Re.: Complaint

Dear Sirs:

This shows my initial Complaint against the
Honorable a Judge of the Maricopa County
Superior Court, in Phoenix, Maricopa County, Arizona U.S.A.

This Complaint involves Maricopa County Superior
Court Case Number CV 2007- and Case Name, shown as
follows:

" Plaintiff,
v. , Defendants
. . . . "

This Complaint involves the court defined as
Superior Court also known as Superior Court of Arizona.

This Complaint involves names of attorneys who
appeared in the Maricopa County Superior Court Case Number
CV 2007- , as follows:

D.D.P.

2011-012

Commission on Judicial Conduct
STATE OF ARIZONA
January 11, 2011
Page 2

At this time, I call attention to the "VERDICT" titled unsigned Minute Entry dated 05/29/2009, that shows docket date (that being, Electronically Filed) "06/02/2009 8:00 AM". The extract is shown, as follows:

". . . . The Court finds that, all pertinent times hereto, the Plaintiff was a loosely organized association with no architectural committee".

Source: in Re. CV 2007-
unsigned Minute Entry (Docket Code 019,
Form V000A) titled VERDICT, dated
05/29/2009, docketed 06/02/2009,
at Superior Court of Arizona, in
Maricopa County, Arizona.

First, complaint is raised to the issue that there is the appearance that the above extract fails to disclose a word, namely, the word "at". The extract's full disclosure should be as follows:

". . . . The Court finds that, [at] all pertinent times hereto, the Plaintiff was a loosely organized association with no architectural committee". Brackets signify word insert.

2011-012

about the grey area that hints at.
 description of
 summed up in four (4) words issued by
 as being, "a loosely organized association", shows that Honorable
 meant to show
 as being a bogus, invalid, and, including, but
 limited to, non-bona fide non-profit association.

Third, complaint is raised about
 words stated as follows:

"The Court further finds that there are
 forty-seven homes in the Sutton Place
 development, ten of which are located along
 Osborn Road and separate from the other
 thirty-seven residences by a gate.
 Defendants' home is one of the ten [sic]
 outside the gated community and is tucked
 in the southwest corner of the entire
 development".

Source: in Re. CV2007-
 unsigned Minute Entry (Docket Code 019,
 Form V000A) titled VERDICT, dated
 05/29/2009, docketed 06/02/2009,
 at Superior Court of Arizona, in
 Maricopa County, Arizona.

Fourth, complaint is raised about
 failure, refusal and denial to make reasonable dis-
 closure. See ambiguity and unclearness of description as follows:

". . . . ten [sic] of which are located
 along Osborn [sic] Road".

Source: Ibid.

Fifth, complaint is raised to the above extract
 because has failed, refused and denied
 to disclose the word "East", in the words, ". . . . along
 Osborn Road". The reader of this extract would know what
 "ten" of what. was inferring to, if The Honorable
 had given reasonable certainty in the
 words, ". . . . along [East] Osborn Road".

2011-012

Commission on Judicial Conduct
STATE OF ARIZONA
January 11, 2011
Page 4

Sixth, complaint is raised because Complainant believes that _____ may have issued a falsehood, in that _____ failed, refused, and denied to disclose that the _____ Subdivision's identified Lot 26, Lot 27, Lot 28, Lot 29, Lot 30, Lot 31, Lot 32, Lot 33, Lot 34, Lot 35, and Lot 36, inclusive, had the amenities, as given by the City of Phoenix, of being hooked up to the City of Phoenix-owned wastewater (sewer) line. The described amenities means to show that above identified Subdivision's numbered lots, addressed _____ Phoenix, Maricopa County, Arizona U.S.A. through _____ Phoenix, Maricopa County, Arizona, inclusive, exist as not sharing any amenities from that interior identified wastewater (sewer) line that is believed to have had been installed by the builder Del Traylor in or about 1964, or thereabout. See Wastewater Map 16-33, as published by Water & Wastewater Department of the City of Phoenix, in Phoenix, Arizona U.S.A. Said Map 16-33 numbered map dated October 12, 1995.

I REQUEST PERMISSION TO HAVE THE RIGHT to file written addenda to this filing, at later date(s).

Respectfully submitted this 11th day of January 2011.

Respectfully,

Enc.: The unsigned Minute Entry dated 05/29/2009, 2 pages, as sent by J. Rutledge, Deputy, of the Honorable Michael K. Jeanes, Clerk of Court. Marked Exhibit "A".