

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 11-227

Complainant: No. 1426510673A

Judge: No. 1426510673B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court commissioner improperly withheld documents from the record.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the commissioner 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 thoroughly reviewing the information provided by the complainant along with the history of the case, the members of the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the commissioner did not violate the Code in this case. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: October 20, 2011.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George Riemer

George A. Riemer
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on October 20, 2011.

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

TO:
RE:

THE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT 2011-227

STATE VS

CR-2007-

-001 DT

pg 1 of 2

Sep 6, 2011

SEP 12 2011

I believe this commission can quite easily determine, that I made several timely and valid motions of complaint, to the Superior Court's Rule 32 division. Where-in reference to the existing record, I unequivocally detailed, and demonstrated Commissioner ability, to withhold pertinent evidence from the record of appeal. Evidence that most obviously, would have made a substantial challenge to her trial rulings. Ms [redacted], The Rule 32 Court, even the State, make no challenge or address of this most overriding issue, within there numerous responses. Simply because there can be no reasonable question upon review of these motions, to Commissioner ability to withhold substantial evidence from the record of appeal. In fact Ms. [redacted] ability to withhold and misdirect other evidence in this matter, in a similar fashion, has already been established by the Court of Appeals response, to Ms Louise Stark's motion of March 23, 2008. Yet ironically, Commissioner [redacted] did not provide the documents that were in fact ordered in that ruling. (The supplement packet that was sent, did not contain the ordered documents.) How counsel, and the Courts have overlooked such overt misconduct is beyond me. I presented that question, within two recent motions of complaint to Judge Rayes,

pg 2 of 2

Where once again I detailed the matter with reference to the existing record. Judge Rayes would take no action, and essentially defered me to this Commission.

Therefore I now most humbly ask this commission of Judicial conduct, to simply collect and review the record, from Judge Rayes last filing of July 1, 2011, back; so as to make it's own determination to the actual extent and Validity of Commissioner misconduct, and act accordingly & in the ballance of Justice. I Thank you Sincerely, for your time and consideration

cc

New times weekly