

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-022

Complainant: No. 1311210033A

Judge: No. 1311210033B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge was rude and biased.

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

Dated: March 29, 2012.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George Riemer

George A. Riemer
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on March 29, 2012.

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

On January 17 2012 I appeared telephonically in court. The case is a voluntary dependency as my son lives in Arizona with his mother, my ex wife. granted the state a motion for cause to show contempt order against me. It seems the state claims I used profanity in an email to the so called treatment team involved in the matter. The claim was that this violated a previous court order from forbidding me from using profane words in my contact with the treatment team.

Unfortunately for and the State, no such court order was ever conveyed to me in any way, shape or form. The court was made aware of this but proceeded in scheduling and holding the hearing, which may be the courts prerogative be certainly shows its lack of professionalism and its willingness to waste everyone's time and the states money.

During the course of the hearing was rude time and again. But his true feelings came out during his ruling. He stated "I would love to find Mr. in contempt..." Clearly this is most inappropriate to state in open court. This statement clearly shows that is not capable of controlling his emotions and I believe was designed to pander to the two attorney's namely and who appear in his court regularly. I believe he felt the need to explain to them why he couldn't grant their motion even though he clearly hated me. No judge (and that is what he is supposed to be) has the right to be insulting and condescending. He went on to say that there were two reasons that he could not find me in contempt and that he could "work around" the first reason. This is a clear indication that cannot be trusted to rule fairly or evenly. My understanding of this statement is even though the law is clearly on my side he could have found a way around that law to find me in contempt. Is that the expectation for judges....to obscure the law and find loopholes so that they can rule the way they want....truth and justice be damned? He finally did admit that since there was no evidence showing some form of gag order was ever conveyed to me that he could not hold me in contempt. He did take the opportunity to restrict my participation in the matter, which of course, was not part of the motion or on the agenda.

In summation, needs to be removed from the bench. I am certain that I am not the only person to appear that has been insulted. I find it both funny and ironic that we put honorable in front of these people's names when they try on those robes. The word loses its meaning when people like fail to act accordingly. is not honorable, nor is he ethical. He is rather, a little tin God with delusions of grandeur that expects respect to be bestowed rather than earned.