

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-126

Complainant: No. 1321610356A

Judge: No. 1321610356B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge violated his constitutional rights and engaged in improper ex parte communications.

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 various minute entries in the case, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judge did not violate the Code in this case. The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of the judge's rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: August 21, 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 August 21, 2012.

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**2012-126****COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE**

Your name: _____

Judge's name: _____

Date: 5-8-12

Instructions: You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Please describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times and places that will help us understand your concerns. You may attach additional pages but not original court documents. Print or type on one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your files.

The Judge is in violation of my Constitutional right to a speedy trial - ON 4-26-12 The Judge Designated my case "Complex" when in 1993 the time of occurrence of case there was no "Complex" case designation - This is clearly a ~~ex post facto~~ violation and a violation of due process.

THE judge is also allowing the STATE prosecution to use DNA collected from cases: CR2004 and CR2005 which were deemed invalid and illegal, After being vacated by a concession of error in 2007 and 2008; at worse the defendant has never had a violent or dangerous conviction to validate DNA collection. (Criminal History is incorrect).

Respectfully,