

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 16-333

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court judge made an improper ruling

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.

The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of the judge's rulings. In addition, 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(a).

Dated: January 11, 2017

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

---

George A. Riemer  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on January 11, 2017.

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

Comp

2016-333

RE:

Dear

I am contacting your Office for assistance regarding [redacted]. [redacted] clearly demonstrates an inability to competently serve the public. I would appreciate a review of Case No. [redacted] decision fell short of the required preparation and competent oversight and intelligence to completely understand the information and Case Law to make an informed ruling in the Case. Both the Arbitrator and the Judge stated in their opinions that the Plaintiff suffered negligence. Then [redacted] awarded the Defendant's [redacted] in attorney fees sends a conflicting message of right and wrong. The Plaintiff was not served justice by the Court.

The Arbitration ruling stated the Plaintiff, [redacted] was wronged by Defendant, [redacted] (known thereafter in this correspondence as [redacted]), that [redacted] was negligent. Defendant was awarded \$ [redacted] in attorney fees by the Arbitrator rather than the \$ [redacted] Defendant demanded. [redacted] decision stated the Plaintiff was wronged by [redacted] negligence. Plaintiff's Attorney cited Case Law, the [redacted], for negligence and damages in the Petition and in the Motion to Set Aside the Judgement. The Plaintiff is afforded under Federal Bankruptcy Law protection intelligent governance. This DID NOT happen in the Case.

[redacted] ruling awarded the Defendant's unsupported attorney fees in the amount of \$ [redacted] (inclusive of the demanded \$ [redacted] and entered for \$ [redacted]) stated in Plaintiff's Court Filings. [redacted] entered a Judgment against the Plaintiff on [redacted] Plaintiff's Motion to Set Aside the Judgment was also then denied. [redacted] did fraud the Court about the legal fees stated in Plaintiff's Filings and Motion to Set Aside the Judgement. The Court issuing a Judgment against the Plaintiff is sending a wrong message in the matter of bankruptcy protection is this Case. The decision demonstrates the Court failed in its diligence and duty to understand the Case. The Court's upholding of Laws did not occur in this matter. [redacted] lack of an in-depth comprehension of the Case as presented and cited is a failure of lawful governance. [redacted] had a responsibility to the Plaintiff as afforded under the Federal Bankruptcy Law to enforce and protect the Plaintiff. The Court did not protect the Plaintiff from the egregious conduct of [redacted] side step of Federal Law for internal misinformation about the matter. [redacted] ruling in favor for [redacted] and their employee(s), blatant violation(s), negligence and conduct for not abiding by the Federal Bankruptcy Laws and issuance of the Judgment for the unfounded and exorbitant attorney fees is clearly unjust governance. Plaintiff previously in the same Court with another Judge, who enforced Federal Bankruptcy Law, ruled in Plaintiff's favor and sanctioned that Defendant for similar actions for unjust conduct. That Case was a result of [redacted] misinformation, negligent instructions and conduct.

legal career precedes this case as evident by the plethora of websites informing the public that is a danger to the public and should not serve the public and be removed.

Please help me and review the and Plaintiff did not receive any semblance of justice in the Case. Plaintiff has been significantly impacted by financial damage ruled by the Court's inability to decipher Laws and justice.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Plaintiff

Attachment

CC:

✓