

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 17-027

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged a justice of the peace was biased, unfair, and issued improper rulings.

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: March 1, 2017

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

---

George A. Riemer  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on March 1, 2017.

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

If you look at the Pleading, it is deficient in so many ways, it is difficult to enumerate, but safe to say, staff should never have allowed it to be filed, and once it was, he should have ordered it stricken sua sponte.

### **DEFICIENT PLEADING**

#### **Rule 108 Justice Court Rules of Civil Procedure**

1. The pleading lacks the name and address of the Court;
2. The pleading lacks the names of the parties;
3. The pleading lacks name and address of the party filing;
4. The pleading lacks the case number;
5. The pleading lacks the required one inch margin on the right;
6. The pleading is not typed or legibly hand written;
7. The pleading lacks a date of any kind;
8. The pleading lacks a caption as in "Motion to Dismiss".

#### **Rule 128 Justice Court Rules of Civil Procedure**

9. The pleading was not served never served upon me as required by the rules and lacks a mailing certificate;
10. The pleading failed to include the paragraph required by J.C.R.C.P Rule 128(c);
11. The pleading failed to state facts and reasons to support the relief requested. It failed to list any statute, case or other rule or legal authority support the relief requested. The "statute" referenced in the document does not exist.

This document doesn't deserve to be called a pleading. It is nothing short of chicken scratch and should be treated as such. Perhaps the Court could extend courtesy to a pro-se litigant who made a minor technical error in format, but this document doesn't even approach minimum standards for Motion practice. It is inexcusable garbage and the author should not be allowed to file same. Canon 3 of the Code of Judicial Conduct clearly states that the judge is required to make sure his staff comply with the code of conduct. His staff never should have allowed this document to be filed as its inclusion in the court file manifests bias and prejudice towards the Defendant.

I don't believe that [redacted] is impartial in this matter. He refused to grant me restitution, even though it was and is required by statute and now every latitude is given this convicted criminal. This court has required me to comply with every single solitary obscure rule; some that even licensed

attorneys I spoke to have never heard of. To make me jump through technical hoops while allowing this kind of swill to be filed is unconscionable. All parties to litigation should be treated equally, and without bias.

has bent over backwards to make it easy on this Defendant and now he has scheduled a hearing based on a clearly defective document that should never have been accepted by the Judge's staff, and once accepted, should have been stricken or summarily denied. For the Court to schedule a hearing based on this "pleading" is an insult to all of us who take the time to comply with the rules regarding motion practice.

It's almost as if is assisting this Defendant to make a mockery of his Court and the legal process, all to my detriment. I expect and deserve a level playing field in front of Why is this being denied me?