State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 06-227

Complainant:

Judge:

No. 1294010025A

No. 1294010025B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The issues raised are solely legal or appellate in nature. If a judge makes an incorrect ruling or misinterprets the evidence, the proper remedy is to appeal to a court with appropriate jurisdiction.

The commission is not an appellate court and cannot change a judge's decisions; therefore, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rule 16(a).

Dated: September 22, 2006.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on September 22, 2006.

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

STATEMENT OF FACTS CJC-06-227

Instructions: Please use this form or plain paper of the same size to explain your complaint. In your own words, describe specifically what the judge did that you believe is misconduct. You should provide all of the important names, dates, times and places related to your complaint, but you do not need to cite the applicable canons of judicial conduct. Although you may attach additional pages, do not write on the back of any page. You may attach copies of any documents you feel will help us understand your complaint.

Your name:	Judge's name:	Date: 8-11-06
<u>On</u>	I went to court before J	ludge_
it was pertai	ning to a Privalaus a Hack on my	
Jaudy et	to proceed in Rule 11 prove	
letter of Pri	Action Roman Psychiatric Encarceral	Linn and for Evaluation
and for Treato	real. This claument has been notocis	ed and is harked by the
	liberties Union. She riled for future	
	will refuse any and all testorely ting to	
he it " and n		objected.
This undates i	by right to due process and further with	plates my 42 5th 6 th
8th and 14th am	readment rights, thus stated in the U.S.	Constitution, this aline.
ia my viewils	an asself on my person and is considered	(coming) assult. As
stated way 1	etter of Protection. Litis held that in	does who physically asself
persons in their	controoms have no achamatic community	. In re Gregory V.
Tompson, São 1	E. 2d 59, (C.A. 9 (Anz.) 1974)) this Richard	is prepublice in my case.
Those also co	obinually filed mations to contrave, my tr	in in praiper
continues to ru	le these motions mostly ad continues to	anosint ma counsel finting
	et of interest with one and fail to per	
	continues to deny me my right	
as thiled to a	erformmer duries and initates her on	the of office, thus inder
the 1st 2nd 30	and 4th Judicial Cannon (E.g. made g	presudicial comments in a
judicial proceedi	og lauduing a person changed with sex-rela	a ted coinces, and participated
exparte proces	dings, these acts constituted above or	concertion afthe indicial
office. The real	Lehman, 168 Ariz 174, 812 P. 2d 992(19	91); for conduct relating
to exparte in	starts, Pailure toperform alutics and inj	proper judicial demeans
In re Weisin	burger, JQ-88-0001 (January 20,198	El. Also an
	dan exparte enoferance with	
	a for his ethical impo	
		1

Continued on Addition page.

(Attach additional sheets as needed)

page 2 of 3

CJC-06-227

also has knowledge of certain proplems with jury selection over the last several years. The state Alleges "selection Problems" test excluded numbers of Jurors in The Knowledge the stats has tampered with jury selection, in vidation of the U.S. Constitution and Article 2, section 22 and 23 of the Arizona Constitution. This is a maliciaus and prejudicial action to deny me my nalt to be heard in open court. Is working against my right to due process for she denied he my right to speedy trial.

Under penility of purjury I declare that all statements and facts are the with the pest of my knowledge.