

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 07-187

Complainant: No. 1314610686A

Judge: No. 1314610686B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no evidence of ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The issues raised in the complaint involve legal decisions and procedures that are outside the jurisdiction of the commission.

The commission is not an appellate court and cannot change a judge's decisions; therefore, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Dated: August 16, 2007.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on August 16, 2007.

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

Copy# 07-18-07
Committed to
Judicial Conduct

STATE OF ARIZONA
SUPREME COURT
DIVISION I

[Redacted]

CASE# CJC-07-187

[Redacted]

vs.

[Redacted]

COMPLAINT OF MISCONDUCT
OF THE COURT

COMES NOW, PLAINTIFF, [Redacted] IN PROCE TO FILE FORMAL
COMPLAINT, FROM HIS OWN KNOWLEDGE AND INFORMATION AND BELIEF, AGAINST
[Redacted] (JUDGE) CHARGING THAT IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF
ARIZONA, IN THE COUNTY OF [Redacted] ACTING IN HIS INDIVIDUAL
AND PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY VIOLATES THE CODE UNLAWFULLY AND PERSISTENTLY
WITH FAILURE TO PERFORM JUDICIAL DUTIES, IN DIRECT VIOLATION OF RULE
81, CANON 1, CANON 2A AND CANON 3B 4 & 5, ARIZONA SUPREME COURT RULE. THE
FOLLOWING REPORT SUPPORTS THIS CHARGE.

THIS HONORABLE COURT HAS JURISDICTION IN THIS MATTER PURSUANT
TO ARIZONA CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE 6.1 AND 6.8 42.

FACTS OF THE CASE IN THIS COMPLAINT INVOLVES TWO(2) SEPARATE
INDICTMENTS OF TWO(2) CASES INITIALLY ASSIGNED TO HONORABLE [Redacted]
[Redacted] SUPERIOR COURT, [Redacted] ARIZONA. PLAINTIFF IS AGENT

PRO SE IN BOTH CASES. PLAINTIFF WAS PROVIDED WITH ADVISORY COUNSEL. [] ADVISORY COUNSEL FILED A MOTION FOR RULE 11 EXAMINATION AGAINST PLAINTIFF IN BOTH CASES. HON. [] GRANTED THE RULE 11 MOTION. THE MASTER WAS TRANSFERRED OVER TO HONORABLE [] OF THE [] SUPERIOR COURT IN [] ARIZONA TO HANDLE THE RULE 11 ORDER OF EXAMINATION. PLAINTIFF WAS FOUND TO BE COMPETENT TO STAND TRIAL AND TO REPRESENT HIMSELF IN PRO SE. HON. [] REFERRED THE CASES... BACK TO HONORABLE [] OF THE [] SUPERIOR COURT. ADVISORY COUNSEL [] MOTIONED TO WITHDRAW. THE MOTION WAS GRANTED. NEW ADVISORY COUNSEL [] WAS APPOINTED. EXCLUSION OF TIME OUTSIDE RULE 8, ARIZONA RULE OF COURT, TIMEFRAMES HAS IN BOTH CASES (EXCEPT OF INTERCROSSED PLEADINGS UNDER RULE 11 INVOLVEMENT IN THESE CASES - AFTER THE RULE 11 PROCEEDINGS) SOUGHT BASED ON PLAINTIFFS CONTINUING EFFORT TO RECEIVE ALL BRADY MATERIAL. INCLUDING ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY MOVES FOR OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION ASSOCIATED WITH THESE CASES. BOTH CASES HAVE SET DATES FOR TRIAL IN THE MONTH OF [] PER HON. [] ORDER.

DESCRIPTION OF COMPLAINT

ISSUE I

PLAINTIFF HAS ASSERTED COURTS NEED TO PERMIT INTENSE PRE-TRIAL EVIDENCE REVIEW TO CATCH AND Toss OUT PHONY CASES EARLY IN THE PROCESS AND IDENTIFY THE WRONGDOERS.

PLAINTIFF HAS FILED A MOTION TO DISMISS PROSECUTION [] PLAINTIFF, ON RECORD SINCE [] HAS REQUESTED BRADY MATERIAL, AND PARTIAL DISCLOSURE OF BRADY MATERIAL HAS BEEN PROVIDED IN AND FOR BOTH

CASES. INSTRUMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT MINUTE ENTRY REPORTS AND DOCKET SHEET [] PLAINTIFF HAS FILED A TOTAL OF FIFTEEN (15) PRO SE... MOTIONS IN AND FOR BOTH CASES. OF WHICH SEVEN (7) PRO SE MOTIONS INTERCONNECT WITH SPECIAL ACTION, COURT OF APPEAL. []

Hon. [] WAS HANDLED (IN COURT) A MOTION FOR DISCLOSURE [] [] RELEVANT TO MOTION TO DISMISS PROSECUTION. MOTION TO DISMISS PROSECUTION WAS FILED [] Hon. [] DENIED THE MOTION FOR DISCLOSURE INITIALLY FILED [], ON []

RELEVANT TO THE MOTION FOR DISCLOSURE ARE THE FOLLOWING FACTS.

* THE PRO SE MOTION TO DISMISS PROSECUTION, ALTHOUGH DENIED IN SUPERIOR COURT BY Hon. [].. AND BEFORE... THE PRO SE MOTION FOR DISCLOSURE WAS MAILED TO THE SUPERIOR COURT, A NOTICE OF APPEAL (FOR DENIAL OF THE MOTION TO DISMISS PROSECUTION) WAS SUBMITTED []. AT FIRST, THE COURT OF APPEALS WOULD NOT ACCEPT JURISDICTION OF THE APPEAL. []

[] PLAINTIFF REQUESTED THE COURT OF APPEALS RECONSIDER. THE COURT OF APPEALS ACCEPTED JURISDICTION OF THE APPEAL AND REDESIGNATED THE APPEAL INTO A SPECIAL ACTION [] * INCIDENTALLY, ADVISORY COUNSEL, [] (WITHOUT INFORMING PLAINTIFF) FILED A PETITION TO SHORTEN TIME TO HEAR PRO SE MOTION FOR DISCOVERY [] ADVISORY COUNSEL [] (WITHOUT INFORMING PLAINTIFF) APPEARED BEFORE Hon. [] (AS THE PLAINTIFF AWAITED IN THE BASEMENT OF THE COURTHOUSE TO BE ESCORTED BY GAIL OFFICER TO Hon. [] COURT) BY HERSELF AND MOTIONED TO CONTINUE THE PRETRIAL CONFERENCE FOR []. ADVISORY COUNSEL, [] (WITHOUT INFORMING PLAINTIFF) MOTIONED FOR A RULE 11 [] THE HONORABLE [] GRANTED THE RULE 11 MOTION [] TO THE COURT OF APPEALS. PLAINTIFF, MOTIONED FOR INTERLOCUTORY STAY OF RULE 11

PROCEEDINGS AND ORDER OF PROTECTION TO HAVE INVESTIGATED THE MOVE FOR A RULE 11 BY DESIGN (PROJECTED INTENT) TO STOP THE SPECIAL ACTION momentum [] THE COURT OF APPEALS ORDERED THE SUPERIOR COURT NOT TO TRANSMIT THE RECORD ON APPEAL FOR THE SPECIAL ACTION [] COURT OF APPEALS, [] JUDGE, * [] ORDERED A RESPONSE TO THE PETITION SHALL NOT BE FILED UNLESS ORDERED BY THE COURT [] COURT OF APPEALS, [] JUDGE, [] THEN ORDERED DENYING MOTION FOR INTERLOCUTORY STAY AND ORDER OF PROTECTION [] COURT OF APPEALS, [] JUDGE, [] JUDGE [] AND JUDGE [] DECLINED TO ACCEPT JURISDICTION IN THE MATTER OF THE SPECIAL ACTION [] COURT OF APPEALS, CLERK OF THE COURT MANDATED NO PETITION FOR REVIEW WAS FILED AND THE TIME FOR FILING SUCH HAD EXPIRED THEREFORE APPELLANT WAS COMMANDED TO CONDUCT SUCH PROCEEDINGS AS REQUIRED TO COMPLY WITH THE ORDER OF THE COURT FILED IN THIS CAUSE [] THUS ON [] PLAINTIFF APPEARED BEFORE [] JUDGE FOR THE RULE 11 EXAM/COMPETENCY HEARING, TO MAKE IT A MATTER OF RECORD THAT PLAINTIFF WAS COMPETENT TO PROCEED ONWARD IN CAUSE# [] TO PRO SE.

AT THE POINT HOW, [] DENIED THE MOTION TO DISMISS PROSECUTION THE ABOVE EVENTS HAD TRANSPIRED, HOWEVER AS NO PROVIDED ANYONE NOTICES IT HAS SIGNIFICANT VALUE TO THE MOTION TO DISMISS PROSECUTION PERTAINING TO THE ISSUE OF EVIDENCE. HOW, [] REGRESSED FROM PRESERVING EVIDENTIARY MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS. FOR ANY FUTURE APPEAL ISSUES DISPUTING QUESTION(S) OF FACT(S) ASSOCIATED WITH THIS CASE. OUTSIDE THE BASIC LINK OF PROBABLE IMPROPERITIES CONNECTED WITH EVENTS ASSOCIATED WITH PROCESS OF THE APPEAL.

PLAINTIFF HAS PRACTICED BEFORE STATE AND FEDERAL TRIBUNALS MANY MATTERS OF LEGAL IMPORT FOR APPROXIMATELY FIFTEEN (15) YEARS PAST AND NO ONE HAS EVER COMMANDED "NO MOTION SHALL BE ALLOWED EXCEPT ONLY WHEN PROCESSED THROUGH ADVISORY COUNSEL, OR A LAWYER, TO THE COURT."

[REDACTED] AT A STATUS CONFERENCE PLAINTIFF ADVISED HOW [REDACTED] A MOTION TO MODIFY CONDITIONS OF RELEASE AND A MOTION TO DISMISS ADVISORY COUNSEL [REDACTED] WERE SUBMITTED VIA MAIL TO THE COURT FOR CONSIDERATION. HOW [REDACTED] RESPONDED TO PLAINTIFF: "YOU HAVE BEEN TOLD THAT YOU SHALL ONLY BE ALLOWED TO SUBMIT MOTIONS TO THE COURT THROUGH ADVISORY COUNSEL." PLAINTIFF RESPONDED: "BY WHAT LEGAL AUTHORITY DOES THE COURT IN FACT BASE SUCH A COMMAND." HOW [REDACTED] REPLIED: "THE COURT DOES NOT HAVE TO SUPPLY A LEGAL BASIS FOR COMMANDING ALL PRO SE MOTIONS FROM THE PLAINTIFF TO THE COURT SHALL GO THROUGH ADVISORY COUNSEL BEFORE BEING.... ADDRESSED BY THE COURT. AS YOU WERE TOLD BEFORE, DO YOU UNDERSTAND." THE PLAINTIFF THEN COMMUNICATED HE WAS NOT AWARE THE COURT ORDERED ANY PREVIOUS HEARING SUCH A STERN ADMONISHMENT.

THE VERY NATURE OF HOW [REDACTED] ACCUSATION IS A MONSTROUS FALSEHOOD. SINCE HOW [REDACTED] HAS ONLY BEEN RECOGNIZED/REGISTERED TO BE SERIOUSLY ACTIVE TO DETERMINE LEGAL QUESTIONS OR DECISIONS [REDACTED] INVOLVED WITH THESE CASES, A DISCLOSURE OF EVERY STENOGRAPHED REPORTS OF PROCEEDINGS CONCERNING THESE CASES, SHALL PROVE THAT NO WHERE IN ANY COURT PROCEEDING TRANSCRIPTS COMMUNICATED PLAINTIFF MUST COMPLY WITH COMMAND "NO MOTION SHALL BE ALLOWED PROCESSED THROUGH THE COURT ONLY... EXCEPTION IS IF IT IS PROCESSED THROUGH ADVISORY COUNSEL."

ISSUE III

IF BY SUBTLE INTENTION OR OPEN SUBVERSIVE ENDORSEMENT, EDGING OUT PLAINTIFFS' NATURAL RIGHT OF DEFENSE FROM THE MINISTRIES OF OUR JUSTICE SYSTEM TO OPEN DEBATE AS A STAPLE OF DEMOCRACY INDEED DEMANDS A HIGHER GRADE OF QUALITY WITHIN THE LEGAL PROFESSION.

BEFORE HOW. [] THOSE OF THE LEGAL COMMUNITY RECOGNIZED BY THE COURT AS SUCH, HAVE AND DO ENTER ONTO RECORD STATEMENTS OF PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION, OR MOTIONS PREVIOUSLY OR INSTANTANEOUSLY SUBMITTED TO THE COURT, KNOW THERE IS A LACK OF SOCIAL ORGANIZATION ... RESERVES TO PERMIT CORDEAL COMMUNICATION AMONGST COLLEAGUES, AND INDEED IMMEDIATE ATTENTION IS FOCUSED BY THE COURT SERVICES WITHOUT DELAY MOSTLY UNREJECTED DETERMINATIONS CONSIDERING THEIR FILED MOTIONS TO THE COURT. HOWEVER, WHEN THE PLAINTIFF HAS FILED PRO SE MOTIONS, OR COMMUNICATES IN PRIVATE OR THE PUBLIC THEATER JUDICIAL AFFAIRS, THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION OF SERIOUS ATTENTION BY THE JUDGE(S), [] ATTORNEY, DEPUTY [] ATTORNEY, DEFENSE COUNSEL, ADVISORY COUNSEL, OR ANY PUBLIC SERVANTS WORKING FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE FALLS SHORT OF DECENT MEASURE COMPLEMENTING PROFESSIONAL FORMALITIES AS THEY DEAL WITH PLAINTIFF ACTING IN PRO SE.

THE SCHEME RESONATES WITH THE STENCH OF TRIUMPHANTS.

LEGAL CLAIM

RULE 1.2 ARIZONA RULE OF COURT PROVIDES:

“THESE RULES ARE INTENDED TO PROVIDE FOR THE JUST, SPEEDY DETERMINATION OF EVERY CRIMINAL PROCEEDING. THEY SHALL BE CONSTRUED TO SECURE SIMPLICITY IN PROCEDURE, FAIR-

NEED IN ADMINISTRATION, THE ELIMINATION OF UNNECESSARY DELAY AND EXPENSE, AND TO PROTECT THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL WHILE PRESERVING THE PUBLIC WELFARE."

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT, RULE XI, CANON 1 COMMENTARY [2004] IN PART

PROVIDES:

"A JUDICIAL DECISION OR ADMINISTRATIVE ACT LATER DETERMINED TO BE INCORRECT AS A MATTER OF LAW OR AS AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION IS NOT A VIOLATION OF THIS CODE, UNLESS DONE REPEATEDLY OR INTENTIONALLY. THE BASIC FUNCTION OF AN INDEPENDENT OR HONORABLE JUDICIARY IS TO MAINTAIN THE UTMOST INTEGRITY IN DECISION MAKING AND THIS CODE SHOULD BE READ AND INTERPRETED WITH THAT FUNCTION IN MIND."

GOOD WORDS AREN'T WORTH A WHOLE LOT UNLESS THEY AMOUNT TO SOMETHING. FOR THE PLAINTIFF THERE IS NOT SIMPLICITY IN PROCEDURE FOR A 'SPOTSY' DETERMINATION OF FACTS. CLEARLY EVIDENT IN COURT DECISIONS. NO EXPOSURE OF ALL RELEVANT TESTIMONIAL OR MATERIAL FACTS CONNECTED WITH THESE CASES AS EVIDENCE. DO IN PART TO THE ROLE HOW [REDACTED] PARTICIPATES IN. WHERE DECISIONS MADE WERE EITHER DISTRIBUTEDLY OPERATING NOT TO ADVOCATE TRUE NATURE OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES OR DISTRIBUTED SWEETLY WITHOUT CAREFUL THOUGHT. THE CENTRAL DEFECT PREDICTABLY LEADING TO FABRICATED ASSUMPTION AT THE STATUS CONFERENCE OF [REDACTED]

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT, RULE XI, CANON 1 PROVIDES:

"AN INDEPENDENT AND HONORABLE JUDICIARY IS INDISPENSABLE TO JUSTICE IN OUR SOCIETY. A JUDGE SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN ESTABLISHING, MAINTAINING AND ENFORCING HIGH STANDARDS OF CONDUCT, AND SHALL PERSONALLY OBSERVE THOSE STANDARDS SO THAT THE INTEGRITY AND INDEPENDENCE OF THE JUDICIARY WILL BE PRESERVED. THE PROVISIONS OF THIS CODE ARE TO BE CONTINUED AND APPLIED TO FURTHER THAT OBJECTIVE."

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT, RULE XI, CANON 2A PROVIDES:

"A JUDGE SHALL RESPECT AND COMPLY WITH THE LAW AND SHALL ACT AT ALL TIMES IN A MANNER THAT PROMOTES CONFIDENCE IN THE INTEGRITY AND IMPARTIALITY OF THE JUDICIARY."

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT, RULE XI, COMMENTARY [CANON 2A] PROVIDES:

IN PART:

"PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE JUDICIARY IS ERODED BY IRRESPONSIBLE OR IMPROPER CONDUCT BY JUDGES. A JUDGE MUST AVOID ALL IMPROPRIETY AND APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY. A JUDGMENT EXPECTED TO BE THE SUBJECT OF CONSTANT PUBLIC SCRUTINY. A JUDGE MUST THEREFORE ACCEPT RESTRICTIONS ON THE JUDGE'S CONDUCT THAT MIGHT BE VIEWED AS BURDENSOME BY THE ORDINARY CITIZEN... AND SHOULD DO SO FREELY AND WILLINGLY."

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT RULE 81, CANON 3 B 4 & 5 PROVIDES:

"A JUDGE SHALL BE PATIENT, DEFTERED AND COURTEOUS TO LITIGANTS, JURORS, WITNESSES, LAWYERS AND OTHERS WITH WHOM THE JUDGE DEALS WITH IN AN OFFICIAL CAPACITY, AND SHALL REQUIRE SIMILAR CONDUCT OF LAWYERS AND OF STAFF, COURT OFFICIALS AND OTHERS SUBJECT TO THE JUDGE'S DIRECTION AND CONTROL."

"A JUDGE SHALL PERFORM JUDICIAL DUTIES WITHOUT BIAS OR PREJUDICE. A JUDGE SHALL NOT, IN THE PERFORMANCE OF JUDICIAL DUTIES... BY WORDS OR CONDUCT... MANIFEST BIAS OR PREJUDICE, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO BIAS OR PREJUDICE BASED UPON RACE, SEX, RELIGION, NATIONAL ORIGIN, DISABILITY, AGE, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, OR SOCIAL ECONOMIC STATUS, AND SHALL NOT PERMIT STAFF, COURT OFFICIALS, AND OTHERS SUBJECT TO THE JUDGE'S DIRECTION AND CONTROL TO DO SO."

CONCLUSION

THUS FAR HON. [REDACTED] HAS TAKEN UNDER ADVICEMENT THREE MOTIONS;
 (1. MOTION TO DISMISS COUNSEL [REDACTED] (MATTER IS MOTION AS THE COURT AS
 MOTION TO WITHDRAW AS ADVISORY COUNSEL [REDACTED] SUBMITTED [REDACTED]
 DECIDED TO GRANT THE MOTION [REDACTED]; (2. MOTION TO MODIFY CONDITIONS OF
 RELEASE; AND (3. MOTION TO VACATE PRIOR CONVICTIONS. THERE IS NO DOUBT
 ARIZONA RULE OF COURT, RULE 91(e) OBEDIENCE VIOLATED IN QUESTION WITH
 RESPECT FOR QUALITY WORK CAPABILITIES. ADDED AS AN ISSUE TO RAISE THE
 LEVEL OF NEGLIGENCE OR PROTECTED INTENT INTENTIONS TO PLAINTIFF.

THEREFORE, THE CANONS AND SECTIONS ARE RULES OF REASON WITH JUSTICE
 IN MIND. THEY SHOULD BE APPLIED WITH CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS, STATUTES,
 OTHER RULES AND DECISIONAL LAW, IN THE CONTEXT OF ALL RELEVANT CIRCUMSTANCES.

THE clearest indication of abuse of discretion circulates around the [] STATUS CONFERENCE WHEREIN Hon. [] STEWLY COMMANDS TO PLAINTIFF TO PARTAKE IN THE ORDER OF UNCOMMON REPORT: PROCESSING MATTERS ONLY THROUGH ADVISORY COUNSEL IS CORRECT METHOD OF FOLDING MATTERS AND SUGGESTING THE COMMAND HAD PREVIOUS INSTRUCTION ACCOMPANYING THE... COURT'S ORDER. IT'S ALICE. AND FROM THIS LIES OTHER REGISTRY OF DECISION MAKING MUST BE EXPOSED. FOR THE INSPECTED BENEFIT ENTRENCHED IN HONEST ASSESSMENT OF JUDICIAL INTEGRITY. FOR THE INTELLECTUAL RIGHT OF PRESERVATION OF FACTS, FOR ANALYZED TREATMENT OF THOSE FACTS, AT ANY AND ALL FUTURE CASE EXAMINATION AND REVIEW.

NOTABLY, INSULTING PUBLIC TRUST WITH CLEVER ABOLISHMENT MODEL TO TO TRANSFORM ESSENCE OF THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND RIGHT TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT RESOLVES OF GRIEVANCES INVOKES CLASSIC DISREGARD FOR CIVIL ORDER. THIS CASE SCREAMS OF MULTI-PURPOSE STRISAM LINE PROSECUTION OF RUBBER STAMPED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT(S). COMMISSIONED NOT IN ACCORDANCE WITH REVOLUTIONARY PROGRESS OF EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW OR RESPECT FOR RELEVANT DUE PROCESS DECLARATION(S). FOR WHICH AN EXPLORATORY SERVICE FROM THE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT IS SOUGHT AGAINST Hon. [] DEDICATED TO CORRECT IMPROVEMENT - WHERE PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE JUDICIARY IS ENDED BY IRRESPONSIBLE OR IMPROPER CONDUCT BY JUDGES.

ULTIMATELY, Hon. [] HAS FAILED TO EXEMPLIFY A GENUINE REFLECTION OF PROFESSIONALISM CONSIDERING RULE 81, SUPREME COURT RULE, LITERAL LANGUAGE AS THIS COMPLAINT COMMUNICATES. ALL QUESTIONABLE ACCOUNTS OF EVENTS THAT SPARKED THIS COMPLAINT ARE DISCOVERABLE THROUGH SEARCH OF PUBLIC RECORD WITHIN [] SUPERIOR COURT, [] Arizona.

CJC-07-187

ANY AND ALL RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING FACT AND JUST DETERMINATIONS
AS THE COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT SERVES FITTING TO APPLY TO THIS
CASE IS GREATLY APPRECIATED.

"I SWEAR OR AFFIRM THAT THIS COMPLAINT INCLUDES ALL OF THE
CLAIMS AND GROUNDS TO SUBSTANTIATE ABOVEFOED COMPLAINT
WORTH SPARKING AN INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL INVESTIGATION ON
THE ISSUE OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT AGAINST Hon. [REDACTED]
THAT THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS TRUE TO THE BEST OF
MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY."

NOTEWORTHY:
ATTACHED HEREIN [REDACTED] IN
CASE # [REDACTED]
IS A MOTION TO CHANGE VENUE.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 13TH day of JULY, 2007.

[REDACTED]

cc: file
enclosure