## State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 07-289

Complainant:

Judge:

No. 1322610468A

No. 1322610468B

## ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge.

The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rule 16(a).

Dated: December 3, 2007.

FOR THE COMMISSION

<u>\g\ Keith Stott</u> Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on December 3, 2007.

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

STATEMENT OF FACTS

CJC-07-289

DATE: 09-27-07

 IN THE YEAR 2002 I FILED FOR DIVORCE FROM EX-SPOUSE, VISITATION
AND CUSTODY, FEBRUARY, 2004, EXSPONSE AND I HAD
A SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT FOR SHARE CUSTODY, VISITATION, ETC. WITHIN
 4 FOUR MONTHS EX-SPOUSE RETALIATED BY VIOLATING THE COURT DEDERED
 FOR SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT. I FILED PETITION TO THE COURTS TO MOVE
 IN MY BEHAIF AND IN A COLLATERAL ATTACK EX-SPOUSE THEN LIED UNDER
DATH OF 2004 TO OBTAIN AN ORDER OF PROTECTION.
 THAT WOULD INCLUDE OUR ON ALLEGATIONS
THAT CONFLICTED WITH THE 2004 SETTLEMENT BY STATING A FALSE
 ACCUSATION THAT SUPPOSELY HAPPENED IN 2003 A YEAR EARLIER.
 GRANTED THE ORDER OF PROTECTION FOR EX-SPOUSE WHICH TERMINATED MY
 GRANTED THE ORDER OF PROTECTION FOR EX-SPONSE WHICH TERMINATED MY RIGHTS TO VISITATION AND SHARED CUSTODY WHICH WAS A DIRECT INTER
 RIGHTS TO VISITATION AND SHARED CUSTODY WHICH WAS A DIRECT INTER
 RIGHTS TO VISITATION AND SHARED CUSTODY WHICH WAS A DIRECT INTER FERLANCE. AFTER I EXPLAINED TO THE JUDGE IN WRITTING THAT MY EX-SPONSE HAS LIED UNDER OATH SINCE 1999 AND IN US WILLING TO DO ANYTHING TO GET BALL AT ME FOR INVORTING HER
RIGHTS TO VISITATION AND SHARED CUSTODY WHICH WAS A DIRECT INTER FERLANCE, AFTER I EXPLAINED TO THE JUDGE IN WRITTING THAT MY EX-SPOUSE HAS LIED UNDER OATH SINCE 1999 AND IN COURTS AND IS WILLING TO DO ANYTHING TO GET BALL AT ME FOR DIVORLING HER
 RIGHTS TO VISITATION AND SHARED CUSTODY WHICH WAS A DIRECT INTER FERLANCE, AFTER I EXPLAINED TO THE JUDGE IN WRITTING THAT MY EX-SPOUSE HAS LIED UNDER OATH SINCE 1999 AND IN <u>COURTS AND</u> is willing to DO ANYTHING TO GET BALL AT ME FOR DIVORLING HER . AND SHE DOES NOT CONSIDER THE EFFECTS IN USING
RIGHTS TO VISITATION AND SHARED CUSTODY WHICH WAS A DIRECT INTER FERLANCE. AFTER I GAPLAINED TO THE JUDGE IN WRITTING THAT MY EX-SPOUSE HAS LIED UNDER OATH SINCE 1999 AND IN <u>COURTS AND</u> is willing to DO ANYTHING TO GET BALL AT ME FOR DIVORLING HER . AND SHE DOES NOT CONSIDER THE EFFECTS IN USING AS ATOOL. I ALSO EXPLAINED THAT IF MY EX-SPOUSE WAS
RIGHTS TO VISITATION AND SHARED CUSTODY WHICH WAS A DIRECT INTER FERLANCE, AFTER I EXPLAINED TO THE JUDGE IN WRITTING THAT MY EX-SPOUSE HAS LIED UNDER OATH SINCE 1999 AND IN <u>COURTS AND</u> is willing to DO ANYTHING TO GET BALL AT ME FOR DIVORLING HER . AND SHE DOES NOT CONSIDER THE EFFECTS IN USING
RIGHTS TO VISITATION AND SHARED CUSTODY WHICH WAS A DIRECT INTER FERLANCE. AFTER I EXPLAINED TO THE JUDGE IN WRITTING THAT MY EX-SPOUSE HAS LIED UNDER OATH SINCE 1999 AND IN COURTS AND IS WILLING TO DO ANYTHINGS TO GIET BALL AT ME FOR DIVORLING HER . AND SHE DOES NOT CONSIDER THE EFFECTS IN USING AS A TOOL. I ALSO EXPLAINED THAT IF MY EX-SPOUSE WAS REALLY AFFRAID OF ME OR REALLY BELIEVED WHAT SHE WAS STATIONS
RIGHTS TO VISITATION AND SHARED CUSTODY WHICH WAS A DIRECT INTER FERLANCE, AFTER I EXPLAINED TO THE JUDGE IN WRITTING THAT MY EX-SPONSE HAS LIED UNDER OATH SINCE 1999 AND IN COURTS AND IS WILLING TO DO ANYTHING TO GIET BALK AT ME FOR BIVORLING HER . AND SHE DOES NOT CONSIDER THE EFFECTS IN USING AS A TOOL. I ALSO EXPLAINED THAT IF MY EX-SPONSE WAS REALLY AFFRAID OF ME OR REALLY BELIEVED WHAT SHE WAS STATIAND IN DETAINING THE ORDER OF PROTECTION, SHE WOULD HAVE NEVER AGREED TO A SETTLEMENT IN
RIGHTS TO VISITATION AND SHARED CUSTODY WHICH WAS A DIRECT INTER FERLANCE. AFTER I GRPLAINED TO THE JUDGE IN WRITTING THAT MY ER-SPOUSE HAS LIED UNDER ORTH SINCE 1999 AND IN COURTS AND IS WILLING TO DO ANYTHING TO GET BALK AT ME FOR DIVORLING HER . AND SHE DOES NOT CONSIDER THE EFFECTS IN USING AS ATOOL. I ALSO EXPLAINED THAT IF MY EX-SPOUSE WAS REALLY AFFRAID OF ME OR REALLY BELIEVED WHAT SHE WAS STATIANDS IN DETAINING THE ORDER OF PROTECTION. SHE WOULD HAVE NEVER.
RIGHTS TO VISITATION AND SHARED ENSTODY WHICH WAS A DIRECT INTER FERLANCE. AFTER I EXPLAINED TO THE JUDGE IN WRITTING THAT MY EX-SPONSE HAS LIED UNDER ORTH SINCE 1999 AND IN COURTS AND is WILLING TO DO ANYTHING TO GET BALL AT ME FOR DIVORLING HER . AND SHE DOES NOT CONSIDER THE EFFECTS IN USING AS A TOOL. I ALSO EXPLAINED THAT IF MY EX-SPONSE WAS REALLY AFFRAID OF ME OR REALLY BELIEVED WHAT SHE WAS STATUNG IN DETAINING THE ORDER OF PROTECTION. SHE WOULD HAVE NEVER AGREED TO A SETTLEMENT IN FURTHER THE MALLAGE, SHE MAS NOT ONLY
RIGHTS TO VISITATION AND SHARED CUSTODY WHICH WAS A DIRECT INTER FERLANCE, AFTER I EXPLAINED TO THE JUDGE IN WRITTING THAT MY EX-SPOUSE HAS LIED UNDER ORTH SINCE 1999 AND IN COURTS AND IS WILLING TO DO ANYTHINGS TO GIET BALL AT ME FOR DIVORLING HER . AND SHE DOES NOT CONSIDER THE EFFECTS IN USING AS A TOOL. I ALSO EXPLAINED THAT IF MY EX-SPOUSE WAS REALLY AFFRAID OF ME OR REALLY BELIEVED WHAT SHE WAS STATING IN DETAINING THE ORDER OF PROTECTION, SHE WOULD HAVE NEVER AGREED TO A SETTLEMENT IN TRIED BEFORE IN AND OBTAIN SOLE CUSTODY AND THEO TO

	CJC-07-289
	WILLFULLY DISREGARDED MY EVIDENCE AND HAD NO JUDICAL
	AUTHORITY TO TERMINATE MY RIGHTS UNDER THE SETTLEMENT
	AGREEMENT IN 2004 BASED ON ACCUSATIONS IN 2003.
	THIS MISCONDUCT TERMINATED MY RIGHTS AS A FATHER AND
	THROUGH MY EX-SPOUSES FAMILY RELATED AFFILIATION WITH THE
	CHULCH ORGANIZATION IN WHICH SHE HAD ATTOMO
	DURING THE SETTLEMENT IN 2004. THIS JUDGE BEING AFFILLATED
	WITH THE REASONS I
	HAD FOLLEDHT FOR MY PARENTAL RIGHT IS THE FACT THE
	ATTHOUGH IT HAS GOOD ASPECT, HAS A RACIST OUT LOOK IN ITS
	FUNDAMENTALLY RACIST BELIEF AND OUTLOOK WITH RESPECT TO
	ANDIT
. <u></u>	IS STILL ONE OF AMERICA'S MOST SEGREGATED RELIGIOUS SECTS.
<u> </u>	JUDGE VIOLATED IN MIS CONDUCT BY
	ABUSING THE ANTHORITY OF THE UNDICAL OFFICE AS PREVIOUSLY
	EXPLAINED. ALSO BY INFLUENCING ANOTHER SUDGE IN MY CURRENT
	CASE IN A SEPERATE CONRT . THIS JUDGE
	SHOWED UP IN MY COURT HEARING TO COMMUNICATE WITH MY JUDGE
	IN A SEPERATE CASE THAT CAUSED PREJUDICE AND CONFLICT OF
	INTREST WHICH EVENTUALLY LEAD TO PERMANENT DAMACHE IN
	THE SEPERATE LASE. I AM STILL FIGHTING FOR A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL
	REPRESENTATION IN THIS SEPERATE LAWSE BECOUSE OF THIS
	JUDGES INFLUENCE EARLY ON IN 2005.
	I AM SCARY FOR THE COMPLEXITY OF THIS COMPLAINT
	AN LENGTH OF FACTS STATED HEREIN.
·	
	3
STATE AND	

	CJC-07-289
	JAFFIRM, UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY, THAT THE FOREGOING INFORMATION AND ALLEGATIONS CONTAINED HEARING
	ABONE STATEMENTS OF FACTS ANT TRUE.
	ORIGINAL OF THE FORE GOING MAILED CERTIFIED THIS BOTH
********************************	DAY OF OCTOBER 2007 TO: COMMISSION ON JUDICAL CONDUCT
. <u></u>	ISOI W. WASHINGTON STREET, SHITE 229
	PHOENIX, AZ \$ 5007
·	
<u></u>	
· · · ·	
	Ľ
CREAR & A MERCE WITH A SEC.	