

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 09-081

Complainant: No. 1269210775A

Judge: No. 1269210775B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no evidence of ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The issue raised is legal in nature and falls outside the commission's jurisdiction.

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

Dated: April 30, 2009.

FOR THE COMMISSION

\s\ Keith Stott
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on April 30, 2009.

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

This instant matter arises from an alleged traffic violation-- prosecuted by a single evidence; by a remote camera. The undersigned disputed the validity of such evidence as being pretentious. A plea of not guilty was raised by the undersigned. By so doing the court had the full responsibility of proving their case.

The court did not produce a single witness to counter the testimony of the undersigned. But more importantly the court ignored and flaunted the law.

The Constitution of United States binds all courts in the United States. The Constitution cannot be replaced with any local Civil Code, no matter how entranced the local judges are with their craftiness.

Extract from Amendment Six of the Bill OF Rights: U. S. Constitution.

The accused person must be informed as to the charges against him and must be allowed to meet the witnesses against him face to face. Otherwise, an innocent person may be punished if a court allows the testimony of an unknown witness to be used as evidence. This amendment guarantees that a person on trial can face and cross-examine those who have accused him. He may be able to show that his accuser lied or made a mistake.

The only person that was raising an allegation was the court employee that had no personal knowledge of the alleged infraction. Since he was not a witness to the alleged infraction he could not of his own knowledge raise an accusable plea for a guilty verdict.

It is clear that the Court is exceeding it's authority in making a decision adverse to the Constitution of the United States.