

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 10-110

---

Complainant: No. 1391810223A

Judge: No. 1391810223A

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge made improper comments and condoned perjury, and that another superior court judge failed to take action regarding the conduct. After analyzing the allegations, the response from the judge, and the video recording of the proceeding, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct on the part of either judge. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: July 21, 2010.

FOR THE COMMISSION

\s\ Keith Stott

\_\_\_\_\_  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on July 21, 2010.

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

THIS COMPLAINT AGAINST MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE

CONTAINS THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS:

1. <sup>A</sup> Complaint and attached letter. <sup>B</sup> List of all recorded documents and problems with each recording (submitted for context.)

2. Fraudulent documents created and recorded after the judicial order (see Document No 3538914 whose recording label fraudulently names Coppercrest et al as the Grantees rather than \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_

3. Fraudulent Affidavit to release Lis Pendens, created by Auffret attorney Mr.

This document ties the Auffrets and Ms.

Title to Coppercrest et al as partners in crime.

4. Forged documents which presented to Judge \_\_\_\_\_ at the TRO Evidentiary Hearing, which took place on August 14, 2009. They were tagged as exhibits # 7 & 10 (The Authorization To Release Information and Credit Data form aka "The Wite-Out Exhibit" and Forged Credit Report created by Credit Information Services Inc. of New Lennox Illinois), Exhibit 12 (the injunction that explains why I was not living in my home at the time I took out the loan) and last but not least, Ex 2. (The Fraudulent documents created by Coppercrest et al Principal Ms. \_\_\_\_\_ sister of Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ along with Phoenix Settlement Services \_\_\_\_\_ Which named a phony 2006 contract with Phoenix Settlement Services fraudulently named as my original trustee (The only loan I took out is evidenced by Document No \_\_\_\_\_ viewable online on the Coconino County recorder's website, in 2008 with Grand Canyon Title Agency named as trustee.

Judge who openly condoned felony acts of forgery and perjury, and the violation of ARS 29-602, and the creation of a renegade mortgage company called Finance LLC, which was not licensed with the AZDFI or the Arizona Corporations Commission (exhibits introduced to show lack of character and willingness to break the law).

\*\*\* These documents were returned to me at the end of the coerced settlement conference that followed the TRO hearing on August 14, 2009.

5. Money Trail-- Endorsement to Promissory Note created January 30, 2008 and Payoff letter written April 24, 2009 naming accounts from 2 different banks, which may or may NOT belong to the same set of investors, who may or may NOT be the current successor assignees

IN ORDER TO UNDERSTAND  
 HOW THIS SCHEME WORKS PLEASE  
 TAKE A LOOK AT THE DOCUMENTS <sup>EX4</sup>  
~~SENT~~ TO ME BY PHOENIX SETTLEMENT  
 SERVICE (THE STATEMENT OF BREACH OR  
 NON PERFORMANCE LETTER, THE SUBSTITUTION  
 OF TRUSTEE, THE NOTICE OF TRUSTEE  
 SALE AND DOCUMENTS

IN WHICH THE COPPERCREST  
 LEVERAGED MORTGAGE FUND LLC IS  
 FALSELY CLAIMING TO BE ASSOCIATED  
 WITH DOCUMENT WHICH IN  
 FACT BELONGS TO COPPERCREST FUNDING LLC.  
 THESE ARE TWO SEPARATE COMPANIES  
 REPRESENTING ENTIRELY DIFFERENT INTERESTS.  
 THE REASON WHY CAN NOT BE  
 USED IS THAT TO DO SO WOULD EXPOSE  
 THE FRAUD THAT MY LOAN WAS SOLD TO  
 MORE THAN 1 GROUP OF INVESTORS!

State of Arizona  
Committee on Judicial Conduct  
1501 W. Washington St.  
Ste 229  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

April 20, 2010

Dear Committee,

THIS COMPLAINT IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED TO INFORM THE COMMITTEE THAT TOOK PLACE ON AUGUST 14, 2009 AND DURING THE IMPROMPTU SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE THAT FOLLOWED THAT HEARING, JUDGE VIOLATED THE FOLLOWING CANONS FOUND IN THE JUDICIAL CODE OF CONDUCT:

CANON 1

1.1 REQUIRES JUDGES TO COMPLY WITH ALL OF THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA , AND TO ENCOURAGE OTHERS TO DO THE SAME. IN THIS INSTANCE JUDGE OPENLY CONDONED NUMEROUS VIOLATIONS OF ARS: 13-2002 A & B, PERJURY, POSSIBLE IDENTITY THEFT, AS EVIDENCED BY A CREDIT REPORT PREPARED FOR THE DEFENDANT'S IN CV 2009-017469 BY CREDIT INFORMATION SERVICES INC. LOCATED AT 317 W. MAPLE ST. NEW LENNOX, IL.

JUDGE ALSO ASSURED US DURING THE SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE THAT NO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA WOULD PROSECUTE VIOLATIONS OF ARS 13-2002.

1.2 JUDGE ALLOWED THE DEFENDANT'S ATTORNEY TO ARRIVE 20 MINUTES LATE FOR WHAT WAS SCHEDULED TO BE AN HOUR HEARING. TO DELIVER PLEADINGS THAT THE JUDGE READ BUT DID NOT GIVE THE PLAINTIFF THE SAME OPPORTUNITY TO READ THEM AND REBUTT CERTAIN FALSE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THOSE LAST MINUE PLEADINGS. HE ALSO ALLOWED THIS ATTORNEY, MR. TO RIP ONE OF HER EXHIBITS AS SHE WAS PREPARING TO DELIVER TO BE TAGGED AS AN EXHIBIT, [PERHAPS IN AN EFFORT TO DESTROY THE ADDRESS OF THE ABOVE MENTIONED COMPANY, CREDIT INFORMATION SERVICES INCORPORATED.

- 1.3 JUDGES SHOULD NOT MAKE ANY STATEMENTS FROM THE BENCH THAT COULD BE INTERPRETED AS SOLICITING A BRIBE. IN THIS INSTANCE, JUDGE WHO, CO-INCIDENTALLY, WAS FLYING TO NEW YORK FOR A VACATION 3 DAYS AFTER THE HEARING, ASKED MR. ONE OF THE LITIGANTS IN THE RELATED CASE CV- WHO HAPPENS TO OWN RESTAURANT IN MANHATTAN NOT ONCE BUT TWICE, BOTH ON AND OFF THE RECORD DURING THE SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE, ABOUT THE PRICE OF ESCAROT AT HIS RESTAURANT, TO WHICH MR. RESPONDED WORDS TO THE EFFECT OF COME IN AND WE'LL TALK ABOUT IT. AT WHICH POINT JUDGE HAPPENED TO LOOK AT ME, NOTICED THE EXPRESSION OF HORROR AND DISDAIN ON MY FACE AND QUICKLY ADDED THAT HE WOULD NOT BE GOING THERE, THAT HE WAS GOING INSTEAD TO ATLANTIC CITY.
- 2.1 JUDGE WAS EAGER TO WRAP UP AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE, SO AS NOT TO BE LATE FOR THE BALL GAME HE WAS ATTENDING THAT EVENING.
- 2.2 BY ANNOUNCING WHAT HIS ULTIMATE DECISION WOULD BE, NOT SIMPLY OF THE TRO HEARING, BUT THE CASE ITSELF, PRIOR TO HEARING ALL OF THE EVIDENCE, OR EVEN ALLOWING ME TO CALL A SINGLE WITNESS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE, THE DEFENDANTS HAD NO MOTIVATION TO WORK OUT A FAIR SETTLEMENT.
- 2.11 JUDGE INDICATED DURING THE SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE THAT SINCE THE DEFENDANT MR. ONCE WAS A PARTNER AT A CERTAIN LAW FIRM THAT THE JUDGE'S DAUGHTER ALMOST MARRIED INTO, HIS CHARACTER WAS VIRTUALLY IMPEACHABLE, DESPITE EXHIBITS SUCH AS THE ORIGINAL AND THE "WITE-OUT" VERSION OF THE AUTHORIZATION TO RELEASE INFORMATION AND CREDIT DATA" FORM, WHICH UNEQUIVOCALLY VIOLATED ARS 2002. TO OPENLY CONDONE SUCH BEHAVIOR CASTS A BAD LIGHT ON THE ENTIRE LEGAL PROFESSION, AND CAN AND DID LEAD TO FURTHER, SIMILAR VIOLATIONS. SPECIFICALLY THE RECORDING OF THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS: NO. viewable online at the Coconino County Recorder's website, WHICH were recorded subsequent to and in violation of JUDGE ORDER SIGNED ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2009 (SINCE JUDGE HAD RECUSED HIMSELF).
- These documents violate ARS 13-2002 A & B, ARS 13-2407, ARS 13-2310 A-E ARS 13-2320 4 D, ARS 13-2311 ARS-13-803, & last but not least ARS 13-823, which prescribes the fines that may be imposed against those who file forged documents in violation of a judicial order. Document No. in particular needs to be corrected as soon as possible.

In closing I would like to ask the committee to do the right thing and thereby restore my faith in the judicial system.

Sincerely,