## State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 10-126	
Complainant:		No. 1393010836A
Judge:		No. 1393010836B

## ORDER

The complainant alleged that a municipal court judge was biased against him in a case involving zoning code violations. The commission reviewed the allegations and found no evidence of bias on the part of the judge based on the information provided. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: October 13, 2010.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott

Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on October 13, 2010.

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

MAY 1 9 2010

## Complaint

May 13, 2010

Keith Stott Jr, Director Commission on Judicial Misconduct 1501 W. Washington Street Suite 229 Phoenix AZ 85007

Re: Judge

Hello Mr. Stott,

Enclosed below, is my Complaint of alleged Misconduct of Judge in the City of Tucson Municipal City Courts. I have also enclosed several documents that supports my case of alleged Misconduct.

Judicial Misconduct by Judge can not begin to describe what occurred in her Court Room, what does come to mind is an out right City Conspiracy, by corrupted City Government Officials, and now our Court System.

Due to the strength of my case against the City of Tucson, I was not going to be allowed to prevail against the City, as such, the corruption, and fraud that I had accused the City of for many years, had now found its way to our City Courts. As such, I believe that my case is not isolated. Please review this website, which emphatically proves that Judge is biased against anyone of ethnic decent. As such, I emphatically believe that Judge is predigest against all people of ethnic decent.

In addition, I allege unequivocally that Judge was biased towards me at my hearing, in favor of the City of Tucson, only because Judge primary area of experience for many years as a Traffic Judge, put her in a position to be biased in favor of the City of Tucson. As such Judge should be precluded her from hearing real legal cases, that do not have anything to do with City Traffic Citations. Only because of continued, institutionalized process that makes her an asset to the city of Tucson, as a Traffic ticket Magistrate.

I alleged, that the reason Judge was chosen to hear my case, was because of her lack of knowledge in trying these types of cases.

In my opinion, Judge could cause me to be injured, and claim that her lack of experience in hearing these type cases, she could claim that misconduct, as a Judge, is because of her claim that her lack of experience in hearing a City of Tucson Infraction case, would be limited, only because she does Traffic Cases, and that she was just doing the best job that she could.! Excusing the City of Tucson of any wrong doing.

Please investigate how many City of Tucson Infraction Cases she has heard before in the past, before my case, and how many City Infraction cases she has heard after my case.

This information, should give you a better idea of how blatantly confident Judge was in abusing me at my hearing.

I also found a web site, that provides more information on the extent of Judge misconduct, as a Judge.

See this documented Internet site enclosed below, that had been presided over in one of her routine Traffic Citations that she preside over.

It is shocking, as to how far Judge has fallen in the way she treats Disability cases of ethnic background in her Court Room. <a href="http://www.tucsonweekly.com/tucson/short-end-of-the-stick/Content?oid=1069965">http://www.tucsonweekly.com/tucson/short-end-of-the-stick/Content?oid=1069965</a>

On a legal note, because of Judge alleged misconduct, she has violate my 1st and 14 Amendment Civil Right Under The Constitution of The United State, see Bery vs. New York City, which pacifically states, that Appellants' artwork is entitled to full First Amendment, and Fourteenth Amendment Protection Under The Constitution of The United States, and not New York City's Constitution. See Bery vs. New York City;

http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?navby=search&case=/data2/circs/2nd/959089.html

I also maintain, that Judge also violated appellants' Civil Rights Under The Constitution of Arizona, Article II, Section 3. Which states That The Supreme Court, Is The Law of The Land. Article II, Section 4. No person shall be deprived life, liberty, or property without Due Process of Law.

By intentionally denying Appellant, any of the Four Motions filed to the City Court, any arguments I had raised in my defense, I was denied the opportunity to present any of my many documents to be entered in the Court Record, and the constant denial of any objections I raised in my defense, were also denied systematically by Judge

As such, Judge Misconduct while I was in Court on May 3rd, 2020, constitutes a clear violation of my Civil Rights to Due Process of Law, both on a Federal, and State level of Civil Rights Violations.

There was not a single issue of evidence, or documents that I was allowed to present into the City Court Record. As such, an Appeal would be a waste of time, since only the evidence that would not be allowed at my Appeal, is that evidence that was entered at my Infraction Hearing.

Being that there was no evidence entered at my hearing that I was not allowed to present at my hearing, due to the actions of Judge misconduct, my Appeal would be based on only the evidence collected at my Infraction Hearing. In my defense this constitutes a blatant denial, and disregard of my Rights to the Appeal Process.

In addition, during her ledged Misconduct, Judge did in fact violated her Oath as Judge, the oath she took during her Swearing In Ceremony as Judge. Which states, that she promises to uphold the Constitution of The United States, and The Constitution of Arizona, above all else.

Furthermore, Ms. deliberately violated my Civil Rights Under the Constitution, of the United States, which is my Right to Do Process of Law, Civil Rights, having to do with 1st, 5th, and 14th Amendment Rights were also violated by Judge

Enclosed is a copy, of Bery vs. New York City, for your review, which clearly describes how my 1st and 14th Amendment Rights Under The Constitution of The United States, were violated by Judge and other Co-conspirators involved in my case.

Furthermore, the Record will show, that there has always been an understanding, and rule, that I have been made to abide by prior to being in City Court.

This rule that was once enforced against me, by a City of Tucson Judge during one of my other Infraction Cases, states that I have to notify Tucson City Courts in advance, if I plan on being represented by Legal Council at my hearing.

As such, my attorney was dismissed by the Judge. The City of Tucson Judge assigned to my Hearing, stated that The City of Tucson would be a disadvantage during my hearing, if I had my Attorney present, and they didn't.

Well at my hearing, Ms. Mehrhoff, a Prosecutor for the City of Tucson Attorneys Office was present, and a Prosecutor form the City of Tucson Neighborhood Services Code Enforcement Department was also present, Mr. James Hurd. Together, I did not stand a chance at my hearing.

Since I was not informed of the two Prosecutors that were going to be present at my Code Infraction Hearing in advance, the City of Tucson violated my 14th Amendment Civil Rights Under The Constitution of The United States, by picking, and choosing who has to obey these rules. I had come with my Attorney to represent me at my hearing, but he was dismissed by the Judge before the hearing had started, and he was asked to leave.

I maintain, that during my City of Tucson Code Infraction Court Hearing, in front of Judge that City of Tucson Code Enforcement Inspectors, and other Co-conspirators at my hearing were deliberately inflicted on me punishment, and fines assessed in the amount of \$4000.00 because of the language that I used in my two Motions filed at the City of Tucson Courts, on my behalf, a Motion To Dismiss, and Motion To Continue.