

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 10-296

Complainant: No. 1405010899A

Judge: No. 1405010899B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that two municipal court judges violated his rights by issuing an improper ruling. The commission reviewed the allegations along with the supplemental information submitted by the complainant and found no evidence of ethical misconduct on the part of either judge. The issues raised involve legal matters outside the jurisdiction of the commission. The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: January 21, 2011.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott

Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on January 21, 2011.

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

NOV 09 2010

**Complaint vs Phoenix Municipal Court,
Judge
Judge**

Case No.

INTRODUCTION

Due to numerous violations of the Arizona Code Of Judicial Conduct (2009), Rule 81 of the Rules of the Arizona Supreme Court, and in accordance therewith, I enter this complaint on this 9th Day of November, 2010. I do this in order that the standards established by this Code for the ethical conduct of judges may be upheld, whereas as noted in your code's Preamble: "An independent, fair, and impartial judiciary is indispensable to our system of justice, upon which the United States legal system is based".

The stated aim is that men and women of integrity will interpret and apply the law with independence, fairness, and impartiality, in order that the respect and honor of the judicial office as a public trust may be maintained, that public confidence may be enhanced in the legal system. As stated in the code's preamble, "judges must avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in their professional and personal lives, in conduct that ensures the greatest possible public confidence".

As "this code is a basis for regulating their conduct through disciplinary agencies" (to wit: the Commission on Judicial Conduct as the appropriate authority), the numerous violations of this Code in this case being clear, as outlined in this complaint, disciplinary action is crucial to insuring such integrity and public confidence, or like the midterm elections of 2010, I fear that the Arizona judiciary will come into great public disrepute and suffer greatly, which I wish to avoid. Your honest and forthright consideration of this complaint is key to achieving this goal, without equivocating over whether the case is still pending in court, or other excuse to pass the buck and avoid these serious violations altogether.

This case has been "pending" from month to month to month to month to month, now for over a YEAR, and still without any finding of probable cause whatsoever, since the evidence through 50 court exhibits clearly show that there is no probable cause. Therefore, the fact that "The commission does not have authority to reverse a court order", as stated in item #7 of your Complaint Form, is moot, as we are not seeking reversal or judicial assignment, but the very thing for which the commission owes its existence, to discipline clear violations of specific codes of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct, which are "overarching principles of judicial ethics that all judges must observe", the code being "A uniform system of ethical principles that applies to all judicial functions". A Claim against the city and the state is pending. May this be avoided, as government is too important to me, for it to come into disrepute. You are ministers of God (Romans 13:3-6). He only throws down governments when they violate the law.

Accordingly, since "The black letter of the rules is binding and enforceable", I present this complaint, showing the specific codes which have clearly been violated, in order "that judges may avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in their professional and personal lives, in conduct that ensures the greatest possible public confidence", and that our recall petitions may become unnecessary.

**Complaint vs Phoenix Municipal Court, Judge
and
Judge**

SPECIFIC CODE VIOLATIONS

NOTE: As the complainant is not trained in the law, he might not apply correctly some of the codes to what appear to be clear violations of that code. However, one misstatement doesn't annul or even apply to other provisions of the code. The commission must decide which codes have indeed been violated, and which ones have not. If only one code is violated, it is cause for disciplinary action.

RULE 1.1: Compliance with the Law: The Phoenix Municipal Court, the trial judge, and her presiding judge, after lacking probable cause in ten difference pre-trial conferences over a period of an entire year, and the state of Arizona being in open attack against defendant's FLDS Church, have turned the case into a continuation of their religious persecution, and in retaliation for his religion and for not finding probable cause, have taken a law or rule (#11) to order this defendant to plead guilty or be tortured, via psychological evaluation and treatment, without even providing the defendant any complaint or grounds for same, in bold-faced violation of federal law on religious persecution, as well as state code, and Rule 11. These laws and Rules are very clear in regards to orders for psychological evaluation and treatment, to wit:

1. **Defendant already has a psychological evaluation** showing defendant to be normal, and nothing has changed since that evaluation. In fact, the defendant has just gotten a little wiser with experience.
2. **This order for a psychological evaluation is a clear retaliation** against defendant's clear understanding of the proceedings, and his effective assistance in the case, to the point that no probable cause could be found after TEN (10) pre-trial conferences over a period of TWELVE (12) months, from November 11, 2009 to November 11, 2010, and to the point that on May 26, 2010, the defense counsel advised on record that the prosecutor "*is considering dismissal*" (end quote), which means that there is considerable reason to dismiss and no probable cause to prosecute, as evidenced in the numerous court exhibits over the past 12 months.
3. **The city has tampered with evidence, and colluded** with two separate medical doctors who examined the defendant and confirmed the disease which caused the symptoms of burning, shock, and loss of concentration, leading to his forgetting to pay for a bag of groceries. The doctors confirmed the tampering and the collusion with the city, who manipulated the doctors to act against the defendant regardless of defendant's medical needs for four long months, until he finally got the crucial prescriptions that he needed. (See Exhibits).
4. **The court's intent was to harm** the defendant in retaliation for his effectiveness in court, and his biblical and religious faith, which was born out in his court briefs and other writings. Effective defense and religion are not delusions nor mental illnesses. The acts of the city comprise of delusion and mental illness, a paranoia of faith, proving how broken government really is in delusional behavior, and in colluding and influencing the witnesses, and tampering with evidence. Documentary proof is available.

**Complaint vs Phoenix Municipal Court, Judge
and
Judge**

**SPECIFIC CODE VIOLATIONS
RULE 1.1: Compliance with the Law**

5. **This case is only a petty-theft case**, rising to the level of a traffic-ticket. But the city has treated it like Murder-One. That is delusional. In the course of the past SEVEN (7) pre-trial conferences over a SEVEN (7) month period, the case has proven without probable cause, and has nothing to do with one's mental state. This case has only to do with the charge, and a physical ailment which led to the charge, which has now healed. The medical profession's own primary medical reference (the Merck Manual), along with the personal prescriptions of two doctors, identifies the disease as a physical disease, not a mental one, and with "typical" physical symptoms, including shock and loss of concentration at the time of the medical episode experienced at the time of the charge.
6. **Rule 11.3 requires reasonable grounds**, or the appointment of mental health experts only on reasonable grounds. The above strongly indicates that there are no reasonable grounds at all.
7. **What is the nature of "mental health experts"?** What does the record show? "Mental health experts" do not consist of anyone participating in the business of forcing drugs upon citizens, productive ones or not, but certainly not upon citizens who are productive. That's just criminal assault, and dealing in drugs, which are felonies. Defendant never takes drugs. It is against his religion, as well as against good law.
8. **What else does the record show on "mental health experts"?** "It is common wisdom that psychologists and psychiatrists kill themselves more often than anyone else" (www.ironshrink.com). Do a google search: "Psychiatrists Kill", and "Psychiatric Scams". "Psychoactive drugs is the medium where many psychiatric scams are exposed" (www.net4truthuse.com/cchrlinks.html), which lists PDF articles from the Citizen's Commission on Human Rights International, to wit:
- a. Massive Fraud: Psychiatry's Corrupt Industry
 - b. Psychiatric Hoax: The Subversion of Medicine
 - c. Eroding Justice: Psychiatry's Corruption of Law
 - d. Pseudo Science: Psychiatry's False Diagnosis
 - e. Creating Racism: Psychiatry's Betrayal
 - f. Psychiatric Rape: Assaulting Women and Children
 - g. Unholy Assault: Psychiatry vs Religion
 - h. Elderly Abuse: Cruel Mental Health Programs
 - i. Schizophrenia: Psychiatry's For Profit Disease
 - j. Harming Artists: Psychiatry Ruins Creativity
 - k. Community Ruin: Psychiatry's Coercive Care
 - l. Chaos and Terror Manufactured by Psychiatry
 - m. Psychiatry: Hooking Our World On Drugs
 - n. The Real Crisis in Mental Health Today

**Complaint vs Phoenix Municipal Court, Judge
and
Judge**

**SPECIFIC CODE VIOLATIONS
RULE 1.1: Compliance with the Law**

9. **What do other doctors say about the “Mental Health Industry”?** Many medical doctors and psychiatrists are adamantly opposed, since it has subverted both medicine and law. Take, for example, Dr. Thomal Szasz, perhaps not coincidental that his last name are defendant’s initials (twice): He conducts a course at the Zur Institute, which deals with education in forensic and expert witnesses, and in consultation with therapists. His course is titled: “*The Myth Of Mental Illness*”, which covers “*The politics of psychiatry, the immorality of involuntary commitment, the dangers of the therapeutic state, the tyranny of pharmacracy, and the fallacy of psychiatric expertise*.” You can take this continuing education course online for \$50 bucks, at www.zurinstitute.com/szaszcourse.html.

10. **This proves that mental health practitioners are suspicious persons.** Psychiatric evaluation is necessarily a subjective process: Unpredictable humans trying to figure out themselves and their own suicidal tendencies, and then in their “professional” fantasies, what other unpredictable human might do. Being human and subject to political coercion and financial interests, they misread the cues, often deliberately for selfish and self-serving gain. Suspicious persons try to “substantiate” their suspicions, which of course skews the test and invalidates the results. Obviously, this indictment cannot apply to all practitioners in the industry, for such an assertion would also be borderline delusional of sorts. But their training and interests are what they are, and the pressures that they face every day.

11. **Defendant is productive and self-supporting,** and has taken care of all his needs all of his life. Over the past few years, he has worked odd jobs to care for his needs, and now he is starting to work full time in sales.

12. **What the defendant has written:** If the court is presuming a need for psychological evaluation over what the defendant has written, such as court brief or satire, his writings are just basic freedom of speech and of religion. To presume a need for psychological evaluation over that is just extreme paranoia and incompetence of the court and of the city (broken government). You just as well order psychiatric treatment of every author under the sun, because everything ever written creates suspicion in some minds, which itself is a subjective process, and not objective at all.

13. **Religious faith and belief is nearly universal.** Defendant’s Christian beliefs are also private, as well as healthy, not delusional at all, if they harm no one. Furthermore, they are confirmed by the scriptures, which is one’s civil right to believe and to express, and are accepted as fact throughout history, and also currently by 270 million Americans (most of our population), and by 2-Billion people worldwide (a third of the world’s population).

14. **Even vulgar writing is protected speech.** It is present throughout our society, not just in writing, but in practice, on the public airwaves day and night. If anything the defendant has written seems a little vulgar or threatening, there is no threat in the freedom of speech that harms no one, merely showing the contrast between social vulgarity and refinement, for satirical and educational purposes. Refinement includes respect for just and Constitutional laws and freedoms, including the supreme law of the land, with its freedom of speech and of religion.