

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 12-074

---

Complainant: No. 1430410527A

Judge: No. 1430410527B

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged that a superior court commissioner falsely charged him with a crime and another commissioner improperly issued an arrest warrant, lied to him, and violated his free speech rights, and both commissioners imposed excessive bail.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the commissioners engaged in conduct that violated the provisions of Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution or the Code of Judicial Conduct and, if so, to take appropriate disciplinary action. The purpose and authority of the commission is limited to this mission.

After reviewing the information provided by the complainant and the history of case, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the commissioners did not violate the Code in this case. The commission does not have jurisdiction to investigate the legal sufficiency of court rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: May 23, 2012.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George Riemer

---

George A. Riemer  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on May 23, 2012.

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

Dear Judicial Conduct Commission:

The purpose of this letter is to ask that you recommend to the ARIZONA Supreme Court to remove \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ from the judiciary of the MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT in the interest of public safety and justice. Further, I ask that U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division Chief, \_\_\_\_\_ conduct a criminal investigation and prosecution for violation of my civil rights.

### **DEFINITIONS**

**Barratry:** 1. Offense of persistently instigating lawsuits, **typically groundless ones.**

2. An unlawful breach of duty on the part of a ship's master or crew resulting in injury to the ship's owner. 3. Common Law: Barratry is an offense both at Common Law and under some state statutes. The broader common-law crime has been limited by certain statutes. An attorney who is overly officious in instigating or encouraging prosecution of groundless litigation might be guilty of common barratry under a particular statute.

**Discrimination:** A failure to treat all persons equally where no reasonable distinction can be found between those favored and those not favored. Baker v. Cal. Land Title Co., D.C. Cal. 349. F.Supp. 23, 238, 239. Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

**First Amendment:** Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or **abridging the freedom of speech**, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

**Fourth Amendment:** The right of the people to be secure in their persons, **houses**, papers, and effects, against **unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation,** and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

**Fifth Amendment:** No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; **nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.**

**Seventh Amendment:** In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a

jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

Eighth Amendment: Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Tenth Amendment: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

U.S.C.A.: United States Code Annotated.

U.S.C.S.: United States Code Service.

A.U.S.C.: Amendment United States Constitution.

U.S.C.: United States Constitution.

Title 18 U.S.C. §241: If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or ...

...They shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results, they shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life.

Title 18 U.S.C. §242: Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such inhabitant being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life.

### CAUSES OF ACTION FOR COMPLAINT

This complaint is a result of falsely charging myself with a crime and faking (or working in conjunction with someone who faked) my signature on a document. Complaint against is for issuing an arrest warrant against myself, preventing myself from placing documents on the record, forfeiting bond money based on a violation of my inherent rights and by publically lying in an arraignment session. As a result

and have violated Title 18 U.S.C. §241 and §242, which constitutes criminal actions.

### **BRIEF SUMMARY**

On January 24, 2012, I was unlawfully placed into the Maricopa County Fourth Avenue Jail after a private bail bond company had Phoenix Police Officers drive outside of their jurisdiction into Chandler and said persons breached the private property of a home/castle in violation of the Fourth Amendment and Arizona's Castle Doctrine/Law. Arresting individuals broke a window and forced open another window of the home, refused to identify themselves, refused to show any warrant and dragged me to a cruiser. Arrest was based on false presumptions which will not be addressed in this letter.

Sometime in the early morning of January 24, 2012, I was in a Fourth Avenue jail cell and three individuals stood in front of the cell, two women and a male Sheriff's Officer. One female was believed to be a Maricopa Attorney named Woman believed to be stated that I had been charged and placed papers into slot of the cell and walked off. Individuals did not identify themselves when asked for identification. About an hour later, I hailed over a Sheriff's officer and asked how I could have been charged with a crime when I never made an initial appearance in court (Fourth Avenue Jail has a court in the jail) and wanted to know why there was a false signature on the court document, see Exhibit 1, note 1. Sheriff's Officer was unable to articulate and walked off.

Under Arizona's own laws, a person must be charged with a crime within forty-eight (48) hours or released. As a result of Ms. actions, Maricopa County's electronic records showed that I was charged with a crime (as a result of false court session and fake signature). Since I never made an initial court appearance, entered the BAR, willingly stated my name on the record or signed any contractual papers, I was not charged with any crime. I should have been released on the early morning on January 26, 2012. Consequently, I was unlawfully held in custody, in excess of forty-eight (48) hours for an additional sixteen (16) days.

On February 6, 2012, I was taken against my will by Maricopa County Sheriff's Officers (MCSO) from Lower Buckeye Jail to Maricopa County Superior Court. MCSO had stated that if I did not go to an arraignment that I could face the possibility of being held in jail indefinitely. In the basement of the Superior Court, an arraignment was held against my will via video-conference, a violation of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, see Exhibit 2, note 2. Further, was aware that I did not consent to video teleconferencing, see Exhibit 3, note 1. Also, according to own condition, an attorney named was to be present during any attempted arraignment, see Exhibit 3, note 2. However, continued with arraignment using a random attorney named a clear violation of own conditions, see Exhibit 4, Page 3. Finally, during arraignment, publically lied by stating that my fingerprints were found at the "crime scene," see Exhibit 4, Page 4, lines 14-17, **NOTE 4:** Transcript text appears to be altered. Whereas the truth shows that there were no fingerprints at any

scene, see Exhibit 5, notes 1 and 2 Further, entered pleas on my behalf as well as on the behalf of other people, a clear violation of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, see Exhibits 2, note 1 and Exhibit 4, Page 4, lines 22-23 and Page 5, lines 13-18. As a result of and violations of the law, the public and law enforcement is under the impression that I have been formally charged with a crime.

**TITLE 18 U.S.C. §241 and §242: CRIMINAL VIOLATION OF INHERENT RIGHTS**

**FIRST AMENDMENT:** (2 counts)

has violated my First Amendment Right by entering pleas on my behalf against my will and consent.

has violated my First Amendment Rights by interrupting me, preventing me from speaking freely in public; see Exhibit 5, page 5, lines 22-23, just one example.

**FOURTH AMENDMENT: Brian Rees**

Factually, and are Maricopa County Attorneys and are **not judges**, see Exhibit 6. violated my rights by issuing an arrest warrant without having a sworn, loyalty oath of office or supporting affidavit as required by law, see Exhibit 7.

**FIFTH AMENDMENT:** (1 Count) and (at least four counts, more to be determined)

violated my inherent rights by participating in a fictitious court proceeding which never occurred and by signing (or allowed someone to sign) a court document which gave the perception to MCSO and the public that I had been charged with a crime. As a result, I was unlawfully held in excess of forty-eight hours.

violated my inherent rights by forfeiting bond money based on an unlawful breach of private property. Second, held an arraignment via video teleconference, even though he had knowledge that I did not consent to video-teleconferencing. Third, publically lied stating that he had knowledge and reviewed my fingerprints and that my fingerprints matched fingerprints at the crime scene. Fourth, a county attorney, entered a plea on my behalf. Fifth, actions of entering pleas on other people's behalf violates the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, *Id*.

Finally, and acting as "judges" when in fact, they are county attorneys, constitutes fraud and impersonation, another violation of my inherent rights.

**SEVENTH AMENDMENT:** Julia Lopez (1 count), Brian Rees (1 Count).

and violated my inherent rights by proceeding against me according to the private administrative rules of Maricopa County, the State of Arizona and the BAR as opposed to the common law.

**EIGHTH AMENDMENT:**

and actions led to false imprisonment in Lower Buckeye Jail for eighteen (18) days. Such imprisonment as a result of violations of my inherent rights constitutes cruel and unusual punishment. Further, and assigned a cash bond of \$30,000 which constitutes excessive bail.

**SUMMARY**

In summary, I have inherent rights granted to me by God. and violated my rights by means of violating Constitutional protections and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. Even worse was the fact that their actions were intentional. As a result, and have committed multiple crimes. Since and are in a position of responsibility, said individuals need to be removed in order to protect the public and to prevent any further violations of other people's rights. Please recommend to the ARIZONA Supreme Court to remove these individuals from the judiciary of MARICOPA COUNTY in the interest of justice and public safety. I am willing to help your commission in any way possible. I am willing to appear in person with full exhibits, police report, grand jury transcripts, court documents, etc., upon request. Thank you.

By:

**END OF LETTER-EXHIBITS FOLLOW**