

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-119

Complainant: No. 1441810332A

Judge: No. 1441810332B

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge discriminated against him on the basis of his race during his criminal trial and prevented an accurate transcript of his case from being available to pursue his appeal.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judge 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, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judge did not violate the Code in this case. The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of the judge's rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: July 16, 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 July 16, 2012.

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

PLEASE STOP THE APPEAL
IN THIS CASE FOR A
INVESTIGATION BEFORE IT
BEGIN. AND A EVIDENTIARY
HEARING.

DEAR: BARBARA WANLASS, ADMINISTRATOR, COMMISSION
ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT.

This is a COMPLAINT TO HAVE A JUDGE IN THIS
CASE REMOVE OFF THE DEFENDENT APPEAL
CASE AND INVESTIGATED AND CHARGE WITH RACIST AND
PREJUDICE OPINION AND PREJUDGING THE DEFENDENT
IN THIS CRIMINAL CASE THAT DEFENDENT
IS INNOCENT IN AND NEED FOR BARBARA WANLASS, THE
ADMINISTRATOR COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT TO STEP IN
RIGHT NOW. BEFORE THIS RACIST AND PREJUDICE JUDGE WITH
THE JUDGE OWN OPINION AND PREJUDGING. DENY THE DEFENDENT
A FAIR AND RIGHTLY AND JUSTLY APPEAL IN THIS
CRIMINAL CASE THAT THE DEFENDENT IS INNOCENT
ON. THE JUDGE DID NOT GIVE THE DEFENDENT A FAIR
AND RIGHTLY CRIMINAL TRIAL NOT IN ONE CRIMINAL TRIAL BY
JURY BUT IN TWO CRIMINAL TRIAL BY JURY AND BY NOT
ANSWERING ANY MOTION PUT IN BY ATTORNEY
WHICH IS THE DEFENDENT ATTORNEY, AND BY MANY
DELAY IN A SPEEDY TRIAL CASE AND MANY FABULIST MOTION
ASKED BY THE JUDGE TO STOP THE SPEEDY TRIAL CLOCK AND
MANY CONFERENCE HEARING THAT WAS NOT RECORDED AND

MANY CONFERENCE HEARING THAT DID NOT ANSWER ANY OF THE MOTION THAT WAS FILE BY ATTORNEY
 THIS JUDGE WILL NOT GIVE THE DEFENDENT A FAIR AND RIGHTLY APPEAL AND THE JUDGE NEED TO BE REMOVE OFF DEFENDENT APPEAL CASE AND INVESTIGATED. DO TO RACIST AND PREJUDICE AND PREJUDGING OPINION AND DENYING THE DEFENDENT A FAIR TRIAL BY JURY. THE JUDGE IS WRONG ABOUT THIS CASE AND DEFENDENT CAN PROVE IT BY THE TRANSCRIPT AND MOTIONS IN THIS CASE AND MANY CONFERENCE THAT WAS NOT RECORDED. NOW THE JUDGE IS ALSO MISSING WITH THE TRANSCRIPT AND TAMPERING WITH THE TRANSCRIPT IN THIS CASE. BECAUSE IT ALSO PROVE THAT THE JUDGE WAS RACIST AND PREJUDICE AND PREJUDGING THE DEFENDENT WITH THE JUDGE OWN OPINION IN THIS CASE. THE JUDGE IS THE ONLY ONE THAT CAN TELL THE COURT REPORTER WHICH IS THE JUDGE FRIEND, WHAT TO DO AND TAKE THING OUT OF THE TRANSCRIPT AND PUT THING IN THE TRANSCRIPT IN THE ORDER THAT THE JUDGE WONT IT IN FOR THE JUDGE CAN PROVE THE JUDGE OWN OPINION BY TAMPERING WITH THE TRANSCRIPT LIKE THE JUDGE DID IN MANY CONFERENCE HEARING AND BY INTENTIONLY DELAYING THE DEFENDENT CASE AND ALSO INTENTIONLY STOPPING THE DEFENDENT SPEEDY TRIAL CLOCK AND SCHEDULE A STATUS CONFERENCE ON ONE DAY AND HAVE IT ON ANOTHER DAY WITH OUT A COURT ROOM REPORTER TO RECORD IT. THIS IS IN JUSTICE THAT THE JUDGE IS DOING IN THIS CASE TO PROVE THE JUDGE OWN OPINION. THAT WHY THE TRANSCRIPT WAS NOT READY ON TIME AND 8 DAY LATE FROM THE TIME IT SUPPOSE

To Be Ready ON The 8 of MARCH-2012 WHICH WAS NOT
 Ready To 15 OF MARCH-2012 WHICH MAKE THE TRANSCRIPTS
 7 DAY LATE WHICH COST THE JUDGE FRIEND THE
 COURT REPORTER \$50.00 DOLLAR A DAY FOR BEING LATE WHICH
 IS THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY DOLLAR FOR BEING LATE WITH THE
 TRANSCRIPTS. THIS IS IN JUSTICE AT IT FULLEST BY A JUDGE
 TO PROVE THE JUDGE OWE OPINION IN THIS CASE. THIS CASE
 HAVE TO BE INVESTIGATED BEFORE THE JUDGE DENY THE DEFENDENT
 A FAIR AND RIGHTLY APPEAL TO PROVE THAT
 THE DEFENDENT IS INNOCENT ON ALL CHARGES.;
 AND TO PROVE THAT THE JUDGE WAS AGAINST THE DEFENDENT
 IN THIS CASE. ALSO THE JUDGE WANTED THE
 DEFENDENT TO TAKE A PLE OF GUILTY IN THIS
 CASE TO.; THAT THE DEFENDENT WOULD NOT DO.
 JUST READ THE DEFENDENT APPEAL CASE
 ARGUMENT THAT THE DEFENDENT WON'T IN
 DEFENDENT APPEAL CASE... THIS IS SOME OF
 THE DEFENDENT PROOF THAT THE JUDGE WAS
 RACIST AND PREJUDICE AND PREJUDGING THE DEFENDENT
 AND THE JUDGE OWN OPINION.

THIS WAS STATED BY THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY AND THE
 DEFENDENT ATTORNEY
 ON THE DAY OF SENTENCING IN OCTOBER, THE
 DISTRICT ATTORNEY AND THE DEFENDENT
 ATTORNEY BOTH ATTORNEY STATED TO
 THE JUDGE THAT THE DEFENDENT IS THE
 PERFECT CANDIDATE FOR PROBATION AND DO TO THE

Defendant Medical Problem Both Attorney
 Recommend Probation for the Defendant
 Then the District Attorney went on to say that the
 Defendant came to court from out of
 town for every court hearing that was ask of the
 Defendant to do and the Defendant
 call in to pretrial service as order to do and
 did every thing the court have ask of the Defendant
 to do and was sign up on parole and did
 Probation on this case for the last 3 year on this case
 Defendant did every thing the court have ask
 of the Defendant to do., Even now the Defendant
 has medical health problem, the Defendant
 is the perfect candidate for Probation.
 The Judge stated that the Judge can not believe what
 the Judge is hearing from the District Attorney in this
 case and the Defendant Attorney
 that they both recommend Probation. The Judge stated
 that the Judge believe that the Defendant
 is guilty in this case., This was the Judge own personal
 opinion.. it was not share by the Attorneys that was
 a afraid to stand up to a Judge.. This is the hole problem
 of the case.... all of this is in the Defendant
 Transcript if the Judge did not take it out of the Transcript
 for the Judge own opinion in this case..

Second Time The case should have been dismissed
 with prejudice., it is stated in the Transcript if the

Judge Did NOT TAKE it OUT OF THE TRANSCRIPT FOR THE JUDGE OWN OPINION IN THIS CASE. AGAINST DEFENDENT
THE CASE WAS DISSMISSED DO TO OWNER OF THE HOUSE STATED TO THE LADY DISTRICT ATTORNEY THAT THE OWNER OF THE HOUSE RATHER HAVE SEX THEN COME TO COURT THIS WAS DISRESPECT TO THE COURT AND TO THE UNITED STATE AIR FORCE THAT THE OWNER OF THE HOUSE SUPPOSE TO REPRESENT.

THIRD STATEMENT MADE BY THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY IN MANY OF THE CONFERENCE HEARING TO THE JUDGE THE UNITED STATE AIR FORCE SUPERVISER WISH THAT THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY STOP CALLING THE UNITED STATE AIR FORCE SUPERVISER FOR THE OWNER OF THE HOUSE BECAUSE THE UNITED STATE AIR FORCE CAN NOT MAKE THE OWNER OF THE HOUSE COME TO COURT, IF THE OWNER OF THE HOUSE WISH TO COME TO COURT THE OWNER OF THE HOUSE CAN, THEIR IS NOTHING STOPPING THE OWNER OF THE HOUSE TO COME TO COURT WHICH WAS STATED TO THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY BY THE OWNER OF THE HOUSE SUPERVISER IN THE UNITED STATE AIR FORCE. THE JUDGE STILL FOUND REASON TO KEEP THE CASE GOING FOR THREE YEAR'S ALL IN THE DEFENDENT TRANSCRIPT IF THE JUDGE DID NOT TAKE IT OUT OF THE TRANSCRIPT FOR THE JUDGE OWN OPINION IN THIS CASE.

FOURTH STATEMENT MADE BY THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY STATED TO THE JUDGE IN MANY STATIC CONFERENCE HEARING THAT IT HARD TO GET IN CONTACT WITH THE OWNER OF THE HOUSE AND WHEN THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY DO GET IN CONTACT WITH THE OWNER OF THE HOUSE, THE OWNER OF THE HOUSE WILL NOT KEEP

IN touch with The DISTRICT ATTORNEY and will NOT ANSWER ANY of The DISTRICT ATTORNEY Phone call and will NOT RETURN ANY of The DISTRICT ATTORNEY Phone call OR LETTER THAT The DISTRICT ATTORNEY send TO The OWNER of The House. The Judge still found REASON TO CONTINUE The case FOR 3, year's with FABULIST MOTION and FABULIST Conference AND NEVER ANSWERING ANY MOTION put in By Defendant ATTORNEY BECAUSE The Defendant ATTORNEY WAS AFRAID TO ARGUE with The Judge ON ANY ATTORNEY MOTION, AND The Judge NEW THAT The ATTORNEY WAS AFRAID of The Judge. all of This is in The Defendant TRANSCRIPT if The Judge Did NOT TAKE it OUT of The TRANSCRIPT TO fit The Judge own Opinion.

Fifth STATEMENT made By The DISTRICT ATTORNEY STATED TO The Judge IN MANY STATIC CONFERENCE HEARING THAT The OWNER of The House keep BARGAINING with The DISTRICT ATTORNEY for other TIKET TO go OTHER place OR The OWNER OF The House well NOT come TO COURT and The DISTRICT ATTORNEY Told The Judge THAT The STATE well NOT keep BARGAINING with The owner of The House and well NOT Buy The OWNER of The House other TIKET TO go some where ELSE The STATE will NOT DO THAT for The OWNER of The House TO come TO COURT. The Judge STATED TO The DISTRICT ATTORNEY TRY TO WORK THING OUT with The OWNER of The House By BARGAINING with Him OR By Bribery The DISTRICT ATTORNEY STATED TO The Judge THAT The STATE well NOT Buy The owner

of The House other Ticket To go some where Else To make The OWNER of The House To Come The COURT The STATE will NOT Do it your HONOR, The Judge Still Told The DISTRICT ATTORNEY To work out some Thing with The owner of The House AND Less The Defendant

ONCE To TAKE A Pie of Guilty IN This CASE.

This was Clear To The Defendant THAT The

Judge IN This CASE WAS AGAINST The Defendant

IN This CASE. FOR 3 year's with FABULIST MOTION and

FABULIST CONFERENCE and NEVER ANSWERING ANY MOTION

PUT IN BY The Defendant ATTORNEY

all OF This is IN The Defendant TRANSCRIPT if

The Judge Did NOT TAKE it OUT of The TRANSCRIPT To fit The

Judge OWN OPINION. all The Things Defendant

STATE is The TRUTH and the Defendant CAN prove

it By A INVESTIGATION IN The CASE. and IN The Defendant

TRANSCRIPT if The Judge Did NOT TAKE it OUT of

The TRANSCRIPT To Fit the Judge own opinion THAT why

The Defendant KNOW The Judge well NOT give

The Defendant A Rightly and fair APPEAL IN

The Defendant APPEAL CASE THAT getting READY

To START, Right NOW and The Defendant ASK

BARBARA WANLASS, ADMINISTRATOR, COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL

CONDUCT To STEP IN Right NOW AND INVESTIGAT THIS CASE

AND Remove The Judge off The Defendant CASE

BEFOR The Defendant IS DENY A FAIR and Rightly and

JUSTLY APPEAL By the same Judge THAT DENY The Defendant

A fair and Rightly TRIAL IN This CASE. also This

Case Should Have Been Dismissed when The District Attorney
 Re file The Case Under A New Number And with out Proper
 Preceding and with A New Number ON A CASE THAT WAS
 Dismissed By The same Judge THAT New THAT it WAS WRONG
 To Do. AND The Judge would NOT ANSWER ANY of The ATTORNEY
 MOTION To Dismiss This CASE BECAUSE OF A
 New Number and By NOT NOTIFYING DEFENDENT
 ATTORNEY for The REFILEING of The CASE To A Loud
 The ATTORNEY Time To ARGUE The REFILEING of The CASE.
 The Judge New all of This and play A PART IN all of This CASE for
 3 YEARS IN DENYING The DEFENDENT A FAIR and RIGHTLY
 TRIAL NOT IN ONE TRIAL BY JURY Two TRIAL BY JURY BECAUSE OF
 The Judge OWN OPINION IN This CASE..... This Judge is WRONG
 IN Her OWN OPINION and Need To Be STOP and Remove By BARBARA
 WANLASS, ADMINISTRATOR, COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT Before
 The Judge Do more WRONG AGAINST The DEFENDENT
 IN This CASE. The DEFENDENT Should Be Release
 From The D.O.C. PRISON SYSTEM Do To This INJUSTICE By A
 Judge THAT Need To Be Remove and INVESTIGATED AND The Appeal
 IN This CASE Need To Be STOP, AND To The INVESTIGATION is
 OVER with By BARBARA WANLASS, ADMINISTRATOR, COMMISSION
 ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT. For This RACIST and PRE JUDICE Judge
 WITH Her OWN OPINION AND PRE JUDGING The DEFENDENT
 IN This CRIMINAL TRIAL CASE Need To Be Remove and
 DEAL with By BARBARA WANLASS, ADMINISTRATOR, COMMISSION
 ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT FOR INJUSTICE IN A UNITED STATE COURT
 Room, To DEFENDENT This Judge well NOT give
 The DEFENDENT A FAIR and RIGHTLY and

JUSTLY APPEAL. Like This Judge would NOT give The
 Defendent A FAIR and RIGHTLY and JUSTLY TRIAL
 NOT IN ONE TRIAL BUT IN TWO TRIAL., The Judge DENY The
 Defendent A FAIR and RIGHTLY and JUSTLY TRIAL.
 The Judge well DO it AGAIN if The Judge is NOT STOP IN The
 Defendent APPEAL CASE.

P.S. The Defendent ASK THAT BARBARA WANLASS,
 ADMINISTRATOR, COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT. STOP
 The Defendent APPEAL CASE BEFOR it BEGAIN
 AND START A INVESTIGATION IN THIS CASE ON The Judge AND
 TAKE The Judge OFF The CASE AND HAVE Defendent
 Release from The D.O.C. PRISON SYSTEM AS SOON AS POSSIBLE
 DO TO INJUSTICE BY A Judge AND ATTORNEYS THAT WAS AFRAID
 TO STAND UP TO A Judge. READ The Defendent ARGUMENT
 THAT The Defendent WON'T PUT IN The Defendent
 APPEAL CASE, WHICH IS 25 PAGES OF FACTS WITH YOUR TWO
 LETTER THAT I HAVE SEND TO YOU. ONE IS THE COMPLAINT ON
 The Judge WHICH IS 8 PAGE LONG AND THE OTHER LETTER IS ON THE
 Judge AND ATTORNEY THAT HELP The Judge BY BEING AFRAID OF
 The Judge AND NOT DOING They JOB AS A ATTORNEY WHICH IS 4 PAGES
 LONG WITH A INVENTORY LIST OF THE ITEM THAT YOU RECEIVED.
 AND A (6) PAGE LETTER TO THE NEW LAWYER ON THIS CASE ()
 SIGN INJUSTICE TO A
 INNOCENT MAN.

READ BACK OF PAPER.


RUFFBURN REALTOR CO. Did Lot of DESTROYING AND CONSTRUCTION WORK TO THIS HOUSE WITH OUT PERMISSION FROM TONY NIXON OR BY THE OWNER OF THE HOUSE.. HAD NO PERMISSION OR NO CONTRACT TO DO ANY CONSTRUCTION WORK IN THIS HOUSE AND HAD NO PERMISSION TO BE ON THAT PROPERTY AND TOOK LOTS OF PHOTOGRAPH OF THE CONSTRUCTION WORK AND DESTROYING THE HOUSE RUFFBURN REALTOR CO., WAS DESTROYING. RUFFBURN REALTOR CO, GOT PAID MONEY FOR THE DESTROYING AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION WORK DONE TO THIS HOUSE BY U.S. A. A. INSURANCE CO. OR THE OWNER OF THE HOUSE... (QUESTION IS HOW MUCH MONEY DID RUFFBURN REALTOR CO., RECEIVE FOR THE DESTROYING AND CONSTRUCTION WORK DONE TO THIS HOUSE WITH PHOTOGRAPH) WITHOUT A POLICE OFFICER OR DETECTIVE INVESTIGATING A CRIME., MEANING NO POLICE REPORT AND NO DETECTIVE INVESTIGATION OF A CRIME. THIS ALSO PROVE THE DEFENDENT TONY NIXON IS INNOCENT IN THIS CASE.

I TONY NIXON SWORN EVERY THING THAT IN TONY NIXON LETTER TO BARBARA WANLASS, ADMINISTRATOR, COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT. IS THE TRUTH ON DATE MAY 2, 2012

Tony Nixon

SIGN INJUSTICE TO A INNOCENT MAN ON DATE MAY 2, 2012

Tony Nixon



NOTARY PUBLIC BY Rose Marie Cook

SIGN AND DATE Rose Marie Cook 5/2/12