State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-142

Complainant:

No. 1443110367A

Judge:

No. 1443110367B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge was biased in deciding to deny his motion to change counsel.

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 and the electronic court records, 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.

CONFIDENTIAL

· · ·

State of Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct 1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2012-142

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your Name:

Judge's Name:

Date: 5-22-12

Instructions: Describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes misconduct. Please provide all of the important names, dates, times, and places related to your complaint. You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to explain your complaint, and you may attach additional pages. Do not write on the back of any page. You may attach copies of any documents you believe will help us understand your complaint.

IN MAY 22, 2012 I APPEARED IN JUDGE COURT. ONCO MY ATTORNEY, ARRIVED JUDGE MADE AWARE OF THE MOTION FOR CHANGE OF COUNSEL AND HER THE STATE BAR COMPLAINT. BOTH OF WHICH I FILCO Also TO THIS COURT DATE THE STATE BAR COMPLAINT WAS DRIOR ON MAY 16, 2012 AND THE MOTION TO CHANGE COUNSEL FILED ON MAY 18, 2012, Once REVIEWED BOTH WE SPOKE I TOLD HER I WISHED TO PROCEED WITH BOTH ONCE ALL PARTIES CHECKED IN WITH JUDGE THE JUDGE ASKLO FELT A CHANGE OF COUNSEL WAS ADPRO PRIATO? HAVE NOT BEEN AFFORDED MY RIGHTS OF FULL STATED 2 DISCLOSULE OF DISCOVERY EVEN THOUGH I HAVE BEEN INCARCERATED DAYS. DUE TO THIS FACT I HAVE BEEN FORCED TO FOR 235 MAKE UNINFORMED DECISIONS CONCERNING MY CASE AND PLEA BARGAINS OFFERED TO ME I HAVE NOT BEEN GIVEN CANDID FEARL ADVICE AND HAVE BEEN MISTERD ON VARIOUS SCERSIONS." JUDGE TOLD ME THAT I WAS MAKING VERY SERIOUS THEN ACLUSATIONS TOWARD A LAWYER THAT SHE HAS KNOWN FOR SOME FOUR YEARS MAD WHOM HAD ALWARS CONDUCTED HEASEIF IN AN MANNER IN THE COURT. I FELT JUDGE Howes WAS NOT Being Impartial To THE SIFURTION, FOR SHE HAS Also NEVER KNOWN ME TO ALT ANYTHING STRER THAN UPRICHT AND HONEST IN HER COURT ROOM Also; HOWEVER, I WAS NOT TREATED AS SUCH. STATED FALTS AND SUPPORTED THEM WITH THE ARIZONA RULES

(Attach additional sheets as needed.)

2012-142

OF PROFFESSIONAL CONDUCT VIDLATIONS IN MH STATE BAR COMPLAINT, LET WHAT GOOD IS THE INFORMATION TO AN IMPARTIAL EAR OR EYE. T WAS THEN REFUSED A CHANGE OF COUNSEL AND INFORMED THAT IF I REFUSED TO TAKE THE PLEA I WOULD BE SUBJECT TO HAVING MY CHARGES STACKED ONE ON TOP OF THE OTHER AND COULD SPEND UPTO 25 YEARS IN PRISON OR THE REST OF MY LIFE IN PRISON AS STATED BY JUDGE I FELT AS IF I WAS BEING THREATENED BY THE SUDGE PERSET. T+ IS VERY CLEAR BY THE SUDGES ACTIONS THAT SHE SHOWED PARTIALITY TO OVER ME BECEVSE OF AN ACTING RELATIONS SAND BETWEENS THE TWO. I FEEL THE SUDGE IS ABUSING HER AUTHORITY USING BLITISHE POWER OVER A LEGAL INDICENT PERSON SUCH AS MYSELF. SHO HAS NO MONEY TO PROVIDE FOR ALTERNATIVE COUNSEL. TO FORCE ME TO SIGN A PLEA BARGAIN I DON'T FEEL IS FAIR OR ACCEPT AN ATTORNEY THAT HAS FAILED ME. THE LACE OF DILLESSE AND CONCERN I MADE EXPERIENCED FROM MY ATTORNEY IN THE LAST CHEET MADATHS 13 REAL YET JUDGE DISREGARDOD ALL THE FACTS AND SUPPORT RECAUSE SHE LING AND NOT ME BECAUSE & LAWER AND I'M A PRISONER. I FEEL DISCRIMINATED <u>ک</u>ر م TO THE PAUS THAT I HAVE AND PRESUDICES DUE SUPPORTED CURRITHING I HAVE SAID AND AM

2012-142

FULL DISCLOSURE OF DISCOULET 15.1(6) WHICH EVEN THE JUDGE REFLECTED ON RECORD AS! HAVE BEEN REQUESTED FROM THE PROSECUTOR BACK IN FEBUARY. TOGETHER WITH THE LACK OF INVESTIGATION, LACK OF LECAL GUIDANCE IN MY DETENSE AND THE MAILADING STATEMENTS, WHICH ARE ALL SUPPORTED IN MY STATE BAL COMPLAINT, SHOULD HALL BEEN DUER WALLMING CUIDENCE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST. THERE IS NO FAIR MANNER IN WHICH TO CONTINUE MY CASE. IT T ALCOT A PLEA BARGAIN T GIVE UP PAD NEVER RECEIVED THE RIGHTS IN ENTITLED TO AND IT I TARE IT TO TRIPL HOW CAN I EXPERT TO BE REPLESCATED BY THE BUT OF HER PRINT AFTER J HAVE BROUCHT TO LIGHT ALL HER SHORT COMMENCES AND FILED A COMPLET ACAMST HER EFFORTS OR EASK THERE OF? ALL THESE FACTS AND FUBENCE ARE RECORDED ON THE TRANSCRIPTS BY THE COURT STENDERAPHER FINALLY AFTER ALL GAS OVER IN COURT BUCHED AT ME Proj STATED I GUESS YOU ARE STUCK WITH ME AND WARED SUT. AT THIS POINT I FEEL I HAVE NO CHOICE BUT TO FILL A NOTICE OF CLAIM PROMPED TO ASSIST IN PRESENTING A CLAIM TO THE CITY OF PHOENIX THAT COMPLIES WITH THE REQUIRIMENTS OF ARS 12-821.01 WHICH DEFINES THE REQUIREMENTS FOR FILING A CLAIM AGAINST A PUBLIC ENTITY IN

2012-142

THE STATE OF ARIZONA, SEEING THE STATE OF ARIZONA MIRED 70 REPRESENT ME AND THE TAX PAYERS PAID FOR IT THIS PUBLIC ENTITY HAS VIOLATED Mit ciuit RICHTS WITH ABUSE OF ITS POWER, RUNNING A CRIMINEL CONSCORTISE AGAIST PESPLE GAD ARE LEGALLY INDIGENT WITH MOTHING TO GIVE BUT LIFE FSELF. THEY ARE USING THEIR CONSTINCT AND MONEY BY DEGANIZING AN ENTERDRISE PERMIT PEOPLE LIKE MYSELF GHO CAN NOT AFFORD TO par and Hamilst ATTURNET TO PROTECT MY RIGHTS WITH EFFELTIVE COUNSEL, THIS IS INDEED A SOCIAL Prijust Ice RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED THIS 23th DAY OF MAY 2012 and a second second