

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 13-333

Judge:	No.1045614832A
Complainant:	No.1045614832B

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge has improperly denied him the right to represent another person in court notwithstanding the fact he is not a lawyer.

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 review, 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 court rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: January 22, 2014

FOR THE COMMISSION

S George Riemer

George A. Riemer
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on January 22, 2014

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

2013 333

DEC 19 2013

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name

Judge's Name: _____

Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

Denial Of Creator-Imputed, Constitutionally Guaranteed Rights

During the course of a _____ Telephonic Status Conference, (Judge
_____ attempted to wrongfully deny _____ Creator-Imputed,
Constitutionally Guaranteed Right to engage in the Professional Practice of Law.

By and through filings deposited with the Superior Court,
_____ informed the Superior Court (and (Judge) _____ of
_____ professional representation of a Client (Plaintiff

During the course of the _____ Status Conference,
_____ respectfully inquired as to whether _____ and/or the Superior Court recognized
_____ as Plaintiff _____ "Lawyer".

Unfortunately, (Judge) _____ politely chose to attempt to deny
_____ right to represent _____ Client (Plaintiff
_____ as a Professional Lawyer. The audio-recording of the _____ Status Conference will
_____ reveal, (Judge) _____ errantly cited irrelevant rules, and refused to recognize
_____ Creator-Imputed, Constitutionally Guaranteed "Right to Work".

(see - Attachment A. - Article XXV - Constitution of The State of Arizona)

DEC 19 2013

Violation Of Sworn Oath(s)

swore an Oath to support the Constitution of The State of Arizona,
not irrelevant rules. wrongful attempt to deny that due under Article
XXV of The Constitution of The State of Arizona constitutes violation of Sworn Oaths undertaken
by
(see Attachment B - Oath Of Admission - State Bar of Arizona)
(see Attachment C. - Loyalty Oath - Arizona Constitution - Secretary of State)
(see Attachment D. - Loyalty Oath - Arizona Constitution - Secretary of State - Arizona Revised
Statutes - 2 Pages)
(see Attachment E. - Arizona Constitution - Article VI - Judicial Dept. - 26. Oath of Office)

Treason

violation of Article XXV of The Constitution of The State of
Arizona and/or violation of sworn oath(s) undertaken by constitute "Treason".
was/is "Warring Against" The Constitution of The State of Arizona.

"Treasonous Actions" (wrongful denial of Creator-Imputed,
Constitutionally Guaranteed Rights and/or violation of Sworn Oath(s)) render "dismissal" of Case
No.

As such, no decision concerning Case No.: exists.
has been compelled to "Appeal" Case No.: despite the
lack of any legitimate decision/ruling, concerning Case No.:

United States Supreme Court & Federal Court Citations

Apparently, violation of sworn oaths (by Judges) is considered an "Act of Treason".

Any judge who does not comply with his oath to the Constitution was against the
Constitution and engages in acts in violation of the supreme law of the land. The
judge is engaged in acts of treason. The US Supreme Court has stated that "no
state legislator or executive or judicial officer can war Against the constitution

without violating his undertaking to support it. See also

The U.S. Supreme Court

stated that when a state officer acts under a state law in a manner violative of the Federal Constitution, he comes into conflict with the superior authority of that Constitution, and he is in that case stripped of his official or representative character and is subjected in his person to the consequences of his individual conduct. The State has no power to impart to him any immunity from responsibility to the supreme authority of the United States. By law, a judge is a state officer. The judge then acts not as a judge, but as a private individual (in his person).

Any Judge who chooses to violate sworn oaths to “...support the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Arizona...”, wars against the Common Law, Arizona’s Constitution, The United States Constitution, The People of The State of Arizona, and The People of The United States. Judges choosing to violate The United States and/or Arizona Constitutions “are without jurisdiction” and have engaged in “Acts of Treason”.

Whenever a judge acts where he/she does not have jurisdiction to act, the judge is engaged in an act or acts of treasor

Criminal Conspirators

is a member of the “Licensed Attorneys’ Labor Union” (The State Bar of Arizona). The “Licensed Attorneys’ Labor Union” (The State Bar of Arizona) is a corrupt labor organization, and/or criminal enterprise. Members of the “Licensed Attorneys’ Labor Union” (The State Bar of Arizona), and Leadership of same, are involved in a Criminal Conspiracy designed to create a Monopoly concerning Attorney and/or Legal Services, and to Fix Prices for same. These Criminal Conspirators have violated, and continue to violate, Federal Statutes, and Arizona Statutes. s membership in the “Licensed Attorneys’ Labor Union” (The State Bar of Arizona) constitutes grounds for removal.

Denial Of Right To Professional Legal Representation

In addition, _____ chose to deny Plaintiff _____ right to Professional Representation (representation by _____ - a Legally-Practicing, Professional Lawyer).

No Titles of Nobility - United States Constitution

Being that Judges of Arizona’s Superior Courts have “sworn” and/or “solemnly sworn” to “support the Constitution of The United States, and The Constitution (and/or Law(s)) of The State of Arizona”, it would be reasonable to question the veracity and/or character of an individual (Judge) who has sworn to support The Constitution of The United States , while violating same, by and through:

- (a .) Acceptance of a “Title of Nobility” (“Honorable” (*Hon.*) and/or “Esquire” (*Esq.*);
- (b .) Participation in a “Criminal Conspiracy” involving members of “The Licensed Attorneys Labor Union” (The State Bar of Arizona), Licensed Attorneys, and/or individuals currently acting as Justices of Arizona’s Supreme Court.

Being that the _____ ORDER issued by _____ refers to _____ as “HONORABLE”, it appears _____ has been granted (and has received) a “Title of Nobility” (HONORABLE).

As such, it appears the issuance, acceptance, and employment of a “Title of Nobility” constitutes violation of The United States Constitution - Article I - Section 10 - Clause 1. (see Attachment G - Article I - Section 10 - Clause 1 - Constitution of The United States)

Therefore, it appears the actions of The State of Arizona, Maricopa County, The Superior Court, _____ and/or Members of Arizona’s Judicial Department constitute violation of Article I - Section 10 - Clause 1 - of The Constitution of The United States. (see Attachment F - Title of Nobility - HONORABLE - Two Pages)

United States Constitution

Article I, Section 10, Clause 1:

No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, **or grant any Title of Nobility.**

Being that _____ accepted and/or employs a "Title of Nobility"
("Honorable" and/or "Esquire (Esq.)"), (Judge) _____ has violated his Oath to support
The Constitution of The United States.

As such, _____ has committed an "Act of Treason", against The United
States, and/or The Constitution of The United States.

Therefore:

(a.) The decision rendered by (_____)
is "mute":

(b. _____ should be stripped of:

- (1.) The Title of Nobility (Honorable);
- (2.) The Title of Nobility (Esquire/Esq.)
- (3.) Authority to act as an Officer of Arizona's Courts/Arizona's Judicial System;
- (4.) All financial income and/or benefits associated with service as an Officer of
Arizona's Courts.

(c. _____ should face State and/or Federal prosecution for Acts
of Treason.

Notice: Conflict Of Interests

_____ believes appointment of Members of the
Commission on Judicial Conduct, by Arizona's Supreme Court, to be a "conflict of interests".

Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct

*The Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct (commission) consists of eleven members with diverse backgrounds who serve six-year terms. **Six judge members are appointed by the supreme court: two from the court of appeals, two from the superior court, one from a justice court, and one from a municipal court.** **Two attorney members are appointed by the board of governors of the State Bar of Arizona.** Three public members, who cannot be attorneys or active or retired judges, are **appointed by the governor and confirmed by the state senate.** (source: <http://www.azcourts.gov/azcjc/AboutUs.aspx>)*

Members” of the Commission on Judicial Conduct, by “the board of governors of the State Bar of Arizona”, to be a “conflict of interests”.

Permitting members of a corrupt Labor Union (The State Bar of Arizona) to appoint Union Members to Arizona’s Commission on Judicial Conduct, “an independent state agency responsible for investigating complaints against justices and judges on the supreme court, court of appeals, superior court, and justice and municipal courts”, is silly.

A Pattern Of Wrongful Conduct

Upon information and belief, individuals currently serving a Justices of Arizona’s Supreme Court have engaged in a pattern of wrongful conduct, whereby they deny and/or attempt to deny Creator-Imputed, Constitutionally Guaranteed Rights.

It appears individuals currently serving as Justices of Arizona’s Supreme Court, and the Leadership of The State Bar of Arizona (The Licensed Attorneys’ Labor Union) have and continue to knowingly engage in a Criminal Conspiracy designed to:

- (a.) Create a Monopoly (concerning Attorney/Legal services);
- (b.) Fix Prices for Attorney/Legal services;
- (c.) Deny Creator-Imputed, Constitutionally Guaranteed Rights;
- (d.) Control and/or manipulate outcomes in Arizona’s Elections;
- (e.) Violate Article XXV of The Constitution of The State of Arizona;
- (f.) Unlawfully compel Membership in a Labor Organization (The Licensed Attorneys’ Labor Union - The State Bar of Arizona);
- (g.) Undermine and/or subvert the will of The People of The State of Arizona;
- (h.) Create unnecessary conflict, as a means to “divide and conquer”;
- (i.) Create unnecessary conflict as a means to increase the financial incomes of Members of “The Licensed Attorneys’ Labor Union” - The State Bar of Arizona;
- (j.) Subvert the Rule of Law;
- (k.) Coerce, harass, intimidate, threaten and/or terrorize.

would inform The Commission on Judicial Conduct that issues related to violation of Creator-Imputed, Constitutionally Guaranteed Rights stem from individuals serving as Justices of Arizona’s Supreme Court. It appears, individuals

serving as Justices of Arizona's Supreme Court (past and present), and the Leadership of The State Bar of Arizona (The Licensed Attorneys' Labor Union) have repeatedly violated "Sworn Oaths", and committed "Acts of Treason".

The Constitution Of The State Of Arizona

ARTICLE II. DECLARATION OF RIGHTS

28. Treason

Section 28. Treason against the state shall consist only in levying war against the state, or adhering to its enemies, or in giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or confession in open court. (emphasis added)

Misprision of Treason

as an Act of Respectful Service", would remind Licensed-Attorneys serving as Members of the Commission on Judicial Conduct of Oaths same swore, when choosing to become Officers of Arizona's Courts.

Licensed-Attorney Members of the Commission on Judicial Conduct owe, "*allegiance to the United States*". Being that The State of Arizona is one of the "*United States*", Licensed-Attorney Members of the Commission on Judicial Conduct owe a duty to "*disclose and make known*" the "*commission of any treason* against" The State of Arizona. (see: 18 USC § 2382)

Failure (by Licensed Attorneys owing allegiance to The United States) to "*make known*" the "*commission of any treason*" against The State of Arizona might appear to constitute "*Misprision of Treason*". (see: 18 USC § 2382)

18 USC § 2382 - Misprision of treason

Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States and having knowledge of the commission of any treason against them, conceals and does not, as soon as may be, disclose and make known the same to the President or to some judge of the United States, or to the governor or to some judge or justice of a particular State, is guilty of misprision of treason and shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than seven years, or both.

Plea For Mercy

would offer a plea for mercy, concerning possible

criminal prosecution, and/or sentencing of (Judge)
should be held responsible for wrongful actions. However, unlawful
actions and violation of sworn oath(s) are mere symptoms of a "disease", which infects Arizona.

swore an Oath to support The Constitution of The State of
Arizona, despite failure to understand the terms, words and/or authority of that to which Judge)
swore support. However, it is possible (Judge) was/is
unfamiliar with the document and/or principles he swore to support.

would remind Members of The Commission on
Judicial Conduct that the "Loyalty Oath" sworn by includes:

"I will faithfully and impartially discharge the duties of the office"
(which is followed by)
"according to the best of my ability"

If "Treasonous Acts" result from illiteracy, ignorance, and/
or failure to comprehend words comprising The Constitution of The State of Arizona,
would encourage leniency and compassion.

A Little Encouragement!

would encourage The Commission on Judicial
Conduct to examine additional evidence related to violation(s) of The Constitution of The State of
Arizona and/or The Constitution of The United States. can
provide The Commission on Judicial Conduct with evidence supporting claims presented, herein.

Conclusion

as an act of respect, would like to express
appreciation for opportunity to present The State of Arizona's Commission on Judicial Conduct
with the foregoing information.

Date