

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 14-051

Judge:	No. 1093713191A
Complainant:	No. 1093713191B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge improperly delayed rulings and failed to take action regarding various allegations of misconduct by others.

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 issues in lawsuits in which the complainant has been involved. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: April 9, 2014.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

George A. Riemer
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on April 9, 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

2014 051**COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE****Your name****Judge's name****_ Date:**

Instructions: You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Please describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times and places that will help us understand your concerns. You may attach additional pages but not original court documents. Print or type on one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your files.

Complainant's Preliminary Notice to the Commission

The Complainant hereby informs the Judicial Commission that prior to setting forth the actual material facts of the Complaint, he recites a (1) semi (1) lengthy "Briefcase History" of Complainant's case history, (b) before the current assignment of Judge to these actions, (c) due to there appears to be an impartiality and/or imputed conflict interest which Judge and current Third Party ADO Arizona Assistant Attorney General (Att. Gen) in these actions. Based upon Judge has willingly refused to provide Complainant with disclosure whether he was a former Arizona Assistant Attorney General (AAG) and/or acted in this AAG capacity or any other legal counsel representation on behalf of the State of Arizona, the Arizona Department of Corrections (ADO) and/or ADO staff, (b) because Third Party ADO and ADO staff are Defendants in this action in which Judge is presently presiding over in Complainant's pending ten (6) action before this Court.

A. Procedural History:

1. The Complainant between and filed ten (10) separate Civil Rights Actions pursuant to 42 U.S.C. Section 1983, pro-se, in the Arizona Court in and for Phoenix, on and/or on page 2, interstate, before the Honorable Assigned Court Judge thereof.

(Attach additional sheets as needed)

Page 3, Continued:

2. The Complainant filed these actions pursuant to the Court's Order granting Complainant's the "Deferral of Court Filing and Service Fees for the County Sheriff to effectuate service upon defendants on behalf of Complainant."

3. Thereupon, the Complainant filed in these actions an Ex Parte Motion for Court Order to Effectuate Service by Sheriff, re: Deferral of Service Fees Order. Judge rejected Complainant's Ex Parte Motion advising Complainant the Court (Judge) will not hear this Ex Parte Motion without giving Third Party ADOE an opportunity to be heard and directed Complainant to (s) specifically serve ADOE statutory agent Court. City. Hon. at the Arizona Attorney General's Office.

4. On the Complainant filed in each of these actions Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Court Order to Effectuate Service by Sheriff, re: Deferral of Service Fee Order. Pursuant to Judge Order, the Complainant served specifically ADOE Court City. Hon. at the Arizona Attorney General's Office. [Exhibit 4]

5. In this Renewal Motion, the Complainant requested Judge to issue a court order to Third Party ADOE to treat Complainant's outgoing mail to the Sheriff (to mail summons and complaints), as non-privileged indigent legal mail to effectuate this Court's ordered service upon defendants in accordance with the Court's Deferral of Service Fee Order at issue.

6. On Third Party ADOE counsel Court City. Hon. filed on behalf of ADOE a "Response to Plaintiff's Renewed Motion." In the Response, Court City. Hon. (s) specifically advised Judge "that the Attorney General's Office routinely will accept mail waivers of service of process on behalf of their essential clients," (Complaints added), in the alternative to Judge issuing a court order which directs ADOE to treat Plaintiff's outgoing mail to the Sheriff (to mail summons and complaints), as indigent legal mail to effectuate this Court's order to effectuate "formal service" upon defendants in accordance with the Court's order. [Exhibit 5]

Complaint against A Judge

Page 4, Sentenced

7. Based ~~consequently~~ upon the ~~advisal~~ of ~~Just. Atty. Gen.~~
 On Judge issued an Order which directed
 Plaintiff to attempt to effectuate service by mail upon the Attorney Gen-
 eral's Office on behalf of defendants or the Attorney General's Office
 via. They will accept mail service receivers on behalf of their
 eventual ADOE clients, " (Emphasis), and therefore Judge (in-
 tentional) did not issue an Order which commands ADOE to treat
 Plaintiff's outgoing mail to the Sheriff (semons and com-
 plaints), as non privileged (independent Legal Mail to effectuate "formal"
 service of "semons upon defendants pursuant to this Court's order
 and not by mail service receiver of service of process to the Attorney
 General's Office. [Exhibit 3]

8. On six days after Judge Belkett issued the
 Order (denying Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Court Order to direct
 Third Party ADOE to treat Plaintiff outgoing mail to the Sheriff, as
 independent Legal Mail, as Atty. Atty. Gen. requested in the
 Response and thereafter asserted Atty. Gen. Motion on behalf
 of ADOE a "Motion for Clarification, Re: Court's Minute Entry Order dated
 [Exhibit 4]

9. In this Response, Atty. Atty. Gen. moved for clarification
 and correction of Judge order. Specifically, Atty. Atty. Gen.
 in the Response sought to "correct" his previous
~~advisal~~ to Judge that, "the Attorney General's Office will ac-
 cept mail receivers of service on behalf of their eventual ADOE clients,"
 (Emphasis), and "re-advice" Judge to the contrary, that, "At-
 torney General's Office DOES NOT, and will not routinely accept
 mail service of process by receiver on behalf of any of its eventual
 ADOE clients." (Emphasis added)

10. The Complainant advises this Commission there are several crucial
 points to note regarding these statements of Atty. Atty. Gen.
 using them to intentionally perpetrate a fraud upon Judge
 to issue the hereinafter (precedent) court order.

Page 5, Continued:

First. In this Response, Chief Judge states the CS take basis of his Motion for Clarification is that he "the undersigned apologizes for any 'confusion' caused by this footnote (advising that the AGO's will accept mail service of process). The record reflects that Chief Judge made this statement Judge was "confused" by this advisal and not in response to any statement by Judge was "confused" by the advisal and that Chief Judge expressly made this statement to Justice by his Ex Parte assertion in the Response Judge was "confused" or the advisal "caused Judge confusion" to cause the President order directing Judge to direct Complainant to effectuate service upon the Office. (Id)

Second. The Complainant respectfully submits to this Commission that Chief Judge advisal to Judge is not ambiguous and hence "in it 'confusing' by the unreviewed language of Chief Judge statement that the 'will' routinely accept mail service receivers...". The definition of the word "will" is not ambiguous term and means that as predicate a CS specific course of action "will" or "will not" occur. See Merriam-Webster Dictionary, Collegiate Dictionary, 11th Ed. Based thereon, the record reflects that the Chief Judge used as "will" that had with a prethought intentionally used the word "will" in advisal to mean that the AGO's will definitely accept mail service of process in non-ambiguous and non-confusing terms. (Id)

Third. The Complainant further requests this Commission to take notice of the following information regarding Chief Judge. The record reflects there was no factual or legal reason for Chief Judge to make and advise Judge that "the Attorney General's Office will routinely accept mail service of process". Based upon the issues before the trial Chief Judge. Re: Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Court Order to Effectuate Service by the Sheriff re: Deferral of Service Fee Order. (Id)

Complaint Against a Judge

Page 6. Continued

(a) This Commission should recognize the "sole" material "Legal Issue" before Judge [redacted] regarding Complainant's "Plaintiff's Renewed Motion which asserts Atty. Gen. [redacted] was required and Committed to Respond as third Party Adversely Affecting Complainant on behalf of AOC is "whether or not AOC has duty to mail Plaintiff's outgoing mail to the Sheriff to effectuate service, as independent "Legal Mail" per the Courts Order;

(b) The Commission should further recognize the "sole" material "Issue" before Judge [redacted] regarding "Who" Complainant is required and Committed to serve by "mail waiver" of service of process is exclusively "directed" to non defendants, per Atty. Gen. [redacted] admission in his Motion for Clarification, (Id. at pg. 2), (Emphasis) and "not" upon the Attorney General's Office. (Id.) (Emphasis Added).

The Complainant avers based upon this admission of Atty. Gen. [redacted] there exists legal and factual basis or reason for him

for making the aforesaid order to Judge [redacted] that "the Attorney General's Office will accept mail service receivers..." in his Response to Plaintiff's Renewed Motion. Based thereupon, this was a knowingly false and misleading of material fact to trial Court Judge [redacted] made for the purpose to obtain a fraudulent court order unknowingly issued by Judge [redacted] as hereinafter stated herein.

11. Based upon the record, the evidence shows that Atty. Gen. [redacted] knowingly and intentionally made the aforesaid false advice to Judge [redacted] that "the Attorney General's Office will accept mail receivers of service of process..." to unlawfully obtain and "deceive" (trick) by providing Judge [redacted] this false information to cause Judge [redacted] to "unknowingly" issue a fraudulent court order directing Plaintiff to attempt to effectuate mail receiver service upon

Complaint Against A Judge

Page 7, continued:

The Attorney General's Office has indicated they will accept mail service executors on behalf of its eventual clients. (Emphasis).

12. On the Complaintant filed a "Motion to Modify Court's Order Directing Plaintiff to Attempt Service By Mail Waiver to the Attorney Office, Based Upon Plaintiff's Excessive Neglect In Filing A Delayed Reply To AGO's Response To Plaintiff's Renewed Motion for Court Order to Effectuate Service By Sheriff, Re Deferral of Service Fees.

13. In this Motion, the Complaintant requested Modification of Trial Court Judge Minute Entry Order (b) and upon Circuit Atty. Gen. Motion for Clarification, intentionally misrepresenting his previous advice to Judge that, "the Attorney General's Office has indicated that it would accept mail service of process by receiver on behalf of its eventual clients," and answer to the contrary that, "the Corrections Department section of the Attorney General's Office DOES NOT, and will not routinely accept mail service of process receiver on behalf of its eventual clients." (Id. at pg. 7-10).

14. The Complaintant further averred in this Motion that Circuit Atty. Gen. Response to Plaintiff's Renewed Motion and Motion for Clarification were fraudulent and frivolous and were intentionally made to obstruct these proceedings before Judge and cause the unnecessary delay of Plaintiff from obtaining his rightfully requested court order directing AGO to treat Plaintiff's outgoing mail to the County Sheriff's Office, as non privileged legal mail to effectuate service by the Sheriff in accordance with this Court's Deferral of Service Fee Order. (Id. at pg. 10)

15. Furthermore, based upon the record, the evidence shows that as the result of Circuit Atty. Gen. previous (false) advice to Judge to obtain the fraudulent court order from Judge which directed Plaintiff to effectuate mail receiver service upon the Attorney General's Office and then after issuance of said order by Judge intentionally

Complaint Against A Judge

Page 8, Continued.

Contracting that previous address and re-addressing Judge that
"the Attorney General's Office, DOES NOT, and will not accept service
by mail service on behalf of its essential ADOE clients;" was the basis
ultimate cause Plaintiff filed this Motion to Modify Judge
aforesaid Order requesting Judge to grant Plaintiff's original
relief in Plaintiff's Renewed Motion and compel ADOE to treat Plaintiff's
outgoing mail to the Sheriff as non-privileged, independent legal mail to
effectuate service.

16. Finally, four (4) month later after Plaintiff filed the Motion to
Modify Court Order, (Id.), on Judge then
granted Complainant's Plaintiff's Motion to Modify; and thereby
simultaneously granted Complainant's "original relief requested
in Plaintiff's Renewed Motion and issued an Order which," directs
ADOE to treat Plaintiff's outgoing mail to the Sheriff's Office (to mail reem-
nans and complaints), as non-privileged, independent legal mail, (Id.
Order dated

17. As the result of third Party ADOE opposing counsel Court City
Gen. aforesaid false address intentionally misleading
Judge was his plans to and did correct purpose fully
and ethically, 1/ from effectuating service for months upon
his ADOE clients and from Plaintiff's rightfully commencing
and prosecuting the action against his ADOE essential
clients fraudulently as aforesaid.

18. In the Honorable self-recovered
herself from all of their ten (10) sections. Thereupon, President, ADOE
re-assignal these actions to the Honorable

Statement of the Material Facts In Support OF Complainant's Complaint Against Superior Court Judge

19. The Arizona Rules governing this Commission Code on
1/ The Complainant hereby advises this Commission that he has submitted
two (2) complaints with the Arizona State Bar regarding the aforesaid and
other ethical misconduct of Court City Gen. in these sections. These
complaints are currently pending review and determination by the State Bar.

Complaint Against a Judge.

Page _____, Continued:

Judicial Conduct has authority to Investigate Complaints Against Judge which include:

- (1) Willful misconduct in office.
- (2) Willful and Persistent failure to perform duties.
- (3) Conduct that brings the judiciary into disrepute.
- (4) A violation of the Code of Judicial Conduct.

(a) A Judge shall uphold and promote, the independence, integrity, and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety.

(b) A Judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially, competently, and diligently.

11

20. Foremost, the Complainant's complaint against Assigned Court Judge ceteris is strictly based upon

Judge "judicial behavior" regarding his willful and persistent failure to perform his judicial duties in conducting no judicial inquiry in and not timely ruling upon and not protecting asserted rights of and partially adjudicating all of Complainant's pending actions before Judge of this Court. and is conclusively "not" based upon any judicial rulings of Judge (Emphases).

21. The Complainant further avers that he does not know nor has ever seen nor communicated with Judge nor has ever received any ruling from Judge on any of Complainant's ten (10) pending actions up to the filing and/or resubmission of this Complaint with this Commission this

22. Complainant had last actually received previously assigned Minute Order Directing A.D. & E. Judge

to treat Complainants' outgoing mail to the Sheriff (summons and Com-
plaints), as non privileged, "indigent Legal Mail" on
2013, on 11/10/13 the ten (10) actions were transferred to Judge
early of as aforesaid

23. Upon Complainant's receipt of previous assigned Judge
Order of at the ASPE: submit on
the Complainant on
and first Amended Complainant's, in each of Complainant's
and Complainant's unrelated action in this Court's
titled: V. State of Arizona, et al., Na Decision 1 on
Judge to (ANOE) "Qualified Legal

Claim Concern to "effectuate service" in accordance with Judge
of as aforesaid on approx collective defendants in these
actions. The Complainant advises these requests for ANOE
Legal Claim Copies of those "lengthy" collectively 22 com-
plaints for service totaled "thousands of (Copies)" to effectuate service
in accordance with this Court's Order and the Rules of this Court.

24. Immediately thereafter, their Party, ANOE appearing counsel (Court Atty
Hon. filed on and on behalf of his

client ANOE a "Request for telephonic Immediate Hearing, re: regard-
ing Plaintiff's abuse of the Legal System re: Plaintiff request for these
(ANOE) Qualified Legal Claim Copies to effectuate service upon defendants
in accordance with this Court's order is an "abuse of the Legal System. As-
sistant Atty. Gen. filed this (w)arrant for Immediate Hearing in all eleven
(11) aforesaid cases before Judge and Judge See eg. [Ex-
hibit, ANOE Request dated This ANOE Request for Immediate

Hearing of Court Atty. Gen. has been pending adjudication be-
for Judge for over (2) months with any judicial inquiry or ruling
to date. (Emphasis). [Exhibit 8]

25. In this Request, Court Atty. Gen. asserted to newly assigned
Judge numerous unproven and (patently) false Character
Assassination regarding Complainant's abuse of the Legal System in
allof these actions, ranging from (1) Plaintiff has done nothing
to serve any of the defendants in any of these cases; (2) that Plaintiff has
used these filed yet unserved cases to deluge the courts with waivers of

11
26. See: Complainant's Appendix In Support of Complaint
Against Judge submitted under a separate cover

previous and unrelated motions requiring thousands of copies; (3) that Plaintiff is a serial inmate filer who ADOE believes is abusive of the legal system as evidenced by numerous duplicative motions filed in these actions; (4) that Plaintiff has now taken this abuse of the ADOE legal indigent-deferral fee services by requesting more than copies ostensibly to serve defendants; (5) that Plaintiff has recently represented to the Court of Appeals that he has already tried to serve all of these Defendants by mail, a clear enticement and (6) other such unfounded and factually and legally irrelevant accusations of Plaintiff's false abuse of the legal system. (Id.)

26. Prior to continuing to put chronology of events in proper perspective, the Complainant of the juncture interests an important material fact regarding Airt. Atty. Gen. claim Plaintiff had requested copies. Initially the accurate calculation of Plaintiff's eleven qualified legal claim copy Request at issue. See: Exhibit , and Exhibit A, thereof ADOE Request I. However, prior to Airt. Atty. Gen. (Before this Request, the Plaintiff had notified Airt. Atty. Gen. there was a miscalculation due to Plaintiff error of accidentally entering numbers on the qualified copies form, and corrected the error by advising Airt. Atty. Gen. of the miscalculation and of the correct total was copies for all aforesaid requests. (Emphasis Added). The Complainant asserts (d)espise this fact, Airt. Atty. Gen. knowingly concealed the correct number of copies Plaintiff was requesting copies and purposefully advised Judge in the Request that Plaintiff is requesting to fraudulently show Plaintiff is abusing the ADOE legal copy system in support of her Request at issue (to note these facts and evidence Plaintiff has set forth in Plaintiff's "Ex Parte" Request to ADOE's Request for Committee Hearing) (Emphasis Added).

27. Based upon the record, the evidence shows that Airt. Atty. Gen. did not request and Judge was fully aware (based on the "Request for Committee Hearing" that Airt. Atty. Gen. did not seek in the Request for nor received any court order from Judge which "empowered" Complainant from receiving any (ADOE) Qualified Legal Claim Copies under (ADOE) Inmate Access to the Courts "policy" at sec. for any such abuse of ADOE's legal system to obtain (c)opies of these complaints

"Qualified Legal Claim Copies" to effectuate service in accordance with Judge
Order of upon approval collective defendants in these
actions. These requests for Qualified Legal Claim Copies totaled thousands of copies
to effectuate that service.

12. Immediately thereafter, Third Party APOE opposing counsel Christ. City
Sen. filed on on behalf of her APOE
clients a "Request for Telephonic Committee Hearing, re. Plaintiff's Abuse of the
Legal System, (b) check upon my request for these (APOE) Qualified Legal Claim Copies
to effectuate service upon defendants in accordance with this Court's Order in
an Abuse of the Legal System. I assert this APOE Request for Committee Hear-
ing has been pending in all eleven (11) of my aforesaid actions in paragraph
11, Indenture.

13. Based upon the record, in each of my aforesaid eleven (11) actions,
the evidence shows that Christ. City Sen. did not request and
Judge never took action based upon the "Request for Committee Hearing
that Christ. City Sen. did not seek in the Request for nor received
any court order from Judge which "informed" me from receiving
any (APOE) Qualified Legal Claim Copies under APOE "Inmate Access to the Courts"
policy. et seq., for any such (identifiable) specific abuse of
APOE's legal system to obtain copies of these complaints to effectuate service
at once, (Emphasis) nor any other request of me for Qualified Legal Claim
Copies of my legal documents to prosecute these actions.

14. Upon Third Party Christ. City Sen. filed this Request he
advised and that Judge knew that APOE client
APOE prison staff that upon his order from Christ. City Sen. and without a court
contrary to APOE Policy et seq., directed APOE client APOE to pro-
vide any more copies of my legal documents submitted for Qualified Legal
Claim Copies for any of these actions or any other cases in other courts.
(b) check upon Christ. City Sen. "Request" and at this point upon
my Ex Parte Response to APOE Request.

15. Thereupon, I submitted an Ex Parte Response to APOE Request with
Judge. In this Response, I fully addressed and responded to
all of the issues and contentions raised by Christ. City Sen. et seq.
confronted, partially and legally fraudulent and (b) fraudulently made to
intentionally obstruct, hinder and deny me from effectuating service upon
Christ. City Sen. essential APOE client defendants and from com-
mencing and prosecuting these actions against them. I in this Response

to effectuate service at issue. (Emphasis) nor any other request of Complainant for Qualified Legal Copies of legal documents to prosecute these actions. (Emphasis). 2

28. Upon Third Party ADOE opposing counsel Assist. Atty. Gen. filing of this "Request", he ^{advised and} knew he ^{advised ADOE prison staff} advised ADOE prison staff upon his ^{own directive and without a court order} own directive and without a court order from assigned Judge ^{and without one's discretion under} and without one's discretion under and contrary to ADOE Policy ^{et. seq.} et. seq. directed ADOE client to submit provide any more copies of Complainant's - Plaintiff's legal documents submitted for Qualified Legal Claim Copying for any of these cases or in other cases in other courts, (based upon Assist. Atty. Gen. Request" and at the point upon Complainant's - Plaintiff's "Ex Parte" Response to ADOE's Request. 2/

29. Thereupon, Assist. Atty. Gen. ^{filing of the "Request for} Hearing", the Complainant initially prepared - Plaintiff's Response (Non Ex Parte) to ADOE's Request for counsel's hearing for formal filing with this Court before Judge in such of these actions as Judge ^{knew (based upon Plaintiff's subsequent unequivocally forced submittal on filing of} knew (based upon Plaintiff's subsequent unequivocally forced submittal on filing of Plaintiff Response Ex Parte with Judge (due to being denied the required copies thereof for formal filing and service thereof. 2/

30. In this Response, the Complainant fully addressed and responded to all issues and contentions raised by Assist. Atty. Gen. in the Request and fully "debated with admissible relevant evidence that all of the issues and contentions of Assist. Atty. Gen. were refuted and factually and legally frivolous.

11
The Complainant hereby respectfully advises this Commission that he is unable to and prevented from providing the Commission with an "Exhibit" of this Ex Parte pleading, (due to he submitted the original thereof with no intention of it hereafter directly to Judge ^{he} because Assist. Atty. Gen. and ADOE refuse to provide him the required copies under the Policy to purposefully prevent him from formally filing this pleading in accordance with the Courts Rules. The Complainant request this Commission to request or subpoena the

(Id). The Complainant in the Response requested that Judge [redacted] based upon the foregoing "C)ome" "Arrest" City, Gen. Request for Ammies Hearing; and thereafter issue an Order which directs ADOE to "copy" Complainant's complaint at issue to effectuate service in accordance with Judge Order and this Court's Deferral of Service Fee Order. /

31. The Complainant further advises this Commission that Judge [redacted] knew (b)ased upon his (Complainant's) - Plaintiff's Ex Parte Response to ADOE Request for Ammies Hearing that Complainant had (submitted with admissibly relevant evidence all of Court City, Gen. [redacted] [redacted] and contention raised in the Request and that they were factually and legally frivolous. (Id) 2/

32. Furthermore, (b)ased upon the record, the evidence shows that Judge [redacted] expressly had known (b)ased upon Complainant's (S)ub- mitted the Ex Parte Response to ADOE's Request... that Court City, Gen. and ADOE are unlawfully holding Complainant in legal "in- communicated" status (b)rom (b)ormally "filing this Response" and all other legal [redacted] months with this Court in these actions or any other case, (b)ased to they and ADOE are currently purposefully refusing to prosecute Complainant's [redacted] which they requested and required qualified legal counsel under ADOE Policy [redacted] et al., to prevent Complainant from [redacted] filing this "Response" and to deny Complainant's constitutional right of access to the Court to prosecute these actions before Judge [redacted] (Id). 2/

33. Based upon the foregoing, Judge [redacted] actually knew Complainant was prevented from (b)ormally filing this "Response" and was unlawfully forced to submit the Response Ex Parte as the only available means to timely assert and protect Complainant's right to file a Response to ADOE's Request under Rule 7.1(a), A.R.E.P. and that Complainant was being held unlawfully in "incommunicado" status (b)rom "formally filing this Response" 2/

34. The Complainant advises this Commission that even at this time, (b)ased on a few weeks later, Judge [redacted] in Complainant's separate case in U. State of Arizona, et al., in the [redacted] of this Court issued a (ruling on Assistant Attorney General's "C)ome" "Re- quest for Ammies Hearing, re: Plaintiff (b)ased on the legal system, re: local copies in this action, as in [redacted] [redacted] Judge [redacted] "Arrested" Court City, Gen. Request for Ammies Hear- ing, (b)ased upon this Request did not allege any (S)pecific abuse of the legal system by Plaintiff (b)ut concludes on allegations and [redacted] non- meritorious. See eg. U. State, Na 2/

and all other legal documents with this court or any other court and deny Complainant's constitutional right of access to the courts to prosecute these actions in accordance with the filing requirements of copies as required by this Court and other courts rules.

34. The Complainant asserts that Judge is fully aware that Arrest. Atty. Gen. "Request for Complainant's Hearing and Complainant's 'Response' thereto are "I will, this is and he has known these have been so since approx and Judge has willfully and persistently have refused to inquire into or issue a ruling thereupon and thus Judge has not exercised sound judicial discretion in performance of judicial duties and from timely protecting Complainant's asserted statutory and constitutional right of access to the courts to be heard on this matter to effectuate Complainant's service of the summons and Complainant upon defendants in accordance with this Court's Order.

35. Based hereupon Judge conduct as evidenced by the record clearly demonstrates that Judge has knowingly acquiesced in no search at prohibited Arrest. Atty. Gen. particularly on behalf of Arrest. Atty. to willfully and persistently not inquire into or rule upon this matter to prevent Complainant from rightfully receiving Complainant's "copies" of these complaints to effectuate service upon defendants and from commencing these actions against Arrest. Atty. Gen. eventual Adversely affect - ants and from prosecuting these against them.

36. As the result of Judge aforesaid actions and inaction in willfully failing to persistently not inquire into or rule upon Arrest. Atty. Gen. Request and Complainant's - Plaintiff's "Response" thereto in the performance of Judge judicial duties constitutes a violation of this Commission Code of Judge Conduct as follows: (1) Willfully and persistently failure to perform duties; (2) Conduct that brings the judiciary into disrepute and (3) Violation of the Code on Judicial Conduct (a) A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially, ..., and diligently and (b) A judge shall uphold ... the independence, integrity and impartiality of the judiciary and avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety.

Actual Injury to Complainant

37. Due to the direct and proximate cause of Judge's illegal (b) behavior in willfully failing to conduct inquire into and

rele upon exist. city. Gen.

Request' and Complainant's - Plaintiff's

"Response" has prevented and continues to prevent Complainant from obtaining Complainant's rightful Court ordered (required) "copies" of these complaints at issue in accordance with (ARCE) Policy and thereby (from effectuating (timely service of those complaints under this Court's Orders and is presently unlawfully and willfully hindering / denying Complainant's constitution right of access to the courts (from prosecuting these actions up to present date; and thus Complainant remains in the imminent threat of this Court's

Court Administrator "summary dismissal" these actions for failure to effectuate service within the time terms under this Court's order and Rules 4, 1 and 38.1, A.R.C.P.

// // // // // // // // // // // // // // // // // //

38. In of the trial Court" Court Administrator send Notice to Assigned Judge and Complainant-Plaintiff that these forecited ten (10) actions pending before the Court were placed on the "Inactive Calendar" pursuant to Rule 38.1 (a), A.R.C.P. In this Notification the Court Administrator advised Judge and Complainant-Plaintiff that he (Complainant) has sixty (60) days (from the date of this Notice to create the deficiencies and effectuate service upon defendant in these actions or to obtain a Court Order contending the time to continue on the Inactive Calendar, "prior" to the deadline for the scheduled dismissal of these actions by the Court Administrator.

39. Thereupon, in late of the Complainant filed and Judge was fully aware from the record Plaintiff had filed (Complainant's) Plaintiff "Ex Parte" Emergency Motion / Declaration to continue on the Inactive Calendar to avoid the Courts.

Court Administrator's Involuntary Summary Dismissal Based upon Excusable Neglect pursuant to Rule 38.1 (a), A.R.C.P. (Emphases)

40. In this Motion, the Complainant requested and Judge knew from the record that Plaintiff had requested in the Motion "that Judge issue a (timely) ruling on Plaintiff's Motion to continue on the Inactive Calendar to avoid Involuntary summary dismissal, "prior" to the Court Administrator's (scheduled) deadline for the Administrator's automatic summary dismissal of these actions." (Emphases).

41. Based upon the record, Judge had known Complainant-Plaintiff's pending ten (10) actions will be summarily dismissed by the Court Administrator, if Judge did not issue a "timely" ruling on Plaintiff's Motion to continue on the Inactive

Calander, "prior to the" Administrator's scheduled summary dismissal of these actions pursuant to Rule 38.1(a), A.R.Civ.P. 3/

42. The Complainant asserts that Judge [redacted] was fully aware Complainant's - Plaintiff's aforesaid ten (10) actions will automatically be summarily dismissed on the Administrator's scheduled docket line, if Judge [redacted] did not issue a (timely) ruling granting Plaintiff's time on the inactive Calander. Despite this material fact Judge [redacted] has willfully and persistently and arbitrarily has refused to enquire into a ruling concerning thereupon, and there Judge [redacted] has refused not to exercise sound judicial discretion in the performance of Judge [redacted] judicial duties and (from) (timely) protecting Complainant's "asserted" right to continue on the inactive Calander pursuant to Rule 38.1(a), A.R.Civ.P., to (timely) exercise Complainant's statutory and Constitutional right of access to the courts. (Emphasis)

43. Due to Judge [redacted] willfully and persistently refusing and failing to issue a ruling on Complainant - Plaintiff motion to continue to the inactive Calander, the Complainant in late of (sent) a letter-complaint to County Court Presiding Judge [redacted]. In this letter-complaint, the Complainant requested Presiding Judge [redacted] judicial supererogatory intervention to direct subordinate Judge [redacted] to issue a ruling on Plaintiff's pending motion to continue on the inactive Calander and prevent the Court Administrator from summarily dismissing Plaintiff's ten (10) pending actions and protect Plaintiff's right to continue on the inactive Calander pursuant to Rule 38.1(a), A.R.Civ.P. 2/

44. The Complainant asserts that he does not know what action if any Presiding Judge [redacted] instituted regarding my letter-complaint requesting his supererogatory intervention to direct Judge [redacted] to rule on Complainant's Pending Motion to continue on the inactive Calander to date. 3/

45. The Complainant further advises this Commission that he has filed an independent "Ex Parte" Petition for writ of Special Action in the Court of 11

3/ The Complainant requests this Commission in the course of its investigation to contact Presiding Judge [redacted] regarding what action he took.

Appeals, State of Missouri, entitled:
State, Mo.

vs. The Hon.

1

seeking an Interlocutory Stay, 3/ of the

Court Administrator's scheduled summary dismissal of Plaintiff's
afore said ten (10) pending actions at issue before Judge
Plaintiff's motion to continue on the inactive calendar to prosecute these
actions, (due to Judge is arbitrarily proceeding not to timely
rule on Plaintiff's motion to continue on the inactive calendar to pro-
tect Plaintiff's statutory right to continue on the inactive calendar upon
the showing of good cause pursuant to Rule 38.1 (a), A.R.Civ.P.

46. The Complainant further advises this Commission that the Petitioner's
for Special Action is pending before the Court, determination on
whether they will accept Special Action jurisdiction now before
before the Honorable Justices and

The Complainant additionally advises the Court is "curiously" deciding on
whether or not to issue an Interlocutory Stay at issue. 3-1

47. Based upon the record, the evidence shows that Judge
is willfully, persistently and arbitrarily not issuing a ruling on Plain-
tiff's motion to continue on the inactive calendar to suppress the cause
the Court Administrator to summarily dismiss Plaintiff's ten (10)
pending actions and deny Plaintiff's statutory right to continue on the
inactive calendar to prosecute these actions.

48. As the result of Judge's afore said actions and inactions in
willfully, persistently and arbitrarily not issuing a ruling on Plaintiff's
pending motion to continue on the inactive calendar in the performance
of Judge's judicial duties constitutes violation of this Commission's
Code of Judicial Conduct. (a) A judge's willful and persistent failure to
performance of Judge's judicial duties constitutes violation of
this Commission Code of Judicial Conduct as follows: (1) willful and
persistent failure to perform duties; (2) conduct that brings the judicial
disrepute and (3) violation of the Code on Judicial Conduct. (a) A judge
shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially... and
diligently and (b) a judge shall uphold the independence, in-
tegrity and impartiality of the judiciary and avoid improprieties and

11
The Complainant request this Commission in the course of its investi-
gation to contact the Court of Appeals regarding what action they are
initiating on this matter.

51. In each of these Motions, the Complainant request "Emergency" Court Order to direct ADOE to provide Plaintiff with (A) Required Qualified Legal Claims (a) Legal Copies and (B) Legal Supplies in each of these actions. (1) pending actions at issue.

52. In these Motions, the Complainant alleged that Court Ally Sen. and ADOE prison officials are presently holding Plaintiff in unlawful legal "maximum security" states, (b) denying Plaintiff those qualified Legal Claims "Legal Supplies, paper, pen and envelopes" and "Legal Copies"; to prevent Plaintiff from preparing legal documents for filing and service in accordance with the requirements of the courts rules and prevent Plaintiff from prosecuting these ten (10) actions to obtain an unlawful tactical advantage, (b) and upon opposing counsel obtaining Plaintiff's unopposed Precedent ruling and dismissal of these actions.

53. Based upon the record, the evidence shows that Judge and Judge is fully aware that Plaintiff has "submitted" these directly to Judge for Court Ordered filing (b) to Plaintiff's address thereon that ADOE and opposing counsel Gottlieb are purposefully denying Plaintiff the Required (A) Required Qualified Legal Claims "Copies" for formal filing and service and that Plaintiff only means to timely alert and protect Plaintiff rights is to submit these Motions Ex Parte directly to assigned Judge and now assigned Judge, to wit:

a. Plaintiff's Ex Parte Response to ADOE Request for telephone Omnibus Hearing, re: Plaintiff's Abuse of the Legal System.

(b) Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion / Declaration To Continue On the Inactive Calendar Titled the Courts Instantaneous Deserrial Based Upon Executable Request Rule 38.1 (a) A.R.C.W.P.

(c) Plaintiff's Ex Parte Emergency Motion for telephonic Omnibus Hearing, re: Anne Third Party ADOE opposing Counsel Court Ally Sen. For Abuse of the Legal System By Directing ADOE Staff to Reluctantly Deny Opposing Prosecution Inmate Plaintiff from Receiving ADOE Qualified Legal Claims Legal Copies to prevent Plaintiff from prosecuting this action to obtain an unlawful tactical advantage.

(d) Plaintiff's Ex Parte Emergency Motion For Telephonic
Oral Hearing, re: AOE Third Party AOE Opposing
Counsel Assist Atty Gen Fortbureau of the
Legal System By Deactivating AOE Staff to Retaliate
Dene opposing Pro-So Counsel Immediate Plaintiff From
Receiving AOE Qualified Legal Claim Copied
Supplies, paper, pen and envelopes to Plaintiff
From Prospecting these Actions
to Obtain an Unlawful Tactical Advantage.

(e) Plaintiff Ex Parte Notice to Court Plaintiff is Unable
to File and Serve Plaintiff's Pleadings in accordance
with Court Plaintiff's Pleadings in accordance
to AOE and Assist Atty Gen Court Rule 3.3 (31) Due
to Reluctance Plaintiff the Required Copies.

(f) Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion to Compel AOE to Provide
Plaintiff with the Required Number of Copies of
Plaintiff's Pleadings Required By the Court Under
Mesquite Et. L.R. 3.8(c)

(g) Plaintiff

(g) Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion for Court Order to Compel
AOE to Copy Plaintiff's Federal Judicial Miscon-
duct Records to Rebut AOE's Opposing AOE
Counsel Assist Atty False Misrepara-
tions to Court in Opposition to: Defendant's
Request For Telephonic Oral Hearing, re:
Plaintiff's Abuse of the Legal System.

(h) Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion/Declaration in Response
to AOE Motion to Declaration to Declare Plaintiff
Evolution Delinquent;
Plaintiff's Motion for Court Order to Direct AOE
to Copy Plaintiff's Federal Judicial Misconduct
Records; and
Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion for Extension of Time
to Respond to Defendant's Motion to Declare
Plaintiff a Delinquent

54. Based upon the record, the coexistence unequivocally shows and proves Judge [redacted] was fully aware that Complainant - Plaintiff has been and presently is being held in unlawful legal "incommunicado" status, by Apoe prison officials and third party Apoe cust. city. Gen. (b) by denying Plaintiff's required (Apoe) Qualified Legal Claim Copies and Legal Supplies from (formally) filing and serving Plaintiff's legal documents with this Court in these actions in accordance with the filing and service requirements of this Court's rules, as in para 53. including. Despite this coexistence and material facts Judge [redacted] has willfully, persistently and arbitrarily has refused to exercise sound judicial discretion in performance of Judge [redacted] judicial duties and (b) from (securing) Complainant's release from being held in legal "incommunicado" status (b) by ordering Apoe to provide Complainant's required Qualified Legal Claim Copies and Legal Supplies and from timely asserting and protecting Complainant's right to file and serve Complainant's documents with this Court in these actions in accordance with the requirements of this Court's rules.

55. As a result of Judge [redacted] aforesaid actions and inactions in willfully, persistently and arbitrarily refusing to exercise sound judicial discretion (b) from (securing) Complainant's release from being held in unlawful legal "incommunicado" status (b) by (securing) ordering Apoe not to provide Complainant's required Qualified Legal Claim Copies and legal supplies and from timely asserting and protecting Complainant's right to (file and) serve Complainant's documents with this Complainant's Court in these actions in accordance with the requirements of this Court, and thus constitutes violation of the Commission's Code of Judicial Conduct as follows: (1) Willful and persistent failure to perform the duties; (2) Conduct that brings the judicial disrepute and (3) Violation of the Code on Judicial Conduct: (a) A Judge [redacted] shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially and diligently and (b) A Judge [redacted] shall uphold the independence, integrity and impartiality of the judiciary and avoid improprieties and appearance of improprieties.

Actual Injury to Complainant.

56. Due to the direct and proximate cause of Judge [redacted] unethical (b) behavior in willfully refusing to secure Complainant's judicial release from being held in unlawful legal "incommunicado" status and thereby agreeing in para 51, with Apoe prison staff and third party Apoe counsel Asst. city. Gen. to prevent Complainant from (formally) filing and serving Complainant's legal documents with this Court in these actions, has prevented and continues to prevent Complainant

from "timely" asserting and protecting complainant's rights and from obtaining "timely" relief of the Courts; and thereby hindering / obstructing complainant's constitutional right of access to the Courts from prosecuting these actions due to the aforesaid unethical behavior and conduct of assigned Judge

5%. The Complainant between mid of through of CS registered online (9) of the following, "Plaintiff's Ex Parte Emergency Motions to Assigned Judge Specifically, the Complainant submitted one (1) of each of these Ex Parte Motion for all of Plaintiff's pending ten (10) actions thereon per each of these nine (9) Motions, to wit:

(a) Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion / Declaration to Contemner on the "Inactive Calendar" to Adversely Affect the Courts Involuntary Dormant Based Upon Executable Neglect. Rule 38.1 (a), A.R.Cv.P.

(b) Plaintiff's Ex Parte Response to APOE Request for telephonic Compeller Hearing, re: Plaintiff's Abuse of the Legal System.

(c) Plaintiff's Ex Parte Emergency Motion for telephonic Compeller Hearing, re: APOE Third Party APOE Opposing Counsel Abuse. City Hon. For Abuse of the Legal System By Directing APOE Staff to Reluctantly Deny Opposing Pro-se Counsel Immediate Plaintiff From Receiving APOE Qualified Legal Claim "Legal Copies" To Prevent Plaintiff From Prosecuting these Actions to obtain an unlawful tactical advantage.

(d) Plaintiff's Ex Parte Emergency Motion for telephonic Compeller Hearing, re: APOE Third Party APOE Opposing Counsel Abuse. City Hon. For Abuse of the Legal System By Directing APOE Staff to Reluctantly Deny Opposing Pro-se Counsel Immediate Plaintiff From Receiving APOE Qualified Legal Claim Copies Samples e.g. paper, pen and envelopes to Prevent Plaintiff From Prosecuting these Actions to obtain an unlawful tactical advantage.

(e) Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion to Compel APOE Provide Plaintiff with the Required Number of Copies of

Plaintiff's Pleadings Required By the Court Under
M.C. Sup. Ct. Local Rule 3.1(3)

(f). Plaintiff's Ex Parte Notice to Court Plaintiff is Unable
to File and Serve Plaintiff's Plaintiff In accordance
with County Court Rule 3.1(3), Due
to App and Court City Hon Are Reluctantly
Serving Plaintiff the Required Copies.

(g). Plaintiff Ex Parte Motion for Court Order to Compel ADP
to Copy Plaintiff's Federal Judicial Misconduct
Records to Reveal ADP's Oppressing ADP Counsel City Hon
City Hon False Misrepresentation to Court
in Opposition to Defendant's Request for telephone
Circuit Hearing re: Plaintiff's Abuse of the
Legal System.

(h). Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion / Declaration in Response
to ADP Motion to Declaration to Declare Plaintiff a
Vexatious Litigant.
Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion for Court Order to Direct ADP
to Copy Plaintiff's Federal Judicial Misconduct
Records; and
Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion for Extension of time
to Respond to Defendant's Motion to Declare
Plaintiff Ex Parte Motion for Extension of time
to Respond to Defendant's Motion to Declare
Plaintiff a Vexatious Litigant.

(I). Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion Requesting Disclosure
of Judge Previous Employment and
Legal Counsel Affiliation with Oregon
Attorney General's Office and Oregon Depart-
ment of Correction (for Book Review
Motion).

58. The Complainant (s) submit these nine (9) Motion Ex Parte,
chances it was and still currently is Complainant's "only means"
to submit these pleadings to the Court to "timely" assert and protect "

Complainant's rights to prosecute these actions and (5) secure Complainant's constitutional right of access to the courts, (d) sue to third Party (AHOE) opposing counsel (Cust. City, Gen. has intentionally created AHOE "not" to provide Plaintiff Complainant with required AHOE Qualified Legal Claim (a) Legal Copies and (B) Legal Supplies, paper, pen and envelopes to purposefully prevent Complainant from prosecuting these (a) (b) actions against Cust. City, Gen. conventional AHOE Client defendants.

59. In each of these Motions, the Complainant carried the burden for (5) submitting these Motions Ex Parte, to obtain the requested relief in these Motions, was (d) sue to third Party (AHOE) opposing counsel (Cust. City, Gen. has directed AHOE prison staff to purposefully hold Plaintiff-Complainant in unlawful AHOE custody legal "incommunicado" states, (b) by denying Plaintiff these Qualified Legal Claim Copies and supplies, to intentionally prevent Plaintiff from prosecuting these actions to obtain an ex parte-legal tactical advantage by opposing counsel (Cust. City, Gen. To purposefully obtain Plaintiff's supposed fraudulent filings and claims of these actions.

60. Based upon the record, the evidence unequivocally demonstrates that Judge had actually received Plaintiff's submissions of these Ex Parte Motions and ever fully aware that Plaintiff had submitted these Ex Parte Motions directly to him requesting court ordered filing thereof, (d) sue to "Plaintiff's correction advised them on these Motions," that AHOE and Cust. City, Gen. are purposefully denying Plaintiff the required (AHOE) Qualified Legal Claim Copies "from" (b) formally filing and serve these Motions and that Plaintiff's "only means" to timely assert and protect Plaintiff's rights is as to submit these Motions Ex Parte directly to assigned Judge

61. Furthermore, the record reflects, the evidence therefrom unequivocally proves Judge ever fully aware that Complainant-Plaintiff was and still presently is being held in unlawful "incommunicado" states by AHOE prison staff and Cust. City, Gen. (b) denying Plaintiff's required (AHOE) Qualified Legal Claim Copies and Legal Supplies and is prevented from formally filing and serving Plaintiff's legal documents with the court in these actions and in accordance with the filing and service requirements of this Court's Rules. Despite this evidence and material fact Judge has willfully, persistently and arbitrarily, has refused to exercise sound judicial discretion in the performance of Judge's judicial duties and from securing judicially by order of the court

complainant's release from being held in unlawful "incommunicado" states, by directing AOC to provide Complainant's requested qualified Legal Claim Copies and Legal Supplies and from timely asserting and protecting Complainant's right to file and serve Complainant documents with this Court in these actions in accordance with the filing and service requirements of the Courts.

6. As the direct and proximate cause and result of Judge's pre-ordained actions and reactions in willfully, persistently and arbitrarily refusing to exercise sound judicial discretion (from conducting timely judicial inquiry in and ruling upon Complainant's - Plaintiff's - pre-ordained Ex Parte Motions to secure Complainant's release from being held in unlawful legal "incommunicado" states by ordering AOC not to provide Complainant's requested qualified Legal Copies and supplies and from timely asserting and protecting Complainant's right to file and serve Complainant's documents in accordance with the Courts requirements and acquiescing in holding Complainant in said "incommunicado" states by not conducting timely judicial inquiry; (constitutes a violation of this Commission's Code of Judicial Conduct as follows: (1) willfully and persistently failure to perform duties; (2) conduct that brings the judiciary disrepute; and (3) Violation of the Code of Judicial Conduct as a judge. ... shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially ... and diligently and impartially and (2) A judge (to clear) shall uphold the independence, integrity and impartiality of the judiciary and avoid improprieties and appearance of improprieties.

Actual Injury to Complainant

6B. Due to the direct and proximate cause of Judge's unethical behavior and conduct in willfully, persistently and arbitrarily refusing to exercise sound judicial discretion from conducting judicial inquiry into and ruling upon Complainant's (1) pending Ex Parte Motion to secure Complainant's judicial release from being held in unlawful legal "incommunicado" states and thereby acquiescing therein in an initial, improper, with defendants AOC premeditated and corruptly, in passing third Parties to purposefully prevent Complainant from formally filing and serving Complainant's pleadings with this Court in these actions, has prevented and continues to prevent Complainant from "timely" asserting and protecting Complainant's rights and from obtaining "timely" relief of the Courts; and thereby hinder/obstruct Complainant's writ relief and

rightful access to the courts from prosecuting these actions due to the foregoing unethical behavior and conduct of assigned Judge

64. The Complainant in earlier, ^{submitted one (1)} Ex Parte Motion to assigned Judge. Specifically, the Complainant submitted one (1) Ex Parte Motion for other Motion, to wit:

(a) Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion Requesting Disclosure of Judge's Previous Employment and Legal Counsel Affiliation with Arizona Department of Corrections (ANDC) (For possible partial or conflict recusal). (Emphasis).

65. The Complainant (submitted this Ex Parte Motion, because it was and still is currently Complainant Plaintiff's "only means" to (submit their pleading to the Court to "timely" assert and protect Complainant's right to prosecute these actions before an "impartial" Judge and thereby Complainant submitted this Ex Parte Motion requesting disclosure of possible partiality and for conflict of interest of assigned Judge. impartially adjudicating these actions.

66. In this Motion, the Complainant requested Judge disclose whether or not he was previously an Arizona Attorney General Assistant Attorney General or legal counsel for the Arizona Department of Corrections and its ANDC staff, as the Complainant had been advised that Judge acted in this capacity. If true, Judge must be recused due to both the Arizona Attorney General's Office and Arizona Department of Corrections and their respective staff are named defendants in Complainant Plaintiff's various actions at issue.

67. Based upon the record, the evidence shows that Judge has and is continuing to willfully and persistently not make this required disclosure to Complainant Plaintiff to date. Upon information and belief, the Complainant alleges that Judge intentionally conceals he was a former Assistant Attorney General and represented ANDC and its staff in that capacity and is knowingly partially adjudicating Complainant Plaintiff's actions to deny Complainant fair and impartial adjudication in these actions.

68. As the direct and proximate cause of Judge's unethical behavior and conduct in willfully, persistently and arbitrarily refusing to accede to and judicial discretion from making this prerequisite partial disclosure to Complainant Plaintiff constitutes violation of this Commission Code of Judicial Conduct as follows: (1) willful and

failure to perform duties; (2) Conduct that brings the judiciary into disrepute and (3) Violation of the Code of Judicial Conduct. (a) A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially, ~~and~~ and diligently and (2) A judge shall uphold the independence, integrity and impartiality of the judiciary and avoid improprieties or appearance of improprieties.

69. The Complainant believes that ~~three~~ of had sent original judge. Three (3) "Ex Parte" Letters requesting him or his chambers judicial assistance per his order, "to either send me a 'photocopy' of each of the nine (9) Ex Parte Motions I had sent him or is identified in paragraph 59-61 pages 53-54 inclusive, which bears his office receipt 'stamp received' or alternatively, send me a letter, which his chambers assistant (Verifying Judge) has received that Ex Parte Motions, (b) sending me a "letter endorsing the following Ex Parte Motions, identifying 'the title of each of my Ex Parte Motions.'" (Emphasized)

70. In each of these letters, I requested the verification relevant to provide as evidence to the Arizona Central Appeal and Arizona Court and to attach as evidence to my Motion for Change of Judge for Cause as evidence in support thereof that Judge ~~has~~ willfully, persistently and arbitrarily not providing me with the verification for self failure to perform judicial duties. Judge ~~has~~ willfully ignored and refused to provide me with verification of his receipt of these Ex Parte Motions I submitted to him. Despite this request and evidence, Judge ~~has~~ willfully, persistently and arbitrarily has refused to exercise sound judicial discretion in the performance of judicial duties.

71. As the result of Judge ~~has~~ willful actions and inactions in willfully, persistently and arbitrarily refusing to exercise sound judicial discretion from conducting judicial inquiry, seeking and responding to my request for verification of receipt of my Ex Parte Motions sent to him, constitutes violation of the Commission Code of Judicial Conduct (a) A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially and diligently and (2) A judge shall uphold the independence, integrity and impartiality of the judiciary and avoid improprieties and appearance of improprieties.

Declarant, Complainant further says that I, ~~hereby~~ hereby declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to my own personal knowledge.

Executed this day of at Oryssa