State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 14-057	
Judge:	No. 1100914895A
Complainant:	No. 1100914895B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a justice of the peace knowingly violated the law and was biased in favor of the prosecution.

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: March 26, 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 March 26, 2014.

CONFIDENTIAL

On

State of Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2014 057

a.m. while engaged in my sole income-producing

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

at approximately

activity of delivering newspapers for the	, wl	hich runs through
University , I was stopped by the	Universi	ty Pol ice Department
for allegedly following too closely and alleg	edly going in	a zone.
Because I had been cited the previous day at approxima same activity, by the same police for allegedly running racially profiled and entrapped, knowing that the police and having inadvertently left my ID at home, I declined	a stop sign. And beli were already in poss	ieving that I was being session of my identification
After the police informed me that I was not under arrest necessary information so that a citation could be issued that they were indeed in possession of all my information speaks for itself – The citation was accurately issued to scene of the stop and told the officers to send me the citation and arrested for failure to obey a police officer (A.R.S.28-1595).	, and further informed on and even knew me me without me productation in the mail. I w	d by these same officers e by name (The record ucing any ID), I left the vas later followed by the
I was taken to the Detention Facility () we later that day when I was arraigned by video. At my ar (), I was released on my own received the cell, on account of my refusal to provide fingerprine criminal charges filed against me and in violation of the	raignment before Just ognizance (ROR). Ho ts and photographs, I	tice of the owever, upon my return to was detained without
I was held for approximately four hours on no criminal the County Court where I was broug arraignment, in violation of the United State's Constitute	ght again before	for a second
celebration, was told by the refused to be fingerprinted and photographed. When the those requests, I explained that because of my status in	the community (I am rney, a former Assista , an arrest record	at I was there because I y I refused to comply with a a licensed ant District Attorney, d would likely destroy my

CONFIDENTIAL

State of Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2014 057

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

read A.R.S.41-1750(A)(1) which averred that fingerprints were, indeed, NOT required in my case. The judge, however, said he was uncertain how to proceed and sought advice and counsel from the county attorney. When the county attorney came in and asserted that the policy served a "good" purpose of keeping accurate records, over my objections that the law in my case (A.R.S. 41-1750(A)(1)) did not require it, ordered that I be fingerprinted.

In addition to the facts that I was standing in front of this judge, who is supposed to represent neither the state nor the defendant, in chains and shackles without criminal charges filed against me; that I had no attorney representing me; that he was determining the conditions of my release for a second time on the same charges; that he had ordered my release and I was appearing in front of him in violation of that order; that the law itself (A.R.S. 41-1750(A)(1)) did not require my fingerprints, he called in the county attorney, my adversary, to ADVISE him on how he should proceed!!

This day in court was a disgraceful, unconscionable violation of everything the Constitution of these United States was drafted to uphold and defend!! I might as well have been Jesus Christ standing before Third Reich!! There was nothing, not even the law (A.R.S.41-1750(A)(1) which had been enacted with this very scenario in mind, to protect me. The county attorney, himself, my adversary, was sitting on the bench and speaking out of mouth for there was no impartiality whatsoever in these proceedings. If this judge is allowed to continue with this sort of incompetence, the citizens of the City of and County of will have no protection from the United States Constitution whatsoever.