

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 15-083

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court judge made improper rulings in a quiet title action.

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.

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

Dated: April 8, 2015

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 8, 2015.

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

seek Justice administered according to written laws instead of the ever-changing desire of private interest.

The dream of America is a land of liberty and justice for all. No longer will kings and tyrants rule us. We will rule ourselves, according to the Rule of Law.

The Rule of Law lives in the heart of free people everywhere. We know deep inside that each of us is entitled to be treated equally by government, that no man or set of men should be given special favors or powers to rule us beyond the limits of our written law. The Rule of Law asserts that men should not be trusted to govern others unless their rule is just, tempered by fixed laws that prevent tyranny, laws that stop individuals from accumulating wealth by force, laws that keep those in high office from exercising power without restraint, laws that deny majority power to act without due regard for the rights of individuals who are a minority, laws that prevent the powerful from plundering the weak.

The Rule of Law decrees that Law shall govern us according to the will of the People and not by the will of ambitious men and women in high places.

The Rule of Law is what our heroes died for in past wars for liberty.

The Rule of Law is worthy of our highest aspirations and dedicated efforts as a united people.

This principle that laws should govern instead of men – laws of our making and not the cruel edicts of tyrant dictators or divine right decrees of kings – is the bedrock of human justice, the philosophical cornerstone of these United States, and the foundation of hope for all mankind.

We the People are protected by the fundamental principles of justice and fair dealings set forth in those simple statements that every schoolchild should be taught to practice for the sake of peace.

Common law is built on these truths that promote the spirit and practice of fair-dealing and the unbiased administration of justice. Without the legal enforcement of these truths, there can be no justice or right dealing between us ... or hope of getting our courts to do what's right by enforcing our contracts or making those who injure us pay damages. Our courts are established primarily to enforce these principles of common law.

Common law is built on these truths that promote the spirit and practice of fair-dealing and the unbiased administration of justice. Without the legal enforcement of these truths, there can be no justice or right dealing between us ... or hope of getting our courts to do what's right by enforcing our contracts or making those who injure us pay damages. Our courts are established primarily to enforce these principles of common law.

It is the common law that's common to us all.

This is the law that never changes and never should be changed by legislation or the arbitrary rule of tyrants motivated by what's good for the interests of a favored few. This is the law that's all for one and one for all, the American way.

**CONFIDENTIAL FOR OFFICE USE ONLY** State of Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct 1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007 **COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE** and Judge

The common law expressed by maxims is for the common good.

1. Defendants Motioned to Dismiss Complaint for Quiet Title.
2. Responded by Memorandum in Opposition to Defendants Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs Complaint.
3. Court Ordered Oral Arguments for (notice days prior to oral arguments are required and was not given)
4. The rules state the moving Party has the burden of Proof, this would have been Defendants Attorneys who Motioned for Dismissal of Plaintiffs Complaint.
5. Judge started to processed of Oral Arguments by shifting the burden of Proof on the by asking us why he should not Dismiss Our Complaint now.
6. We responded with the Proof and the Material Facts that were unresolved, which was Defendants had no Standing as Creditor and Holder in Due Course because there was no proper chain of title to them from Decision One and that fraud vitiates everything, Then we offered the Judge "Proof of Claims".
7. Judge refused Plaintiffs offer of Proof and Said We Could not Appeal.
8. The Judge claimed a final judgment was entered on the merits of the case and we stated "There is no recorded Judgment for or Against Plaintiffs or the Defendants. The Foreclosure Sale falsely initiated by Defendants years does not moot the issues of the clouded title as we claim in Memorandum in Opposition.
9. Now Defendants threaten to Foreclose by obtain a order Against Plaintiffs who are the Owner of record, With the Judges assistance and without ever providing proof as required by A.R.C.P 17 (a).
10. The Defendants were not entitlement to a judgment. The only evidence is Defendants false and forged documents exhibited in Plaintiffs proof of Claims.
11. The Judge violated my rights to Oral Arguments by making it a hearing to show cause without notice. The rules were not followed and prejudiced the Plaintiffs rights to Due Process.
12. The Plaintiffs should have been able to move the court right then for judgment based on the Defendants failure to meet its burden of proof (All issues have been resolved).
13. Plaintiffs have proven the other side failed to meet its burden of proof, in Memorandum in Opposition to Dismiss.
14. The evidence offered as Proof outweighs the merits of the Defendants case.
15. The Oral arguments process was unfair. Maxim promotes fairness.

16. It is not fair for the Judge to shift the burden of proof on the Plaintiffs who did not bring the Motion to Dismiss.

17. Defendants did not even make a statement... The Judge did all the Speaking for them. then ruled in their favor to dismiss and allow Orders for them to take my home.

18. It is not proper to Grant an Order to Dismiss when Material Facts remain unresolved concerning the Complaint for Title and the Cloud created by Defendants Documents.

19. (Plaintiffs filed in the County office their Declaration of to claim our home against unsecured creditors).

1. "The is the True owner of the real property in question.

2. Bank of "Trust" will not supply to this Court any evidence substantiating Bank of "Trust" etal...' claims of legal rights to the real property in question, and therefore **pursuant to the maxim of law "evidence not in this court does not exist"** Bank of "Trust" etal... They have no evidence proving they are the legal owner.

3. Bank of "Trust" are attempting to unlawfully steal real property from its True Owner by committing the felonious act of filing false and/or forged documents in a public office to fraudulently establish legal ownership that does not exist.

4. Bank of "Trust" have no lawful standing to foreclose on "The real property.

5. Bank of "Trust" numerous felonious acts committed against the State of Arizona are evidence of Bank of "Trust" *malum in se* intent.

6. Bank of "Trust" numerous felonious acts committed against the of Arizona Bank of "Trust" from proceeding against "The in action

7. True ownership is an ancient and un-abrogated common law principle that defeats any and all legal ownership claims, fraudulent or not.

and claim they are the victims of Fraud in this case, our right have been violated by the Courts who ignore the fact that fraud vitiates everything and should not be rewarded. The Courts have Abused our right to Discoveries and Due Process of the Law.

**The doctrine of Abuse of Rights**, found in various guises in jurisdictions, refers to the concept that the malicious or antisocial exercise of otherwise legitimate rights can give rise to civil liability. In general terms, the doctrine of abuse of rights provides that 'fault' in the delictual sense.

It may be imposed upon a party who has exercised a right in a manner that has caused injury to another.

At least one of four conditions is required to invoke the doctrine: (1) the predominant motive for exercising the right is to cause harm; (2) no serious or legitimate motive exists for exercising the right; (3) the exercise of the right is against moral rules, good faith, or elementary fairness; or (4) the right is exercised for a purpose other than that for which it was granted.

**PLAINTIFFS ON AND FOR THE RECORD MAKE AN OFFICIAL  
"OFFER OF PROOF OF CLAIMS"**

IN SUPPORT OF THEIR CAUSE OF ACTION TO SUE BANK OF TRUST AND TO  
OBTAIN A JUDGMENT FOR TITLE & INJUNCTIVE RELIEF FOR BANK OF  
INTERFERENCE IN PLAINTIFFS REAL PROPERTY AND FOR THE FALSE AND FORGED DOCUMENTS TO COLLECT  
MONEY DAMAGES PURSUANT TO STATUTORY AND EQUITABLE DAMAGES AND PRESENT UNTO THE COURT AS  
FOLLOWS:

**IN THE COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF**

**and  
Plaintiff,  
vs.**

**THE BANK OF  
F/K/A**

**THE BANK OF  
Defendants**

**Case No.:**

**DATE OF SERVICE OF THE COMPLAINT FOR TITLE & RELIEF ON DEFENDANTS:**

**DETAILED AND CONCISE STATEMENT OF CONTESTED ISSUES OF FACT AND/OR LAW**

**Exhibit #1 "Warranty Deed".**

- There is no Assignment to the seller/sponsor, depositor, or special purpose vehicle recorded or otherwise
- **Plaintiffs Warrantee Deed supersedes all other claims**

**There is no competent evidence on the record to controvert this fact.**

**Exhibit #2 "Adjustable Note".**

Plaintiffs Claim The Defendants and or his successor or predecessor by and through his ens legis Decision Company, altered said Promissory Note by stamping said Promissory Note "PAY TO THE ORDER OF \*\*\* CORPORATION \*\*\*WITHOUT RECOURSE." MORTGAGE signed by: Asst. AND THEN A SECOND STAMP "PAY TO THE ORDER OF \*\*\* \*\*\*WITHOUT RECOURSE."

**There is no competent evidence on the record to convert this fact.**

**PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. 4 NOTICE No. 3 U.C.C. 3-604.**

**DISCHARGE BY CANCELLATION OR RENUNCIATION.**

(a) A person entitled to enforce an instrument, with or without consideration may discharge the obligation of a party to pay the instrument

(i) by an intentional voluntary act, such as surrender of the instrument to the party. Destruction, mutilation, or cancellation of the instrument, cancellation or striking out of the party's signature, or the addition of words to the instrument indicating discharge or

**THE COMMISSION'S POLICY IS  
TO POST ONLY THE FIRST FIVE  
PAGES OF ANY DISMISSED  
COMPLAINT ON ITS WEBSITE.**

**FOR ACCESS TO THE  
REMAINDER OF THE  
COMPLAINT IN THIS MATTER,  
PLEASE MAKE YOUR REQUEST  
IN WRITING TO THE  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL  
CONDUCT AND REFERENCE  
THE COMMISSION CASE  
NUMBER IN YOUR REQUEST.**