State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 15-193

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged one superior court judge and five appellate court judges improperly denied him court-appointed counsel on appeal.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judges 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 judges' rulings. In addition, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judges did not violate the Code in this case. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety as to all six judges, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: August 19, 2015

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

George A. Riemer Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the six judges on August 19, 2015.

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

Comp 2015-193

COMPLAINT AGAINST JUDGES

A. Regarding Judge

of the

Court:

- The failure of Judge to appoint appellate counsel for as required by Rules 6.1(a) and (b), Ariz.R.Crim.P. and "Comment" to Rules 6.1(a) and (b); "Comment" to Rule 6.3(b); Rule 6.6 and "Comment" to Rule 6.6; U.S. Const. Amend.14; and Ariz.Const.art.2, § 24, constituted not only a qualified failure to follow the law but also a violation of his "Oath of Office" under Ariz.Const.art.6, § 26, and Rule 81, Rules of the Supreme Court, Canon 1, Rules 1.1; 1.2; and Canon 2, Rules 2.2; and 2.5(A).
- **B.** Regarding Judges

and

of the Arizona Court of

- The failure of Judges and to appoint appellate counsel for as required by Rules 6.1(a) and (b), Ariz.R.Crim.P. and "Comment" to Rules 6.1(a) and (b); "Comment" to Rule 6.3(b); Rule 6.6 and "Comment" to Rule 6.6; Rule 31.5(a) and "Comment" to Rule 31.5(a); U.S. Const. Amend. 14; and Ariz. Const.art.2, § 24, constituted not only a qualified failure to follow the law but also a violation of their respective "Oaths of Office" under Ariz.Const.art.6, § 26, and Rules 81, Rules of the Supreme Court, Canon 1, Rules 1.1; 1.2; and Canon 2, Rules 2.2; and 2.5(A).
- 2. The intentional disregard of the law in this case— having been brought to Judges' attention in no less than proceedings over the past —constitutes an additional violation of their respective "Oaths of Office" per Ariz.Const.art.6, § 26; also Canon 1, Rules 1.1; 1.2 and "Comment" to Rule 1.2, at 5; Canon 2, Rule 2.2 and "Comment" to Rule 2.2, at 1.3; Rule 2.5(A) and "Comment" to Rule 2.5, at 1.4.

C. Regarding Judges

and

of the Arizona Court

of

- 1. During the course of Petition for Review proceedings, both Judges and were made aware of the constitutional structural direct appeal by virtue of the failure to appoint appellate defect in counsel by Judges and Nonetheless, Judges took no remedial action as is required by Canon 2, Rule and 2.15(A)(C) and the "Comment" to Rule 2.15, and simply deemed uncounseled direct appeal—a proceeding which violated Rules 6.1(a) and (b). Ariz.R.Crim.P. and "Comment" to Rules 6.1(a) and (b); "Comment" to Rules 6.3(b); Rules 6.6 and "Comment" to Rule 6.6; Rule 31.5(a) and "Comment" to Rule 31.5(a); U.S. Const.Amend.14; and Ariz.Const.art.2, § 24-as an "oversight".
- 2. This intentional disregard by Judges and of the failure to follow the law by Judges and constitutes a violation of their respective "Oaths of Office" to uphold the constitutions of the United States and Arizona as to proceedings before in violation of Ariz.Const.art.6, § 26; also Canon 1, Rules 1.1; 1.2 and "Comment" to Rule 1.2, at 5; Canon 2, Rule 2.2 and "Comment" to Rule 2.2, at 1.3; Rule 2.5(A) and "Comment" to Rule 2.5, at 1.4.

The basis of these complaints is more fully set forth in the accompanying

Memorandum and Joint Appendix attached hereto; the relevant facts and attached

documents are applicable to all 6 complaints herein.

MEMORANDUM

Statement of Relevant Facts:

On	after a jury trial,		was sentenced in	County	
	<i>.</i>				

(App. at 1,2.) At sentencing, court-appointed trial counsel,

(App. at 2 through

7.) In the regarding the motion for new trial, notice was given that, "Pursuant to Rule 31.5, Ariz.R.Crim.Proc., appointed counsel at the determination of guilt and proceeds on appeal as an indigent without further authorization. (Rule 31.5.a.1)." *(id.* at 6.)

The next day, Mr.		filed a	from the Judgment			
of guilt and sentence'"[App. at 8.] as well as a as counse						
for	on this matter''' (App. at 9.) On Judge					
	ordered "that	may withdraw as	counsel of			
record " [App. at 10.] but neglected to appoint counsel for appeal.						
Or	n the	Court Cl	erk's Office notified			
	of the	(App.	(App. at 11, 12.) Then, on			
the		Court Clerk's Offic	Court Clerk's Office notified			
the appea	als from the	and	for			
(A	app. at 13 through 15.) In t	his	the court was			
informed that " [a]t the determination of guilt and sentencing, was:						
'Represented by court appointed counsel'" (id. at 13.)						

On		relying on the						
Minute Entry which erroneously stated that had								
and entered [App. at 1.], issued an order to show cause								
this 1	No.	should	ł	(App.at 16.) This				
order was sent to Mr. [App. at 17.], who had withdrawn from								
representing a month earlier. (App. at 10.) Next, on								
dismissed (App. at 18.) This order was also sent to Mr.								
(App. at 19.) Neither order was sent to (App. at 17, 19.					9.)			
The da	ay after the		Mr. submitted a		la			
to	o for		on this matter'' in and e		olained			
			(App	o. at 20.) Mr.	did			
not further notify the court that he had already been withdrawn as counsel								
pursuant to Judge order. (App. at 10.) Thereafter, M					ter, Mr.			
-	-for the first timene	otified	that (1) the	e	had			
been	and (2) he had fil	ed a		as				
On	On who had been corresponding with							
Clerk,	in rega	rds to		[No.				
	wrote a letter to Mr.	ab	out	(App. at 2	21, 22.)			
explained that the court should be receiving a corrected								

.

.

from Judgewhich would show thatwent to trial and did nottake a plea. (id.at 21.)included documents in support of this issue with theletter and updated Mr.as tothen-currentmailing address. (id.

at 22.)

On relieved Mr. in connection with [No. and, despite the fact that had been dismissed, further ordered that shall transmit the record forthwith to with a notice of transmittal to be filed with this Court.'' (App. at 23.) Notably, Mr. did not have the record had ordered that the

(App. at 16.) Additionally, the court on extended the "[t]ime for filing a and/or for Review.. from its order that allowed Mr. to withdraw. (App. at 23.) Although the order was sent to Mr. it was not sent at his then current mailing address [App. at 24.] of which to had been **ad**vised in (App. at 22.) letter to Mr.

Next, onin an apparent response to,letter,ordered the direct criminal appeal "reinstated" [App. at 25.]

11

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.