State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 15-206

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge conspired with the prosecutor and defense attorney to commit kidnapping, ignored his requests to remove counsel, lacked jurisdiction to sentence him, and ordered the clerk not to file his petition for post-conviction relief.

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: August 26, 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 August 26, 2015.

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

Comp

2015 - 06

To whom it may concern:

This complaint is sent so an investigation may be initiated into judicial misconduct and several civil rights violations that have accurred by, apparently, corrupt elected state officials. The acts are completely illegal and the public image surrounding the integrity of the judicial system requires prosecution of any individuals who may have acted in concert through their overt acts.

The image the citizens of this country and state maintain surrounding our criminal justice system, is one that the judges in our courts retain the highest standard of integrity, are impartial to the proceedings before them, are completely unbiased, and most importantely are honest. Afterall, the core concept behind the criminal justice system is to seek the truth and, at the same time, punish an individual for his actions. Public image demands like punishment and prosecution of State officials who have broken their oaths of office and laws they have sworn to uphold.

This complaint stems from County now The judicial officer involved is , the original defense attorney was from the Public Defenders Office, and the prosecutor was . Although I do not have any hard evidence they acted in concert or conspired to commit this act, the only reasonable presumption is they did based on circumstantial evidence, omissions thereof, and their knowledge of the law. It is presumed the officials are better situated to understand the law than the layman. Thus, if any one of knew the acts of

20 - 5 - 206

other were illegal, pursuant the rules of professional conduct, their duty is to report any improperties they have first hand knowledge of.

Objectively analyzing the facts of the case, the government has through actions by state officials clothed with

authority of the State. They must have one of two impressions in their mind: I was (B) We are untouchable because we are the

Those same State officials, or at least one of them, has attempted to commit overt acts to further the initial predicate act essentially covering his trail and at the same time ensuring his initial illegal ruling would not be disturbed or subject to reversal. At least the evidence, taken as a totality and objectively evaluated, clearly requires that determination be made.

At hand is a filed in County in Said was filed to the clerk based on two things; () Rule 32 counsel, was ignorant of the law, therefore I moved to have her removed. These requests were completely ignored by A letter was sent to expressing concern regarding competence as an attorney because she refused to argue the expired and therefore, the trial court lacked jurisdiction to revoke an already expired term of after its termination. A letter was also sent to telling her to withdraw from my case. Besides the letters, I filed a motion trying to invoke my right to self-representation. Everything went ignored by

2015-206

(2) I knew if I didn't submit the claim now, a strong probability existed it could be precluded from future review. I already knew something was wrong, previously I had filed a Rule 24.2 motion never issued rulings on that. I argued the expired

and the court lacked jurisdiction to impose sentence and, the crime of requires elements to sustain the conviction (unauthorized presence and intent to commit another felony). Since I was an undisputed lease holder of the property, the plea lacked one of the essential elements. knew this to be true; the file clearly states several times that it was my home. The file even contains a letter from affirming I was a resident of the home. ignored that motion knowing full well these facts. Mr. went as far as to state it on the record during the disposition hearing. was the only element that existed to support the charge

After I filed the petition, a few days later I recieved an envelope from the clerk of County. That county usually performs service to the other parties for the defendant. The clerk also mails a conformed copy back to the defendant. When I opened the envelope it contained my original petition. After closer examination, I found the seals of the clerk covered in white out tape. It contained two seals, and The seal shows it was even

assigned to which is division in said county.

It is important to note, Every document I ever filed was filed except the most important one, the . The Clerk obviously returned the petition, but upon who's orders was it returned? It also appears the State recieved its copy of the petition. While on review in the Arizona the court ordered the State to this allegation, respond in its response. The State claimed miracubusly that in the same time frame somehow and unexplainably

These alleged coincedences do not magically occur. It is quite funny to see how one initial bad act has spread like a bad seed and the dishonesty is not limited to the judicial branch only.

Under Arizona law, Court Rule 91(F)"... all documents..., and filed in the action or proceeding. the court may order the return of an original... provided an appropriate copy or duplicate is substituted thereof." Thus, the court is the only authority capable of ordering the return of a document.

The moment the was recieved by the clerk, it became a public record. When the petition was removed from the clerk's office, this act became a felony act because a copy was not retained by the clerk and the person who ordered its return knowingly removed a public record. see A.R.S. § 13-2407.

The petition is available upon an agreement to its safe return. Also available is a conversation held in the Arizona court where one party says they should direct the Court to address the improperties. The other party says no, since it is not a filing, we should return it to Mr. we do not have a case for him, and direct him to the Court. This conversation was sent to me covered with the cover letter on top and under that a simple white sheet of paper with two post its. Obviously the honest people in the Court intended for me to have this conversation or else it would not have been included nor nicely covered up. This happened when I sent them all the evidence backing my claims after the State claimed they had unrelated case orders in their file around the same date the petition was filed.

This complaint is forwarded to several parties in hope that oversight might be accomplished. The names on the post-its are not disclosed to protect the honest people in the Arizona Court. This letters' intent is to show how deep the corruption is in the Arizona

My case will be decided in Due course with a fair and impartial decision maker. As a citizen of this country, I expect that my claims will be taken seriously and acted upon. I am open to give any testimony that may be needed during the investigation or possible future prosecution. All documents are available upon request and agreement to their safe return.

Included is an appendix of cases corroborating the Court lacks jurisdiction to revoke probation after expiration. Now, back before

is a Rule 60 motion to void the illegal sentence. Hopefully this time, he will act how the law requires him to act. That is all for now. If any questions need to be answered, feel free to write. I have all documents on hand backing every claim I have made contained in this complaint. I do leave one thing out. Knowing full well how will try to manipulate his way out, I will disclose another act proving his is a dishonest person, at the same time negating his only justification for illegally removing public documents. BasicTHE 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.