

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 15-301

---

Judge:

Complainant

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court commissioner was depriving him of his constitutional rights and was prejudiced against him.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the commissioner 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 judicial officer'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: December 9, 2015

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

---

George A. Riemer  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the commissioner on December 9, 2015.

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

\* complaint against commissioner

2.

UNFORTUNATELY (COMMISSIONER <sup>is</sup>  
UNWILLING TO HEAR BOTH SIDES OF CASE'S)  
(FOR DISMISSAL)

\* THIS PRE-TRIAL DETAINEE AND INDIGENT  
DEFENDANT, <sup>is BEING</sup>  
KNOWINGLY DEPRIVED OF HIS GUARANTEED  
CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO ACCESS THE  
COURTS), <sup>STANDING</sup>  
ON AVAILABLE COURT  
TRANSCRIPTS DATED <sup>Am</sup>  
SPECIFICALLY AN INCIDENT, WHERE  
MULTIPLE DEPRIVATION'S) OBSTRUCTING  
AND DEPRIVING THIS DEFENDANT'S RIGHTS  
(AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION AGAINST JUSTICE)  
SHOWING HIS OPPRESSIVE ONE SIDED  
NATURE TODAY HARMING AND REFUSING  
TO HEAR OR ALLOW DEFENDANT TO SPEAK  
IN RESPONSE APPROPRIATELY AGAINST  
UNFAIR PREJUDICIAL USE OF PRIOR'S)  
PURSUANT TO (RULE 609) AND OBJECTION'S)  
TO PRESENTATION OF PRIOR'S). THEN  
DEFENDANT REMOVED FROM COURTROOM,  
AS REASONABLY OBJECTION'S) MADE  
CONCERNING EXTENSION'S) OF TIME  
TO ADDRESS MULTIPLE MOTION'S) IN  
TIMING BEING DISCARDED, IGNORING  
THE IMMEDIATE AND AVAILABLE  
EVIDENTIARY MATERIAL IN SUPPORT



(NOTE) DEFENDANT PRE-TRIAL DISTRESS <sup>CON. OVER</sup> UNREASONABLE DELAYS

3.

OF (TWO) MOTION'S) TO DISMISS THAT ARE STILL PENDING OVER 18 MONTHS... THIS DEFENDANT HAVING SUFFERED EXCESSIVE FORCES USED BY A NOW EX-OFFICER CAUSING PERMANENT PHYSICAL INJURIES) AS MEDICAL RECORDS WOULD REVEAL, VERIFY CAUSE OF INJURIES THIS DEFENDANT INTENTIONALLY BEING DEPRIVED ACCESS TO MATERIAL AND MATERIAL IN WHICH IS ALSO IN SUPPORT OF DISMISSAL OF CASE'S). (COMMISSIONER UNREASONABLY ALLOWING CONTINUOUS DELAYS AND VIOLATION'S), CLEARLY DEPRIVING DEFENDANT'S) PRE-TRIAL EXCULPATORY DEFENCE AND ANY CHANCE OF FAIR TRIAL.

WHILE ALLOWING AND MAKING HIS OWN UNSUBSTANTIATED REMARK'S) EXPRESSING PERSONAL BELIEF ABOUT DEFENDANT'S PRESUMED GUILT, WAY BEYOND ANY COMMENT OF EVIDENCE, AGAINST THE DEFENDANT'S OBJECTIONS, AGAINST THE IMPROPER STATEMENTS OF PERSONAL OPINION. AS TO THIS DEFENDANT'S GUILT, ESTABLISHING UNFAIR PRE-TRIAL PREJUDICE THAT EXIST,



THAT THIS DEFENDANT RIGHTFULLY IS  
 OBJECTING TO, AS SHOWN BY SIMPLY  
 REVIEWING THE FAULTY AND DEFECTIVE  
 GRAND JURY INDICTMENT. (SHOWING PREJUDICE)  
 DEFENDANT ATTEMPTING TO ADDRESS THE  
 (RULE 609) MATTER'S AND VARY  
 IMPORTANT EVIDENTIARY HEARING  
 EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE FRAUDULENTLY  
 BEING CONCEALED, AS CAN BE FOUND  
 ALSO IN REQUESTED COUNTY  
 RECORDS AND THE

MATERIALS BEING  
 WITHHELD TO PREJUDICE ANY DEFENCE.  
 \* SEE: MILKE VS. RYAN, 711 F.3d 998 (2013)  
 THIS STATE COURT DECISION'S BASED  
 ON AN UNREASONABLE DETERMINATION  
 OF FACTS WITH THE PROSECUTION'S  
 FAILING TO TIMELY DISCLOSE THE  
 EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE AND THE  
 INDICTMENT EVIDENCE, VIOLATING  
 AND CONSTITUTIONALLY GUARANTEED  
 COMPULSORY DISCOVERY PROCESS

(COMMISSIONER) HAS  
 ABUSED HIS POWER, ABUSED HIS  
 DECISION IMPROPERLY WITH ONLY  
 ONE SIDED PROCEEDING'S AND WITH  
 UNREASONABLE DELAYS IN HIS DECISION



making, punishing this defendant, so for these very good reasons shown above that commissions is undermining the confidence in the outcome of having a fair trial.

- extreme prejudice exist allowing predetermined guilt and defendants rights to be trampled on habitually by ineffective assistance of counsel and prosecutorial misconduct
- \* SEE: GOLDBERG vs. KELLY 397 U.S. 284, 90 S.Ct. 1011, 25 L.Ed.2d 287 (1970) THE INTENTIONAL DISPROVISIONS TO provide process prior to inflicting this harm would violate the due process clause, in which the 14th amendment speaks
  - \* SEE: PEOPLE vs. ROSARIO 9 N.Y.2d 284 (1961) THIS DEFENDANT SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO USE DISCLOSURE THAT CONTAINS MATTERS WHICH IS INCONSISTENT WITH PRIOR STATEMENTS
  - \* SEE: (RUL 602) NEED FOR PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF INCIDENT.  
AN UNFAIR CONSPIRACY, IF YOU WILL;  
A FRAUDULENT SCHEME AND PRACTICE  
OBSTRUCTING DEFENDANTS INVESTIGATIONS



COMMISSIONER IGNORING DEFENDANT'S  
STATEMENTS).

TO PRESENTATION REVIEW  
FOR FINDING PROBABLE CAUSE AND  
WARRANTING DISMISSAL, IGNORING  
MANDATORY RESPONSE TIME LIMITS  
ON MATTER(S) PRESENTED AND THE  
UNREASONABLE EXTENSION OF TIME  
LIMITS CONCERNING EACH IMPORTANT  
MATTER, AS PRESENTED, WITH GOOD  
CAUSE TO ARGUE SUCH VIOLATIONS, AS  
STATED AND

PROMPTLY CHALLENGING THOSE MATTER(S)  
BRINGING ATTENTION TO THIS CRUCIAL  
QUESTION OF THIS DEFENDANT INNOCENCE  
(THIS DEFENDANT DEPRIVED ACCESS TO COURT) AND

\* SEE: HEARING TRANSCRIPTS DATED

WHERE CLEARLY  
MAKING IT HARDER FOR DEFENDANT  
TO FILE AND ADDRESS TIMELY MOTION(S)  
TO PREPARE HIS DEFENCE AND MAKE  
IT EASIER FOR FACT

I SINCERELY ASK THAT THIS COMMISSION  
CONSIDER ALL THE ABOVE MATTER(S)  
TO POTENTIALLY AVOID A MANIFEST  
OF INJUSTICE, AND TAKE APPROPRIATE  
ACTION(S)

DATED

SIGNED