## State of Arizona

## COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

# Disposition of Complaint 16-213

Judge:

Complainant:

#### ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge made improper statements about a member of his family, improperly suppressed evidence in his criminal case, and framed him for a crime.

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(a).

Dated: September 28, 2016

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 September 28, 2016. I understand the commission cannot reverse court orders or assign a new judge to a case.

I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing information and the facts I have provided upon which mv allegations of iudicial misconduct are based are true and correct.

Signature:	
Date:	

## INSTRUCTIONS

Use the following space or plain paper of the same size to explain your complaint. Explain why you believe what the judge did constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list the names, dates, times, and places relevant to your allegations. Additional pages may be used and relevant copies of documents may be sent with your complaint (please do not send original documents). Use one side of each page only and write legibly or type your complaint. Please keep a copy of your complaint for your records.

See attached

THIS JUDICIAL COMPLAINT MUST REMAIN SEALED DUE TO THE RECEVANT ISSUES AND FOR THE SAFETY OF COMPLAINTANT AND HIS FAMILY.

# JUDICIAL COMPLIANT

On or about		in (	Court room, but		
not relevant to any hearing, trial, case or the like, made public, personal and ultra					
vires statements to complainant's Private Investigator (" ')					
concerning complainant's	(" ')	[name re	dacted to protect		
person from further retribution].					
previously abused	discretion,	and viola	ated Loyalty		
Oath and literally broke almost every rule to assist corrupt prosecutors [.					
and dirty o					
] frame complainant by unlaw	fully suppressin	ig over	, almost		
pieces of 'material.					
The statements at issue were threa	atening, intimida	iting and	coercive; and		
were intended to cause Jane Doe harm, both personal and professional, in regards					
to employment as a	-				
Apparently, does	not condone Jan	ne Doe's	employment, and		
believes the state and federal constitutional prohibitions against "corruption of					
blood" do not apply to	just ad		believes		
S.C.O.T.U.S. mandates relevant to '	suppression	do not ap	oply in		
(	)(				
).					
is currently intent	ionally violating	A. R. C	rim. P. Rule		
•	•	_	: : :		

is currently intentionally violating A. R. Crim. P. Rule 32.4(e) in an *ultra vires* attempt to prevent complainant from obtaining "redress of grievance" (1<sup>st</sup> Amendment) through "due process" (5<sup>th</sup> Amendment).

is unlawfully using office and authority under color of law to prevent the transfer to another judge of complainant's A. R. Crim. P. Rule 32 Post-Conviction Relief; so can continue to conceal previous *ultra vires* acts and abuse of discretion to frame complainant for a crime that simply cannot exist under Arizona law and, even if it did, was not committed by complainant.

incontrovertibly prove intent to obtain the improvident conviction through unlawful 'suppression.

Said statements are good and sufficient fortiori requiring provide sufficient evidence to prove biased rulings that prejudiced complainant were inadvertently and/or simply erroneous, but lacked actual criminal intent to frame an innocent person as a means to obtain pecuniary gain through the ELECTED OFFICIAL AND JUDGES PENSION FUND; which is unconstitutionally invested in the private prison corporations operating in Arizona (

must by law be recused from complainant's P.C.R. and be sanctioned in the most extreme manner possible for blatant judicial misconduct; not only in the interest of justice, but also to prevent from using authority under color of law to inflict harm on the Jane Doe and/or other members of complainant's family.

The statements are possible exculpatory evidence that ' ' material and as such complainant, as a *pro se* Defendant, has the substantive right (5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Amendment) to examine under oath; therefore mandating transfer the relevant P.C.R. to another judge (Rule 32.4(e)) - - but will not violently abide by the Arizona law for fear conspiracy to frame Defendant will be discovered and evidenced during the procedure(s) and/or hearing(s).