

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 18-006

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge violated his constitutional rights in a civil matter.

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: February 21, 2018

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Margaret H. Downie

Margaret H. Downie
Executive Director

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 21, 2018.

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

comp

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT 2018-006

COMPLAINT
RULE 8 (B) 6 VIOLATION

THIS CASE SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN
PROSECUTED FROM THE BEGINNING
WONG SUN V. UNITED STATES 371 U.S. 47
1963, NO PROBABLE CAUSE

THIS PLAINTIFF HAS ALREADY SENT TO ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL
CONDUCT A COMPLAINT AGAINST, TRIAL
ON

BUT THIS COMPLAINT IS AGAINST WHO WAS
ASSIGNED TO PLAINTIFF'S CIVIL STATE COURT COMPLAINT ON,

CASE NO, 4TH - FRUIT OF THE POISONOUS TREE WITH ARIZONA CONST

PLAINTIFF WAS ARRESTED ON, PROBABLE CAUSE FOR ARREST

"UNKNOWN" UNKNOWN BLACK FEMALE BUT THIS MALICIOUS PROSECUTION

FALSE IMPRISONMENT CLAIM WAS NOT COMPLETE UNTIL, BEFORE TRIAL

TRIAL "GRANTED PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO

SUPPRESS ALLEGED INCRIMINATING STATEMENTS IN THE POLICE REPORT
THAT RESULTED IN DRUG ARREST OF PLAINTIFF. BECAUSE

ALLEGED FEMALE WHO ALLEGEDLY MADE THOSE STATEMENT TO UNDER
COVER POLICE WAS "UNKNOWN" DENYING PLAINTIFF HIS 4TH 5TH 6TH RIGHT
TO FACE HIS ACCUSER AFTER THIS WAS DONE IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE FOR

ANY PUBLIC OFFICIAL ACTING UNDER COVER AND AUTHORITY OF STATE
LAW TO "SHOW CAUSE" WHY PLAINTIFF WAS NOT RELEASED ON

BECAUSE IN THIS CASE "SUPPRESSION WAS GRANTED" BUT THERE WAS NO
"EXCLUSION OF EVIDENCE AND THEREFORE NO REMEDY" FOR THIS

MALICIOUS PROSECUTION FALSE IMPRISONMENT AND

HAS CONTINUED TO DENY A "REMEDY" NEXT PAGE

2. EVERY SINGLE THING THAT HAS BEEN DONE TO THIS PLAINTIFF CONCERNING THIS MALICIOUS PROSECUTION FALSE IMPRISONMENT CLAIM HAS BEEN DONE FOR ONE PURPOSE ONLY AND THAT PURPOSE HAS BEEN TO "AVOID PROVIDING A "REMEDY" AND THAT REMEDY IS THE REMEDY REQUESTED IN BACK OF PLAINTIFF'S CIVIL STATE COURT COMPLAINT FILED

RULE 8 (B) 6 VIOLATION

WAS ASSIGNED TO PLAINTIFF'S CIVIL STATE COURT COMPLAINT PURSUANT TO RULE 4 AFTER "DISQUALIFIED" HIMSELF FROM PLAINTIFFS "WITHOUT STATING WHY"

BUT EVERY SINCE HAS BEEN ON THIS CASE HE HAS MADE MANY DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS OF A CONSTITUTIONAL MAGNITUDE IN WHICH OVER A PERIOD OF TIME HAS RESULTED IN A BLATENT AND OUTRIGHT DENIAL OF ANY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT IT IS AS THOUGH THIS PLAINTIFF HAS NO RIGHTS THAT IS BOUND TO RESPECT

EQUAL PROTECTION 5TH 14TH

"THE FOLLOWING PAGES WILL SHOW HOW ACTIONS PROVE THAT HE HAS CLEARLY REFUSED TO PROVIDE A "REMEDY" FOR THIS MALICIOUS PROSECUTION FALSE IMPRISONMENT "JUDGE ACTIONS WERE TAKEN IN BAD FAITH INTENT TO DECEIVE" "DISHONESTY OF BELIEF AND PURPOSE"

14TH 14TH ARIZ US CONST

STARTING WITH THE FIRST VIOLATION

REFUSED

TO RULE ON MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL BECAUSE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST DATED ON BACK

FEDERAL AND CIVIL RIGHTS DEPRIVATION 4TH 6TH AMENDMENT

CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

3. THE SECOND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION WAS WHEN, REFUSED
TO RULE ON MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDINGS IN ORDER TO LOCATE 2
UNDER COVER POLICE OFFICERS AND,
THESE OFFICERS MADE FALSE STATEMENTS IN THE POLICE
REPORT THAT AIDED THIS MALICIOUS PROSECUTION FALSE IMPRISONMENT
"MOTION DATED ON BACK" "POLICE REPORT"
PLAINTIFF SENT 4 CIVIL STATE COURT COMPLAINTS TO
TO BE SERVED TO THE 4 DEFENDANTS IN HIS
COMPLAINT BUT ONLY SERVED 2 OF THE
4 DEFENDANTS IN THIS STATE COURT COMPLAINT AND THOSE 2 DEFENDANTS
ARE AND,
BUT THE UNDER COVER
POLICE AND WERE NOT SERVED
WITH SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT BY STATING
THAT THEY COULD NOT LOCATE THE 2 UNDER COVER POLICE OFFICERS
NO ADDRESS "DUE PROCESS DEPRIVATION OF FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS"
BUT PLAINTIFF IS STILL BEING CHARGED 32 DOLLARS MILEAGE FEE
BY. EVEN THOUGH THE UNDER COVER OFFICERS
WERE NEVER SERVED WITH SUMMONS AND COMPLAINT DUE PROCESS VIOL
"DEPRIVATION OF DUE PROCESS WITH 6TH 14TH FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS"
SO FOR TO DENY OR IGNORE A MOTION TO STAY THE
PROCEEDINGS IN ORDER TO LOCATE THOSE 2 UNDER COVER POLICE
WHO INITIATED THIS MALICIOUS PROSECUTION FALSE IMPRISONMENT
WOULD NO DOUBT BE A VIOLATION OF A CONSTITUTIONAL MAGNITUDE
HAS JUST WALKED AWAY AND LEFT THIS
MALICIOUS PROSECUTION FALSE IMPRISONMENT CLAIM INCOMPLETE
UNFINISHED AND UNCORRECTED "NO REMEDY PROVIDED"

4.

HOW CAN A JUDGE JUSTIFY JUST WALKING AWAY AND LEAVING

SOMEONE FALSELY IMPRISONED ON A CLAIM THAT PROVES WITHOUT
QUESTION ARIZ RULES OF CIVIL P 12 (A) VIOLATION
STATE V. SMITH 412 1 20 763 ARIZ (1971)

THAT IT IS NOT POSSIBLE FOR ANY PUBLIC OFFICIAL ACTING UNDER COLOR
AND AUTHORITY OF STATE LAW, THAT HAS THE AUTHORITY TO MAKE
A DECISION ON THAT CLAIM TO "SHOW CAUSE" WHY PLAINTIFF
SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN RELEASED BEFORE TRIAL ON AND
THAT THERE NEVER SHOULD HAVE BEEN A TRIAL IN THE FIRST PLACE, SEE 4.

DOCUMENTS IN BACK OF COMPLAINT SENT TO JUDICIAL COMMISSION DATED ON BACK

POLICE REPORT AND TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS SENT ALONG WITH THIS
COMPLAINT

IN THE CIVIL STATE COURT ~~RECEIVED~~ COMPLAINT FILED . . . PURSUANT TO RULE 4
ONLY 2 OF THE 4 DEFENDANTS IN THAT COMPLAINT WERE SERVED WITH SUMMONS
AND COMPLAINT AND THOSE 2 DEFENDANTS ARE,

AND

BUT NEITHER ONE OF THESE

DEFENDANTS OR THE ATTORNEYS FOR THESE DEFENDANTS EVER DENIED THE "ALLEGATIONS"

MADE AGAINST THEM IN THE COMPLAINT, AND ACCORDING TO RULES OF CIVIL

PROCEDURE "8 (B) 6 FAILURE TO DENY AN ALLEGATION IS THE SAME AS

"ADMITTING GUILT" AS TO THAT ALLEGATION THIS WAS ALSO A VIOLATION OF ARIZ
RULES OF CIVIL P 12 (A) BUT NO REMEDY HAS BEEN PROVIDED

"FEDERAL AND CIVIL RIGHTS DEPRIVATION 4TH § 14TH"

THE FOLLOWING PAGES SHOW THREE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT
MOTIONS FILED BY PLAINTIFF CONCERNING HIS CLAIM

BUT THEY WERE IGNORED BY

IN ORDER TO AVOID PROVIDING A "REMEDY"
FOR THIS MALICIOUS PROSECUTION FALSE IMPRISONMENT

SEE MOTIONS ON FOLLOWING PAGES →

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

V.S.

PLAINTIFF

DEFENDANTS

"MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL"

CONFLICT OF INTEREST 6TH AMENDMENT

PLAINTIFF FILES THIS
MOTION REQUESTING COURT TO APPOINT COUNSEL NOT
ASSOCIATED WITH
BECAUSE IT HAS BECOME VERY CLEAR TO PLAINTIFF
THAT HE WILL NEVER RECEIVE ANY FAIRNESS
OR DUE PROCESS 14TH AMENDMENT EQUAL PROTECTION 5TH 14 ARIZ. CONST
CONCERNING HIS CLAIM THAT "PROVES WITHOUT QUESTION" THAT HE
SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN PROSECUTED 4TH AMENDMENT VIOLATION

NO PROBABLE CAUSE

6TH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO COUNSEL

BECAUSE THE 4 DEFENDANTS IN THIS COMPLAINT OR EMPLOYED
BY THE STATE OF ARIZONA, ~~ALONG WITH THE~~

ATTORNEY AND , ALL WORK IN THE INTEREST
OF THE STATE, THIS IS WHY PLAINTIFF HAS NOT AND WILL NOT RECEIVE
A FAIR RULING ON HIS COMPLAINT OR ANY MOTIONS CONCERNING
HIS COMPLAINT FILED 12-8-2016 "PLAINTIFF REQUEST COURT TO PUT"
PROCEDURES
ON HOLD UNTIL COUNSEL FROM ANOTHER COUNTY CAN BE APPOINTED
TO HELP PLAINTIFF RECEIVE FAIRNESS & DUE PROCESS CONCERNING CLAIM "
14TH AMENDMENT

**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.**