

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 18-012

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged multiple judicial officers failed to uphold the law and ignored evidence that they were lied to.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judicial officers 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 judicial officers did not violate the Code in this case. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Commission member Art Hinshaw did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: March 5, 2018

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Margaret H. Downie  
Margaret H. Downie  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on March 5, 2018.

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

Judge

Attorney

2018-012

Judges

This case was created by \_\_\_\_\_ in order keep me from doing anything about it  
stealing from me. \_\_\_\_\_ lied under oath & instructed his client to lie under oath to win the  
case. I told \_\_\_\_\_ the truth under oath & was not believed.  
\_\_\_\_\_ made a decision in favor of \_\_\_\_\_

When this case was appealed proof the decision \_\_\_\_\_ made was due to  
& \_\_\_\_\_ lying under oath was included in the appeal.  
The proot submitted was a copy of the email from the \_\_\_\_\_ White House sending my complaint to the  
\_\_\_\_\_ copy of \_\_\_\_\_ record were \_\_\_\_\_ told the \_\_\_\_\_ it had my property and  
that it knew it was a mistaken deposit. it didn't contact me & it was talking with  
its attorney because the \_\_\_\_\_ had contact them about my property.

This record showed Judges theft 18 USC 656  
47-4302 Payor bank's responsibility for late return of item  
13-1802 Theft The intent to deprive the owner of the property permanently  
13-2702 - Perjury  
Not upholding the Arizona Securities Act A.R.S. 44-1801

RULE 2.15. Responding to Judicial and Lawyer Misconduct  
A judge having knowledge that a lawyer has committed a violation of the Rules of Professional  
Conduct that raises a substantial question regarding the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or fitness as  
a lawyer in other respects shall inform the appropriate authority.  
13-2702 (B) Perjury is a class 4 felony.  
18 U.S.C. 1623 Subornation of Perjury  
Lying under oath disrupts the judicial process

All of these Judges were told multiple times that I am a Private Banker fighting for my promissory note  
which are my legal instrument, in which I made promise in writing to pay a determinate sum of money  
to the party listed. This was dropped at \_\_\_\_\_ by mistake  
\_\_\_\_\_ kept it for itself. To date nothing has been done to hold \_\_\_\_\_ or  
\_\_\_\_\_ accountable.

COMP( [redacted] )

Judge  
[redacted]

2018-012

Attorney  
[redacted]

All the banks refused to return my promissory notes when they were not used as intended.  
[redacted] kept my deposit handed to a branch manger.

18 U.S. Code § 656 - Theft, embezzlement, or misapplication by bank officer or employee  
47-4302. Payor bank's responsibility for late return of item

[redacted] kept a deposit dropped at its location by mistake  
18 U.S. Code § 656 - Theft, embezzlement, or misapplication by bank officer or employee  
47-4302. Payor bank's responsibility for late return of item

1. A demand item, other than a documentary draft, whether properly payable or not, if the bank, in any case in which it is not also the depository bank, retains the item beyond midnight of the banking day of receipt without settling for it or, whether or not it is also the depository bank, does not pay or return the item or send notice of dishonor until after its midnight deadline; or
2. Any other properly payable item unless, within the time allowed for acceptance or payment of that item, the bank either accepts or pays the item or returns it and accompanying documents.

[redacted] never credited the depositor was the Holder in Due Course  
18 U.S. Code § 656 - Theft, embezzlement, or misapplication by bank officer or employee  
47-4302. Payor bank's responsibility for late return of item

Deposits are funds that customers place with a bank and that the bank is obligated to repay on demand, after a specific period of time or after expiration of some required notice period.

[HTTP://www.federalreserve.gov/boarddocs/supmanual/cbem/3000.pdf](http://www.federalreserve.gov/boarddocs/supmanual/cbem/3000.pdf)

In [redacted] after informing every bank regulator & the White House that these banks kept my loan deposits for themselves and no bank regulator nor the [redacted] did anything to hold them accountable. I filed against [redacted] all at the same time.

I gave this Judge proof of what each bank did & proof that I had informed every bank regulator & the White House who sent everything to the [redacted] All of these lawyers lied to win the case I brought against their client for keeping my deposits or loan payoffs.

None of what I said or did was taken seriously. None of it was checked out .No Due diligence.

All they lawyers were concerned with wining their cases no matter what.  
I was only concerned with following the law which is why I told Congress everything.

Judge

2018-012

Attorney

created this case to keep me from doing anything about it keeping my promissory note handed to branch manager. These lawyers knew their client had stolen from me they knew I had reported to every bank regulator contacted the White House who contacted the. These lawyers knew the a governmental agency contacted wanting answers. This lawyer new this was not the first time was against me in the Arizona Courts over my promissory notes. That case I started myself.

I submitted a police copy of the promissory note with a card from the police station where the promissory note was signed & copy of my Private Bankers promise. I told the Judge that I was a Private Banker & that kept my promissory note for itself. On the top right of my promissory note Federal Reserve Act Section 13, 31 USC 5103, 18 USC 8 in the middle were terms & conditions on the bottom is the definition of Private Banker & promissory note & card from the police station where the promissory note was signed. I made a promise to a month until the full amount was received which had to be picked up from my home, if someone didn't pick up the promissory note matured. If the promissory note was signed over to another the promissory note matured. This Judge actually held the copy in her hands.

I informed the Judge that a publicly placed UCC lien went active when didn't return my promissory note when requested. The return request was made via mail & nationwide . 47-1202. Notice; knowledge

These lawyers did everything possible to win the case. In doing so caused this Judge to rule against me for following the Arizona Revised Statutes, United States Code, 1913 Act of Congress, 1933 Presidential Executive Order, and not up hold the Arizona's securities laws

When I pointed these facts out to the Judge I was ignored. This case is currently in Arizona Court of Appeal Division 1 with two case numbers

COMPC

5

In Judge didn't uphold the Arizona Revised Statutes and ignored me when I informed & proved the lawyers to have lied to her.

Judge

2018-012

Attorney

Both kept my bill payoff for themselves yet never credited my account. I used promissory notes which are Commercial Paper that matured when the first payment was not picked up from me or when the promissory note is signed over to another party. Use of promissory notes is covered by the Arizona Securities Act. This was not enforced.

47-3603. Tender of payment

B. If tender of payment of an obligation to pay an instrument is made to a person entitled to enforce the instrument and the tender is refused, there is discharge, to the extent of the amount of the tender, of the obligation of an indorser or accommodation party having a right of recourse with respect to the obligation to which the tender relates.

Both lawyers lied to the Court saying that I was not a client and that my promissory note was worthless and that I was just trying to get out of paying my bill. On the promissory note was the 1913 Federal Reserve Act, 18 USC 8, 31 USC 5103 and it listed the address of the police station as the issue location where it was signed & copy filed. No one called the police station to check out if what I was saying was true. Bills showing my name as a account holder were not taken into consideration.

The Arizona Revised Statutes, Arizona Securities Act, Federal Reserve Act, United States Code, 1933 Presidential Executive Order were all ignored.