

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 18-019

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged a justice of the peace backdated a ruling, was biased against her, and made improper rulings in a civil case.

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).

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

Dated: May 8, 2018

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Margaret H. Downie

Margaret H. Downie  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on May 8, 2018.

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

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct  
1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

**2018-019**

**COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Judge's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions:** Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

*See Plaintiff's Attachment to Judicial Complaint -  
with attached exhibits (or in separate folder) made  
a part hereof - of relevant court documents.*

*Note: This Complaint against Judge  
is filed concurrently with Complaint  
against Judicial Employees in*

**PLAINTIFF'S ATTACHMENT TO JUDICIAL COMPLAINT AGAINST JUDGE**

**w/attached exhibits (or in separate folder) made a part hereof**

( ) – Case No.

( ) – Trial date:

**Named Individually, and Jointly and Severally**

**as Defendants in**

**Complaint Transferred to**

**I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

PLAINTIFF HEREBY ASSERTS " JUDGE HAS KNOWINGLY AND WILLFULLY (i) deprived her Constitutional Rights to Due Process and Equal Protection of the Laws; (ii) obstructed justice; (iii) violated her Civil Rights; (iv) violated the ACJC Preamble and Rule of Law; (v) violated FRCP Rule 19(2)(A) " by refusing to join to Plaintiff's lawsuit without any legal authority – despite Defendant being individually named as l, etc., of , and jointly and severally with Defendant, in Plaintiff's Complaint Notice (handwritten in body of Complaint), and properly served by ; (vi) refused to acknowledge Plaintiff's new discovery disclosure of Defendants " violation of the AZ Consumer Fraud Act regarding fraudulent l leases that are inadmissible in trial, and vitiated Defendants entire proceeding as void by " giving Plaintiff the right to claim punitive damages; (vii) committed "fraud upon the court" himself by authorizing his Clerk to fraudulently backdate an ruling to suppress and deny Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (MSJ), thereby, vitiating the entire proceeding by the judge's " (which includes perjury/tampering with a public record/fraudulent schemes/criminal conduct); (viii) allowed the court Clerk (under his supervision) to " violate FRCP Rule 79(2)(3)(A) requiring each docket entry to briefly show the nature of the paper filed in chronological order which, instead, show some papers fraudulently falsified in the docket, out of chronological order, and " thereby, containing false information in public records; (ix) refused to acknowledge (by his own corrupt deeds and actions) that Defendants vitiated their entire proceeding by their " in their documents; (x) refused to acknowledge (by his own corrupt deeds and actions) Defendants of intentionally refusing to join to Plaintiff's lawsuit to shield him from all personal liability, which Plaintiff now asserts constitutes collusion/conspiracy with a judicial "; (xi) refused to correct the court docket " notation to obfuscate implied " and " in Plaintiff's damages claims in her Complaint against Defendants (including their " in Plaintiff's new disclosure discovery of Defendants " l violation of the AZ Consumer Fraud Act, and violation of his signed loan agreement with the prohibiting discrimination against Plaintiff at ); (xii) refused to acknowledge that Defendant, , may have also violated his loan agreement with the by overcharging Plaintiff in rent from 7, in which a refund (plus interest) would be due; (xiii) abused his discretion by showing bias and prejudice against Plaintiff, but favoritism towards Defendants (and their " counsel) – despite their pattern of " criminal felony misconduct in Plaintiff's lawsuit (including perjury/tampering with a public record/ fraudulent schemes); (xiv) refused to comply with FRCP Rule 60(b) making judgments void based on his " of a backdated ruling; (xv) refused to acknowledge the decision that Plaintiff is entitled to judgment as a matter of law because "

" ; (xvi) refused to comply with FRCP 56(a) in which the court " to Plaintiff, who has shown there is " (including by Defendants intrinsic/extrinsic " making their entire proceeding " ); and (xvii) violated Constitution Art. 3 § 1 wherein judges can hold office with compensation "

By Judge " and in the court docket, he has knowingly and willfully vitiated the entire proceeding before trial. Thus, Plaintiff does not recognize this judicial " , " who has corrupted the " by his criminal felony conduct (and allowed Defendants to do the same).

PURSUANT TO A.R.S 13 § 3884, PLAINTIFF ASSERTS (AS A "CITIZEN") SHE CAN ACTUALLY HAVE THIS JUDGE ARRESTED AT TRIAL FOR HIS FELONY CRIMINAL CONDUCT.

1. Pursuant to ARS 22-204A, Plaintiff's Motion for change of judge ( ) and venue for cause in was about . Her case was transferred to Judge in about

2. On Plaintiff and Defendants counsel attended a pretrial conference in In response to Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (MSJ) filed on before this conference, Defendants counsel handed Plaintiff a *Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment and Defendants Cross Motion for Summary Judgment*. Pursuant to JCRCP Rule 129(c) typed on the first page of Defendants Cross Motion, Plaintiff had 30 days to file a response. Judge confirmed she had 30 days to respond, and also promised he would not rule on her MSJ or Defendants Cross Motion until after Plaintiff filed a response. On Plaintiff filed a timely *Opposition/Reply to Defendants Cross Motion for Summary Judgment"* in less than 30 days.

3. However, Judge spoke false perjured words from the bench to Plaintiff on [redacted] and also breached his promise. With utter disregard for the 30 day Rule of Law in Rule 129(c), and under his authorization, his Clerk fraudulently backdated a " " to denying Plaintiff's MSJ, i.e., the Clerk falsely inferred in the court ruling that Plaintiff did not file a reply to Defendants' motion (i.e., to their Cross Motion) – knowing that the box should have been checked that Plaintiff ... "Filed a reply to the response on this day \_."

4. By such fraudulent scheme, and perjury, Plaintiff asserts Judge deliberate denied her MSJ, which points out Defendants "...":  
" " ; " "  
" " ; , " and "

court's conspiracy to shield Why? So Defendants felony criminal conduct would be concealed; so Plaintiff's right to judgment as a matter of law would be denied even though there was no genuine issue as to a material fact; and so Plaintiff's significant 7 "*Opposition/Reply to Defendants Cross Motion for Summary Judgment*" document would not be heard, which " violates ACJC Rule 2.6(A)(1) ..." "

5. Plaintiff's significant document (*supra*) discloses new information that Defendants, , and  
," violated the 1967/1974 AZ Consumer Fraud Act (CFA Act) regarding two fraudulent "r leases that are inadmissible in trial; and that Plaintiff has a right to also claim punitive damages. Plaintiff now asserts Judge did nothing about Defendants " because he also committed " against Plaintiff by his ruling wrongfully denying her MSJ. (See Plaintiff's MSJ; Defendants '*Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment and Defendants Cross Motion for Summary Judgment; and Plaintiff's Opposition/Reply to Defendants Cross Motion for Summary Judgment* regarding the CFA Act (pgs. 3-10) – in separate folder.)

- Page 2 of 7

Page 3 of 7

9. **Ex. B attached hereto** – shows face sheets of Plaintiff's/Defendants documents in the "c" order in which they should have been filed in the court docket titled as follows:

(i) " " Filed "; (ii) Defendants "

10. In violation of FRCP Rule 79(2)(3)(A), Plaintiff asserts that (under supervision and authority), fraudulently falsified a Calendar Events and Hearings docket so events in public records would not be in chronological order, are misdated and misleading, and cause intentional confusion. Some entries in the docket were made to distract attention away from Plaintiff's filed MSJ and significant documents showing Defendants violated their entire proceeding by " , " and committed consumer fraud. Further, docket entries do not briefly show the nature of all papers filed with several " d" documents filed as follows:

- a. .. ( Fraudulent Falsified Entries: At no time did Plaintiff file a " ; nor a " ; nor an " " in on .
- b. .. ( Fraudulent Falsified Entries: Two separate " " are included in the docket without any explanation on Plaintiff never received notice of these two rulings by mail.
- c. .. ( Fraudulent Falsified Docket Entry: At no time does Plaintiff recall Defendants filing a " on , which was never served on Plaintiff. Therefore, Plaintiff asserts this falsified docket entry constitutes " " made by a judicial " " – to **JUSTIFY** his refusal to join to Plaintiff's Complaint fully knowing that Defendant, named individually, and jointly and severally with as a Defendant in Plaintiff's handwritten Notice in body of Complaint. However, in " violation of FRCP Rule 19(2)(A) , " this judge has refused to join to Plaintiff's Complaint by court order. Instead, in a fraudulent scheme of felony criminal conduct (ARS §§ 13-2310, 13-302) to " by shielding him personal liability in Plaintiff's lawsuit, this judge has " violated the Rule of Law. Without Defendant, , as a party to Plaintiff's lawsuit, it is impossible for her to have a fair and impartial hearing and complete relief. Accordingly, this judge has also " deprived Plaintiff of Constitutional Rights to Due Process and Equal Protection of the Laws, obstructed justice (18 USC § 1503), and violated her Civil Rights (28 USC § 1343(a)(1-4). (See **Ex. A attached to Plaintiff's MSJ – her handwritten Complaint " " naming Defendant, , individually as , etc., and jointly and severally with Defendant, – in separate folder.)**

d. For the record in , however, after Plaintiff filed an *Motion for Court Order to Add Defendant, , to all Documents Filed by the Parties Pursuant to* – Defendants filed a *Motion to Strike Unnamed Defendant from Plaintiff's Motions on* . On , Plaintiff filed a response titled: *Opposition to Defendants Motion to Strike (Alleged) Unnamed Defendant, i, from Plaintiff's Motions so a 'Fair Hearing' [sic] and 'Complete Relief' Cannot be Entered; for Obstruction of 'Due Administration of Justice'; for Defendants Motion not Filed in 'Good Faith' or 'Truthful'; for Defendants' Fraudulent Schemes; and for Perjury.*

**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.**