

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 18-106

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge was biased against him and made improper rulings in his criminal trial.

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: June 20, 2018

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on June 20, 2018.

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

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 my allegations of judicial 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.

IN THE CONSTITUTION THE 6TH AMENDMENT: JURY TRIALS PLAINLY STATES THAT, I, AS A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES HAVE THE RIGHT TO CONFRONT MY ACCUSER. JUDGE _____ KNOWINGLY TRIED, CONVICTED, AND SENTENCED ME TO _____ RAN CONCURRENT ILLEGALLY ON COUNT 2 (ORIGINAL COUNT 5) IN _____ IN VIOLATION OF MY CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE LAW.

A VICTIM / WITNESS NAMED _____ WAS INTRODUCED INTO TRIAL WITHOUT BEING PRESENT AT TRIAL OR ANY PROCEEDINGS. IN THE CRIMINAL CODE § 13-4096: SHORT TITLE, IT IS SPECIFIED HOW TO SECURE THE ATTENDANCE OF A WITNESS FROM "_____". "A STATE IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS, UNDER ARTICLE 24 § 13-4102 THE PROSECUTION SHOULD HAVE APPLIED TO THE COURT FOR AN ORDER THAT THE WITNESS BE EXAMINED CONDITIONALLY. HOWEVER THIS WAS NOT THE CASE. / SEE PAGES 130-135 (REAL)

A DEPOSITION WAS NEVER TAKEN AND YET EVERYTHING WENT ON AS IF IT HAD. MY 6TH AMENDMENT RIGHT

TO DUE PROCESS WAS VIOLATED BY THE ACTIONS OF THE PROSECUTION AND THIS WAS ALLOWED BY THE COURT.

MY ATTORNEY MOTIONED FOR A RULE 20 JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL (SEE PG. 132) AND THIS WAS DENIED BY JUDGE IN THIS ACTION JUDGE HAS BROUGHT THE JUDICIARY INTO DISREPUTE BY VIOLATING MY CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE JUDICIAL ETHICS CODE OF CONDUCT: 1.1 COMPLIANCE WITH THE LAW; 1.2 PROMOTING CONFIDENCE IN THE JUDICIARY; 2.2 IMPARTIALITY AND FAIRNESS; AND 2.3 BIAS, PREJUDICE, AND HARASSMENT.

THE FACT THAT JUDGE WAS AWARE OF MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS AND DUE PROCESS AND STILL CHOSE TO ALLOW ORIGINAL COUNT 5 WHICH IS NOW COUNT 2 (PG. 130) (ITAL) AND BLATANTLY VIOLATED THE LAW, THE 5TH AND 14TH AMENDMENTS, AND JUDICIAL ETHICS IN THE DENIAL OF THE RULE 20 MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL (SEE PG. 132) (ITAL) LEAVES LITTLE DOUBT AS TO WHY SHE DID THIS. JUDGE WAS BIASED. I WAS GUILTY UNTIL PROVEN INNOCENT. I HUMBLY ASK THE COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE THIS MATTER AND I FEEL THAT JUDGE SHOULD BE DISQUALIFIED UNDER RULE 2.11 OF THE JUDICIAL ETHICS CODE OF CONDUCT.

SINCERELY,