State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 18-189

Judges:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge violated Rules 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, and 2.11 of the Code. The complainant also alleged a second superior court judge failed to timely rule on a motion in a criminal matter.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if a judicial officer 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 a 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).

Dated: September 26, 2018

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on September 26, 2018.

3		Comp
	i.	COPY18-189
		-
(m)		
		and the second second second
		in the second
		100 Mar (100 Mar)
12) J MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF
13) DISMISSAL OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF
		HABEAS CORPUS DUE TO JUDICIAL
		MISCONDUCT
16		
	Come Dow,	bringing this MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
16	OF DISMISSAL OF "PETITION FOR	WRIT OF HABEAS CURRUS" DUE TO JUDICIAL MISCONDERT,
	before the Honorable	, in an attempt to receive a Ruling that is NOT
	prejudiced, by this Court.	an e service and e sources and e sources and an an a source and a service service sources and a service source and a service source of the service sources and a service sources and a service source of the service sources and a
		n () e précommendation de la company de l La company de la company de
		FACTS
23		bis PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS with this
	Courton on'	; Lines 15-20, Petitioner effectively precluded two
	judges from Ruling on this Tilin	q, citing Rules of Indicial Conduct, Rule Si. One
26		Page 1 of 8
14		a construit and and and a construction of the second second second second second second second second second se

•	
1	of these judges; Judge exceeded her outhority and Dismissed
2	Petitioner's Hebezs Corpus action on 1 , in violetion of multiple Rules
3	within Rule 81-having total disregard for the statutes her Dath of Office also
4	represents -both at state and Federal levels and constitutional provisions.
5	
6	MEMORANDUM AND POINTS OF AUTHORITY
1	Judge appears to act in contempt of the very laws she
8	has taken an Oath of office to uphold, THEREFORE, her actions
9	hereby violate the following:
10	1. Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct, Rule 81:
11	a. Preamble - impropriety
12	b. Rule 1.1. Compliance with the Law
13	A. Judge has violated numerous sections of "this" Code, as
14-	well as the following
15	c. Rule 1.2. Promoting Confidence in the Judiciary
16	A. has totally lost confidence in the
17	judiciary of STATE OF ARIZONA, and its appelote
18	courts, due to failure to comply with A.R.S.'s.
19	d. Rule 2.2. Impartiality and Fairness
20	A. Failure to uphold and apply the written law, causing this
21	innocent man "tort" injuries - that daily continue.
22	e. Rule 2.3, Bras, Prejudice, and Harassment - 91 (A) and (B)
23	A. Judge has Ruled in this matter with bras and prejudice
24	this map CANNOT receive a fair Ruling From this prejudiced
25	judge.
26	Page 2 of 8

- 1

Sec. 2004

-

-

Bardel Charles

-

f. Rule 2.4. External Influences on Judicial Conduct - 91(B) A. believes Judge is financially 2 compromised, as well as other "hidden interests "this" Court 3 refuses to recognize, and her conduct and judgment in this metter has been compromised - plus it is likely she has 5 already read of allegations against her, by me. 6 g. Rule 2.6. Ensuring the Right to Be Heard - 91 (A) .7. , absolutdy had a " 8 A. I in being heard-due to numerous violations of lew 9 perpetrated against his person. By filing the Dismissal 10 against his person - this action is " i of a 11 violation of this Rule. 12 h. Rule 2.7. Responsibility to Decide 13 would normally been able to decide, but she has 14 A. Judge been effectively disgualified; pursuant to Rule 2.11. 15 i. Rule 2.11. Disguellification - 91 (A)(1) 16 A. Judge MUST be aware of 17 numerous motions he has filed into this Court, and should equally be 18 aware of his " 19 Filed This dispute has been heard in 20 but 21 has filed his " However, 22 into the l Court, 23 continuing to make issue of the Dismissed Rule 32 24 action by her, in this Court. has been prejudiced. ZS Page 3 of 8 26

х. «Х т	
1	j. Rule 2.11. Disgualification - 91(A)(2)(a), (c)
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	continue to fail in his proceedings in this
7	Court - therefore he is unable to receive a fair and
8	equitable decision from this judge.
9	8. Judge has failed to comply with her:
10	a. A.R.S. 38-231. Oath of office
11	A. Inclusive of Arizona Revised Statutes, found within the
12	Constitution of the State of Arizona, 25 Follows:
13	i. A.R.S. Const. Art. 25 3. Supreme Law of the land
14	11. A.R.S. Const. Art. 254. Due process of law
15	iii. AR.S. Const. Art. 297. Oaths and affirmations
16	iv. A.R.S. Const. Art. 2514. Habeas corpus
	V. A.R.S. Const. Art. 2524. Rights of accused in
18	criminal prosecutions
19	vi. A.R.S. Const. Art. 2531. Damages for death or
21>	personal injuries
21	
22	mandetory
23	viii. A.R.S. Const. Art. 2533. Reservation of rights
24	ix. A.R.S. Const. Art. 2536. Preferential treatment or
25	discrimination prohibited; exceptions; definition
26	Page 4 of 8
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

!

•	
• • •	
ι, « λ	· ·
	x. A.R.S. Const. Act. 6 & 26. Oath of Office
2	xi. A.R.S. Const. Art. 6.1 g 2. Disquelification of judge
3	A. Charges against Judge and
4	are meluded in
5	befor the
6	Court - THEREFORE, pursuant to ".
7	Arizona Constitutional provision; should not Judge
8	be "
9	<u>`?</u>
10	xii. A.R.S. Const. Brt. 12.54. County officers; duties, powers,
11	and qualifications, salaries
12	A. Judge has exceeded her dutics, power and
13	authority granted by Arizona Revised Statutes,
	inclusive of Arizona Constitution,
15	Right of Due Process, enumerated violations that
16	precede and follow this statement.
17	b. Federal Laws, under U.S.C.A.:
38	i. U.S.C.A. Const. Art. 1 59. Priviledge of Writ of Habeas Corpus
19	shall not be suspended - clause
20	ii. U.S.C. A. Const. Art. G. Supremacy clause
	III. U.S.C.A. Const. Amend 1. Right to Petition For a redress
22	of grievence - Judge denied this right by Dismissal.
23	iv. U.S.C.A. Const. Amend 5. Due Process clause violated.
24	V. U.S.C.A. Const. Amend 14. Due Process clause violated.
85	Vi. U.S.C.A. Const Amend. 14. Equal Protection of law clause.
24	Page 5 of 8

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.

	Comp ()
	18-189
I	
<u>8</u>	
9 10	SPECIAL ACTION FOR VIOLATION OF
11	SPEEDY DECISION-AR.S. CONST. ART. 6521 BY SUPERIOR COURT
12	
	Come now, Betitioner in fact, brings this
15	Special Action before this Court for a response, for thwith.
. 16	
- 17	JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT
18	The Superior Court; in , has failed to file a Response to
	Petitioner's MOTION FOR GRAND JURY TRANSCRIPT, Filed
20	according to I.L.S. stamp on Petitioner's motion. (See APPENDIX A)
	Pursuant to A.R.S. Coast. Art. 9 581. Superior court; speedy decisions.
22	this Court has jurisdiction, Special Actions, Rule 7 (6).
23	
24	STATEMENT OF ISSUES
25	1. The Superior Court failed to file 2 " to Petitioner's
26	Page t of 8

1	"-has not received a Response
2	within the GO day requirement -violating Petitioner's Due Process Rights,
	additionally causing prejudice for Petitioner's "
4	"Filed with the Court, because this
5	Petitioner was unable to attach as an Appendix/Exhibit something the
6	Court failed to grant by no Response.
7	2. Petitioner, while incorcerated in , has been
8	attempting to obtain Arizona Revised Statutes governing the
9	filing of a Special Artion, from Inmate Legal Services, but
10	have been repeatedly met with deniels.
11	3. Petitioner has a constitutional right guaranteed of Due Process
12	of Low to obtain these A.R.S.'s, also this right guaranteed
13	under Freedom of Information Act - therefore, Petitioner
14	has a " against
t5	4. Due to the preceding issues, Petitioner makes claim to a
16	" against the Respondent. Issues raised.
17	
18	1. Petitioner filed his "
20	Superior Court to provide him with the Transcript.
· · ·	2. The Superior Court has failed to file any form of Response to
<u> </u>	this motion, violating Arizona's Constitution and Due Process. 3. Petitioner needed to make this Transcript to be part of his
23	" but is now unable to
24	attach as an Exhibit/Appendix to make his argument in the
25	Billeen as an Exhibit / Appendix ib MARE his cigoment is ing Page 2 of 8
26	VEGE EQ. 2
any and the state of the state	

United States Supreme Court. 4. Petitioner has been prejudiced in his Petition due to his inability to argue the points in the Grand Jury Transcript. 5. This also is a " 6. This also gives Petitioner a " "of injury, due to Rules of Sup. Ct. Rule 14.2, stating that Petitioner will be unable to amend his Petition, Chamed in has 8 continually renied this Petitioner from obtaining the Arizona 3 Revised Statutes governing proper Filing of this action into this 10 Court, in Inmate Legal Services. Petitioner has also Filed an 11 to obtain redress. The following 12 Officers are now involved in this denial: 13 a. Badge (Name NOT disclosed) 14 b. Badge (Name NOT disclosed) 15 c. Bedge 14 d. Badge (Name NOT Alsolosal) 17 is purposely intentionally denying this Petitioner his 18 8 Due Access Rights to obtain and examine A.B.S. so he can 19 " Special Action, while incarcerated. File ". 20 actions also come under " 21 9. 1 has also denied Petitioner's Rights under the 22 10. -a treaty. 23 1. has NOT addressed Patritioner's Grievance, but only 24 11. continues to deny him access to A.R.S.'s. 25 Page 3 of 8 26

• • •	
1.1	ARGUMENT WITH CONTENTIONS
2	1. Petitioner believes Court was required to comply with
3	A.R.S. Const. Art. 6521. court; speedy decisions, but
4	it did not. This constitutional statute violated Petitioner's
5	Right to a speedy decision - creating for Petitioner, what is
6	now a violation of Due Process, causing prejudicial injurg
2.	to his Court Petition for Writ of Certioneri,
8	creating a " claim-which is a
9	; that is NOT harmless error, due te
10	Court, Rule 14.2., denying . filing from any amendment(s).
11	a. A.R.S. Const. Art. 6 5 21. Speedy decisions
12	b. A.R.S. Const. Art. 254. Due Process of Law
13	C. U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 5. Due Process clause
14	d. U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 14. Due Process clause
15	e. U.S.C.A. Rules Sup. Ct. Rule 14.2
. 16	F. Tort trespass of Law (U.S.C.A.)
17	9. Colorable Claim (U.S.C.A.)
18	
. 19	
20	A. State V. Spreitz, 202 Ariz1, 39 P.3d 525 (2002) citing State
21	V. Watton, 164 Ariz at 328, 793 P.2d at \$5, citing State V.
23	8.
24	
25	Supple able 111 120 E2d 1190
24	
······	

La contra c	
	e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e
	1194 (9th Cir. 1980).
	h. Cone v. Bell, 129 S. Ct. 1969, 1783 (2009)
2	i. U.S.V. Bagley, 473 U.S. 667 (1985)
4	j. Brzdy v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83(1963)
5	A. " supports Petitioners contentions that had
6	the Grand Jury Transcript had been granted to this
. 7	Petitioner for his Court filing - believes
8	he would be granted Retrief.
g	1. This Petitioner herein preserves his Right to
10	again raise this issue - preserving this issue
11	to raise in the Court,
12	because this inaction by Respondent has had
. 13	"effect to <u>Court.</u>
14	K. Petitioner has been Prejudicially injured by Respondent.
15	2. Petitioner has been denied-knowingly intentionally of A.B.S.
16	Statutes governing the filling of Special Actions, by Inmate
17	Legel Services (1.L.S.) of
18	in hese actions
19	are a Denial of Due Process and Obstruction of Justice
20	against this inmate.
21	a. Spe Appendix B. Petitioner requested Special
22_	Action Statutes-was DENIED.
23	b. See Appendix C. , Prtitioner requested Special
24	Action Statutes - 2ND Request - Was DENIED.
25	C. See Appendix D. <u>Petitioner requested I.L.S.</u>
2.6	Page 5 of 8

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.