State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 18-224
Judge:	
Complainant:	

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge lied in an evidentiary ruling to cover up prosecutorial misconduct and made erroneous evidentiary rulings.

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 officer 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 Anna Mary Glaab did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: November 14, 2018

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on November 14, 2018.

Comp

2018-224

JUDICIAL COMPLAINT

Against

l.

t	>	NO:		
Complainant,	}			
VS.	<u> </u>		!	
) :	; }	:	**************************************	
Accused.	;	;	}	!

Ţ	I	I TRANSCRIPTS CAN BE			
OBTAINED:					
, , , , , ,	-	ł			
	•		,		
THESE TRANSCRIPT	S ARE T	HE EVII	DENCE TO PROVE OR		
DISPROVE THESE CI	AIMS.				

l am	and I appeared before	in the case of	
This case	was assigned to as my original	: judge had .	Judge

took over the case in	and	it. The	in	unanimously
ruling and ordere	ed an	;	1	,
This complaint is about wh	at occurred at the	=	1	1
fraudulent and		ruling not to	order the pre	paration of the
so as to cover	up intentiona	l lies that	nade in her ne	w ruling to once
again case.				
Judge entire beha	avior in this case s	hows incompet	ence, unethic	al behavior, bias
and/or corruption.				
) has filed r	equests with the	court,	, for	the preparation
of the evidentiary hearing transc	ripts, all were	or	. als	o filed a
action with :	hov	vever, jurisdicti	on was denied	i.
Judge first falsely cl	aimed the reques	t for transcripts	was : !	communications
(Exhibit A), which is bewildering	how a motion sei	nt to the	with a	; to
opposing party is . Judge	in the fir	al motion	it by simpl	y saying, "
' (Exhibit B).				
is an indigent	: whose	consists o	of claims,	all involving the
testimony and evidence that took	c place in this evic	lentiary hearing	g – how is this	not good cause
for transcripts to be prepared?				
Without these transcripts	the cou	rt could not ma	ke a proper	· review or
fairly review this case in any man	ner. These transc	ripts are the ke	y to :	f i. Thank
God for Court Judges		who	Judge	ruling and
ordered the preparation of thes	e 1 (<u>Ext</u>	nibit C). A copy	of these	are not
provided as they are long, but will be if requested by this body.				
is aware that cour	ts do not appreci	ate it when a pa	arty disparage	s a fellow judge,
but when the judge is incompeten	t, unethical, bias a	and/or corrupt -	-an exception	should be made
so that higher Courts can view			-	
decisions were made by the lower			-	•
doubt.	•	-		

Judge	a	• •	before beco	ming a judge ar	nd who has a
reputation am	ong	as not being	a fair arbitrator	of the facts, inte	entionally lied
and mis-lead v	what occurred at	the evidentiary hea	aring to justify a	n illegal ruling.	either did
this because	is incompetent	t, or, to cover up for	the criminal act	s of	
when hid	evidence and lie	ed to the court al	out it which w	ould have	;
innocence, or,	maybe judge	is being paid o	off by the alleged	i victim, the	
Corp	poration, to susta	ain this conviction	because if it is o	over turned the	re could be a
massive lawsu	it as a	: committed	l at the t	rial on behalf of	the ,
What o	ther explanation	could there be for	a judge to blata	ntly lie as to wha	at occurred at
the evidentiar	y and ti	nen to try to cover	it up by not a	llowing the tran	nscripts to be
transcribed ar	nd provided to the	ne :	or any party for	them to review	w? Now in all
fairness it cou	ıld only be incor	mpetence as Judge	current	ly has approxin	nately
1	cases that are	, either	,	or ;	the :
court believes	out of decision	ons of are wro	ng.		
<u>EXHIBI</u>	<u>T.D</u> - Judge	dismis	ssal order & ame	nded dismissal	order.
<u>EXHIBI</u>	<u>re</u> - :	remand	ed order.		
<u>EXHIBI</u>	<u> </u>	1	dismissal orde	r .	
The fol	llowing are a list	of the numerous e	rrors in Judge	: ruling an	d the reasons
why does	not wish the tr	anscripts to come	to light and exp	ose actions	by means of
becoming par	t of the record,	as the only way to	refute rulin	g is by means o	of the hearing
transcripts.					
1) basis for to justify	•	g up testimony & e l ignoring testimon . This was wrong	y & evidence th	at was presente	_
a)	This Cou	rt's first false fact ru	ıling (Top of Pg.	3) states:	
the current his	documents h	icknowledged at the le discovered in the ere actually duplicate	i s of the exhibits h		however, attached to his d as exhibits to

Neither	nor	made this	statement	l it was created up wh	olly in the
head of Judge	. Judge	flat out lied abo	out :	making this statement.	There was
no testimony or ev	idence prese	nted what so ever i	n the	that supports this sta	atement, it
was only a theory o	of the	. The only reaso	n Judge	became aware of	this theory
was because of the	lie by	in his	closing argu	uments at	; -
The n	ever present	ed any witnesses t	o corrobor	ate any theory or to su	apport any
exhibits, nor was th	is issue even	brought up during l	hearing. The	en in closing Statement	s, after the
rested,	•	said that no		were in the ca	se file and
claimed that as an	'	it should	be believe	d and accepted. This is	clearly an
abuse of discretion	and manifes	stly unjust, not to m	nention a fa	alse statement by	. He lied
and the accep	oted his asser	rtion as evidence, ar	nd put this	statement falsely on	so as
to claim an	to sup	port a bad ruling.	e did t	his without allowing	an
opportunity to cro	ss examine	or to	ı the	e case file into eviden	ce. Not to
mention that closin	g arguments	are not evidence.			
· act	ually testified	l that he obtained t	these docu	ments from the	
file and they were	not attached	to his previous	, they were	e wholly independent d	ocuments.
And that these doc	uments in	case file j	prove that t	the hid and failed	to disclose
b) This Cou	rt's second fal	se fact ruling (Top of	Pg. 3) states	s:	
		evidence that the fore he supplied the r		possession of the attachment to	: at : for
This statem	ent is contra	ry to		-J	-
offe	red the follow	wing evidence and t	he ne	ver denied or refuted an	y of it.
• At the	case logs are v		nitted the	g and he wrote or	
	"Called	Talked to about	19	office	

- Exhibit F— Submitted the testimony, under oath in testifying that he had possession of these and various business to trial and that he handed them to r.
- Exhibit J submitted a formerly undisclosed supplemental showing that turned over to these and various prior to trial.

These documents are evidence and they do clearly support is claim that the : had possession of these prior to trial. How could court miss this? As a matter of fact, this is the exact same conclusion/language which the Court used to deny original which by this Court Exhibit D). Court just regurgitated 1 : original dismissal. was c) This third false fact ruling states: The Court also falsely claimed that that his plea agreement would have been a if he accepted it. / was that the plea agreement which the introduced at the evidentiary hearing was a fraudulent document, not that it would have been fraud for him to accept. court erred by intentionally ξ which it relied upon for its ruling

introduced a copy of a The during evidentiary hearing without any authentication that it was the related to the newly discovered offer letter. This unsubstantiated document listed ⊧of priors and said the was conditioned upon it being true. in fact other priors not listed in document. However, testified that the document was fraudulent as it did not have it: it said " instead of "- : į. ". No one from the testified that it was the in question or authenticated the document in any way. It was a fraudulent document created specifically for the and the court by ate it up hook line and sinker and used this document solely to dismiss claim (. Another made up lie by Judge

2) The court erred as of the evidence standard was wrong and manifestly unjust, an abuse of discretion, and clearly erroneous.

<u>Preponderance Standard definition</u>: The greater weight of the evidence, in merit and in worth. (2) Sufficient evidence to overcome doubt or speculation.

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.