State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 18-236 Judge: Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge failed to appoint him an attorney for several years and made delayed rulings in his case.

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.

After review, 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 members George H. Foster, Jr., Diane M. Johnsen and J. Tyrrell Taber did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: November 7, 2018

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on November 7, 2018.

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:	747
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.

See Attachment.		

_	
	Judge was the Judge of County
-44	Superior Court in and as such was mandated by law
	to appoint Complaintant counsel" "after Complaintant
	to appoint Complaintant counsel" , "after Complaintant filed his NOTICE of P.C.R. Rule 32" ". Rule 32.4 ccxcs)(.
	version). Judge was derelict in his duty causing Complaintant
	to go over , without counsel & Due Process and
	forcing Complaintant to file his P.C.R. petition pro se on
	- after Complaintant Sent
	Judge a letter requesting counsel that Judge ignored.
	Since filing the P.C.R. Judge has been in direct violation
	of Ariz. Const. art. II & 21& R.S.C. Rule 91 by ignoring and not
	ruling on over , defense motions,
	Judge has therefore committed perjury every time he
	has signed to receive pay attesting that he has no motions
-	outstanding for more than sixty (60) days.
	Judge is using the powers of his office under color of
	State law to delay the P.C.R. because he must rule in Complaintant's
	favor, and as such a ruling will negatively affect Judge
	bid for re-election.
	Rules of the Supreme Court Rule 81 (Version)
	Cannon I
	Judge unlawful use of the powers of his office to
	conceal his dereliction of duty obviates both the "
	&". "of the Judiciary.
	Judge complete lack of ", ",
	"I. Commentary]
.	

	is self-evident and established factually through his
	dereliction of duty and his current unlawful, extra-judicial, and
_	ultra vires acts to conceal the dereliction of duty.
	Judge "
	"[Commentary] &
	for his own future pecuniary gain at the cost of unlawfully
	retaining an innocent man in prison (Complaintant) and the cost
	of the "of the whole of Arizona's judiciary; Since Judge "[Commentary.] is based
	Since Judge "[Commentary.] is based
	solely on preventing the body politic from discovering Judge
	previous dereliction of duty that caused an innocent
	man to remain unlawfully incorcerated for almost a decade as
	such a discovery would cost Judge any possibility
	of being re-elected. Cannon Z
-	Cannon L
	A. Judge dereliction of duty in directly violated
	Arizona Law (Rule 32.4(c)x2) and his current dereliction of duty
	directly violates art. VI \$21, R.S.C. Rule 91, A.R.S. \$\$ 13-2702, et seq.,
	and other laws.
	B. Judge is allowing"
-	
	Judge "
	" [Cannon ZA Commentary] are self-evident by the P.C.R.
	record."
	"E Cannon
-	ZB Commentary 1 this obviously includes unlawfully retaining an

-4-

100000	
	innocent man in prison to prevent the body politic from discovering
	the truth concerning Judge abject & repetative
	intentional dereliction of duty.
	"[Id.]
	Judge is obviously exploiting his office to prevent the body
	politic from discovering the truth about him and his other exploits.
	Cannon 3
	A. Judge is placing his" "far below his
	personal re-election duties.
	B. (1) Judge has refused to properly adjudicate
	Complaintant's case because it will negatively effect Judge
	bid for re-election.
The same of	(z) Judge is not being" "as" "in
	Arizona requires Judge to dispose of matters within 60
	days (art. VI \$21, R.S.C. Rule 91), and federal law as determined
	by the United States Supreme Court in Strunk v. U.S., 412 U.S. 430,
	436,440 (1973) Commands that Judge exonerate &
	release Complaintant.
The second second	(3) Judge has allowed the prosecutor to repeatedly"
	"(A.R.S. 339-161) into the Court
0/000000000	without sanctions, as a means to continue the matter past the
Contract of	mid-term election.
	(5) Judge has made his bias a prejudice against
	Complaintant obvious, as evidenced by all of his decisions
	in this matter, all of which are contrary to law and favor the
	State while depriving Complaintant of his substantive rights.

(4R7) Judge refused to allow Complaintant to speak or make an Offer of Proof in the Status Conference () and ordered Complaintant to remain belly chained so Complaintant could not access his notes and legal materials as a pro se litigant. Judge has had ex-parte communications with the prosecutor-as evidenced by the dates & verbiage in Court & State Filings. (8) Judge is intentionally delaying the Order to exonerate & release Complaintant until ofter the election. (9) Judge is unlawfully using the powers of his office to prevent the discovery of his of dereliction of duty. C. (1) Judge refuses to diligently discharge his administrative duties (art. VI & 21, R.S.C. Rule 91) (3) Judge (3) Judge (Rule 32.4(c)(z)) is mandated by law (of appointing counsel E. (1) Judge refuses to disqualify himself from the matter even though his complete lack of impartiality is self-evident a he has a financial interest in the form of future pecuniary gain from being re-elected. See esp. E(1)(e)(iaii) Judge should cease using the powers of his office to commit current acts of descliction of duty to conceal his previous acts of dereliction of duty from other Judicial Candidates. NOTE 1: This Review Board should note that the continuing delay

of this matter after the filing of the P.C.R. was based on Judge

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.