## State of Arizona

## COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 18-333
Judge:	
Complainant:	

## **ORDER**

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

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 Gus Aragón did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: February 20, 2019

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 20, 2019.

1	State of Arizona	Comp
2	Commission on Judicial Conduct	2018-333
3	1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229.	
4	Phoenix, Anzona 85007	
. 5		
6	COMPLATATE AGATAST	A JUDIOF
7	1091	
8	Nome: Judges	Nome
9	Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of H	
10	complaint. Describe in your own words what you belie	Se the molecular and that
11	constitutes judicial misconduct be specific and	list all the names dates
12	times, and places that will help the romanission and	orstend wair inning
13	. Additional pages may be attached along with co	nies (not arginals) of
14	relevant court documents. Please complete one sic	Le of the paper only and
15	Keep a copy of the complaint for your records.	water the paper only juice
16		
17	On the loy of I was stripped	of my right to equal
18	protection of not having juriors of my peer. My tr	ial court has manu
19	unfair unconstitutional conduct within the proc	roodings. This issue folls
20	under the violation though Tama	and not
21	one jurior was in my jury nor giving me the	
22	my perisatal.	
23	Second, durning hearings Life motion for deposit	en res
24		et for deposition to be
25	full and effectively cross examined due to her inconsistar	it testimony to police and
26	preliminary. Trial hidge allowed her perjured testing	nony to be read without
27	my defense alterney's and	full and effectively
28	cross examing hir Vidating my confrontation claused	endmyright to comfoot
29	· witnesses. This also folls under due process violation	S and sixth Amendment
30	violation as well.	
31 32	Third this was - cuplability ca	se which the judge
32	I granted when my defense showed proof within eve	clence collected but

consistantly allowed the of the Prosecuter		nean unfair			1134
at the leased the This isn't a for	. •				A tion
my constitutional righ	te had have	violated of	eina conth	ma libe	rfu.
the courts in tegrity.	1311851161	T VECTORICA OF	9		- 5
na sor is in agin in				-	,
	<del></del>				
				±	
	×	<del></del>			
	0.0	CNOWIGOE	50 PG	FURS MS	<u>-</u> -
		DAY OF	000	- V	
	<del></del>			······································	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
		,	-		
		-			
				,	
	-	,			
				. ,	