### State of Arizona

# COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 18-340			
Judge:				
Complainant:				

### **ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court judge was biased against him and made improper evidentiary rulings 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 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 27, 2019

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 27, 2019.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2018-340

# CONFIDENTIAL Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct 1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

of the complaint for your records.

## COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

HALINO			Desarba	in VOUE OWD	words
Instructions: Ike this form	or plain paper of the same size	e to file a col	mplaint Describe	the names	dates.
what you believe the infra	or plain paper of the same standard did that constitutes judicial mis	sconduct. Be spe	ecific and list all d	Big Harriso,	along
What you believe the judge	did that constitutes judicial mis elp the commission understand	your concerns.	Additional pages n	nay be allacted	3 (100)
times, and places that will in	elp the commission understand relevant court documents. Plea	ese complete one	e side of the paper	outy, and keep	ر ښه
with copies (not onginas) o	TORNATION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE				

Judge's Name:

ny lawyer filed + motion for (L) from tetrages has opinions The state did not rept to mation, the Judge Changed my Whole motion into a lile hering which was not the case! The Tudge then said we were allowed to other Problems from Representative or well as Det: and hear my/De and hear my bekense testitled then ! States expect Agent Exput I petitioner was prepared to cross-examine the Judge and issue A discovery issue and give the redirected ur later the did hand he used the discourse inves had state a the we hought we was gonera continue the the Hearing so me to Defense und cour examine the States expect and the courts / Judge made a preliminary ruling designing Pet, framens protion to reconsider testimony. Then I filed motion to reconsider has been nothing but in face and the Jidge denied! Tidge while care-since takin aver lose in of state! He plans to state to duchat she wants appears her to pass Count onder deading - I was in be precluded cons but allowed the major that was made than the cores which is against rules his totally Bias and bes whetever the state allows! I have in) complaint is neverted properly and you see all the violations her committed! Thank you respectfully 2