State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 18-384

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge improperly denied his request for a new attorney.

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).

Dated: April 18, 2019

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on April 18, 2019.

CONFIDENTIAL

Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct 1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2018-384

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name:

Judge's Name:

Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

The detendant told advised the Judge of the nesksont duty of the free Court provided Counsel, the Judge witnessed the tenssion between the free Council & defendent and concerted with (See the , an Motion to Midity release conditions) The defindant advised the Judge that there is substantial evidera that needs to be discussed for dismissed of by Council & not pro-per, that has never been argued correctly , the Judge knows exactly what the defendent is specking of result's , perjury on blood , al new photograph tompering evidence listed in the Change of Consel petition. For any Judge to denie a review of new tompored evidence is a evidention hearing, or to not request the free neglegent Canal Why they didn't present this subject is criminal. See Cary of declaration attached. Thank you