

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 06-254

Complainant: No. 1079110270A

Judge: No. 1079110270B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge.

The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Dated: November 2, 2006.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on November 2, 2006.

This order may not be used as a basis for disqualification of a judge.

Sept 28, 2006

1 of 10

OCT 02 2006

Commission on
Judicial Conduct
1501 W. Washington
Suite 229
Phoenix, AZ 85007

CJC-06-254

RE:

[Redacted]

Dear Commission:

During [Redacted] while still
only a practicing civil attorney in [Redacted]
Arizona, and an indigent-court ap-
pointed attorney for [Redacted] Superior
Court, [Redacted] became involved
as an "Victims Rights representative for a
criminal case [Redacted] connected
to the alleged molestation of then [Redacted]
year-old [Redacted]
who became a [Redacted] this month
Sept. 2006.

In [Redacted] Attorney [Redacted]
[Redacted] became a "Victims Rights Repre
sentative to [Redacted]

[Redacted] An older cousin of
the alleged victim in

Sept 28, 2006

2 of 10

CJC-06-254

the first case [redacted] County
criminal case [redacted] involved [redacted]
different families in [redacted]

In [redacted] case [redacted] in
[redacted] has himself become a convicted
sexual felon currently under custody
of The Arizona Department of Cor-
rections.

Question?

If former [redacted] Attorney,
[redacted] represented [redacted]
[redacted] as his Victims Rights Repre-
sentative in [redacted] when
[redacted] claimed he had been a molesta-
tion victim as a [redacted] in
[redacted] Should the Honorable [redacted]
[redacted] not have recused herself
in [redacted] when [redacted]
[redacted] himself became accused of
molestation of several female teen-
age victims. Was there not a "conflict
of interest"? Judge [redacted] presided
over [redacted] criminal proceedings.

Sept 28, 2006

3 of 10

CJC-06-254

and had initially sentenced [redacted] to a term of probation, which [redacted] quickly violated.

During [redacted] Attorney [redacted] had represented [redacted] in a child-custody dispute over [redacted] with his biological mother [redacted]

[redacted] had never married and had lived together only shortly, so the minor [redacted] had never known an ordered family life with his parents.

As a adult, [redacted] had also never lived by himself, and chose to live with his parents [redacted]

In [redacted] Arizona, [redacted] had also been previously married to another woman and had fathered a female child now in her [redacted]

Two/or on [redacted] [redacted] connected with her mother [redacted] (now deceased) and contacted then CPS child protective service worker [redacted] A2 [redacted] to report a suspected molestation of [redacted]

CJC-06-254

[redacted]

[redacted] had had previous contact with CPS when they had reported [redacted] husband and [redacted] father to CPS for his alleged molestation of a [redacted] now approximately [redacted] years of age.

On [redacted] called [redacted] CPS worker [redacted] at his office and requested his assistance at her residence. She called by phone and CPS [redacted] referred her to the [redacted] Police Department; but [redacted] was undeterred. She called a 2nd time insisting that [redacted] respond telling [redacted] intended to kill the alleged perpetrator [redacted] a [redacted] AZ resident.

CPS [redacted] quickly called [redacted] Police Detective [redacted] and both men quickly responded to the residence of [redacted]

Sept. 26, 2006

5 of 10

CJC-06-254

It was later determined that [redacted] had not consulted with her own son [redacted] [redacted] About the suspected molestation of [redacted] neither had [redacted] consulted with [redacted] About her initial molestation story.

On [redacted] CPS [redacted] and [redacted] Detective [redacted] began a 40-45 minute interview/interrogation of [redacted]

Ironically, [redacted] and [redacted] [redacted] allowed [redacted] The Accuser [redacted] to participate in the questioning. During the interview [redacted] actually accuses the young child of lying, when she had actually coached the boy into his story and fabricated her molestation accusations.

The [redacted] interview resulted into a [redacted] search warrant served on Defendant [redacted] at his residence [redacted]

Sept 26, 2006

6 of 10

CJC-06-254

[redacted] molestation case [redacted]

was scheduled to go to trial before

[redacted] molestation case [redacted]

but in [redacted] attorney

[redacted] convinced them [redacted]

Superior Court Judge [redacted]

to reverse the order of trials, so

Judge [redacted] schedule [redacted]

to go to trial in [redacted]

The [redacted] criminal trial resulted
in a mistrial so Judge [redacted] scheduled
a 2nd trial for [redacted]

then court appointed [redacted]

[redacted] haphazardly convinced
defendant [redacted] to opt for

An Alford Plea in [redacted] with

A stipulation that [redacted] be

dismissed with prejudice.

Just Recently [redacted] has

contacted the Arizona State Bar to

Report Attorney [redacted] for

withholding exculpatory evidence from him

in order for him to opt for the Alford

plea.

Sept 21st 2006

7 of 10

CJC-06-254

In a [redacted] issue of

[redacted] Newspaper [redacted]
[redacted] Attorney Revealed to
[redacted] Residents that he most
likely would have lost [redacted]
because [redacted]

would most likely would not have
been able to testify at [redacted]
[redacted] trial. Only to rebut
any defendant's testimony.

[redacted] Allegations would have
have been considered only hearsay.

On [redacted]
statements did nothing to implicate
[redacted] in any crime.

[redacted] and [redacted]
lived in two towns [redacted]
and no connection between the two
was ever made by the [redacted] Police
Department.

[redacted] has received direct
confirmation from [redacted]

Sept 26, 2006

8 of 10

CJC-06-254

[redacted] AZ Dept of Economic
Security, [redacted]

[redacted] That Child Protective Service
Workers [redacted] never filed a
Report with his agency.

So on [redacted] CPS [redacted]
was acting under "color of law" His
interview with [redacted] was
unlawful and contrary to established
interview of established "child
witness" techniques.

When [redacted] Attorney [redacted]
became the Honorable Judge of [redacted]
Court, Superior Court, she appointed
CPS [redacted] to a Chief Probation
Officer after she had "fired" or
terminated - then Chief Probation Officer
[redacted] for "misconduct" for having
a alleged e-mail romance with an
convicted felon using her office
computer.

to defendant's knowledge no other
person other than CPS [redacted]
was considered for the position, and

Sept 26, 2006

9 of 10

CJC-06-254

According to a recent communication from
[redacted] County Board
of Supervisors [redacted]
No one can question Judge [redacted]
[redacted] Appointments.

In [redacted] CPS [redacted] was
named as a caseworker for [redacted]

CPS is an agency that deals with
child and minors; NOT ADULTS

[redacted] fabricated his molesta-
tion as did [redacted] did with

Judge [redacted] and her
Chief Probation Officer [redacted]
[redacted] are now material witnesses
in both [redacted]

and these cases cannot be solved
unless the Commission of Judicial
Conduct will agree to conduct an
investigation in cooperation with
Judge [redacted]

Sept 20, 2006

10 of 10

CJC-06-254

[redacted] Attorney and [redacted]
Superior Court Judge [redacted]
and CPS worker [redacted] became
inadvertently, through no direct actions
of their own, became victims also
to the fabrications and lies of
[redacted]

But the minor [redacted]
[redacted] is a true victim of molesta-
tion but the actual perpetrator is
actually his own [redacted]
[redacted]

Will the Commission of Judicial Conduct
please agree to contact Judge [redacted]

Respectfully,

[redacted]