

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 06-270

---

Complainant: No. 1296910673A

Judge: No. 1296910673B

---

**ORDER**

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no misconduct on the part of the judge. The question of jurisdiction is a legal determination. The commission is not an appellate court and cannot change a judge's decisions; therefore, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Dated: December 27, 2006.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on December 27, 2006.

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

Re: State's motion to strike Amicus Curiae Brief

Dear Honorable

Plaintiff's, motion to strike goes against my Const. rights to a determination of probable cause, to confront, cross-examine, compel the attendance of witnesses, to "PRESENT EVIDENCE in my OWN behalf.". (see paragraph 5, exhibit (a)

Amicus Curiae, (Friend of the Court) motion was filed by

The accused does not have access to the court pro per, since he was appointed ineffective counsel; by the court.

Page 1 of 5

CJC-06-270

Pursuant to A.R.C. P. rule 16.1(b) Jurisdiction can be challenged at any time.

This accused is exercising the doctrine of laches: Those who are vigilant to their rights have them. (challenge subject matter jurisdiction)

On [redacted] [redacted] acting on behalf of Plaintiff, filed motion for Rule 609, to impeach accused "for the purposes of impeachment...through public record..." (see exhibit (b) page 2)

The accused submits Amicus Curiae brief and Affidavit being notarized and filed with clerk of the court are public record. (see in public record, filed [redacted])

The accused's Constitutional right to present evidence in his own behalf and Challenge Subject matter jurisdiction, far out weigh Plaintiff's [redacted] motion to strike

In closing since Subject Matter Jurisdiction has been challenged and Plaintiff has failed to rebut Amicus Curiae brief/Affidavit of

CJC-06-270

Subject Matter Jurisdiction, point by point any motion filed by Plaintiff is moot and in a clear absence of all Jurisdiction.

"Where there is absence of proof of Jurisdiction, all administrative and judicial proceedings are a nullity."

Thompson v. Tolmie, 27 U.S. 157, 2 Pet 157, 1829 WL 3177 (U.S. Dist. C

7 L. Ed. 381

Griffith v. Frazier, 8 Cr. 9, 3 L. Ed. 471, Dassinger v. Oden, 124 Ariz. 551, 606 P.2d 41 (App. Div. 1 1979)

[redacted] Commissioner [redacted] forwarded Amicus Curiae brief to Honorable [redacted] Accused challenged Subject Matter Jurisdiction which [redacted], under the color of law, ignored challenge.

The accused claims [redacted] in collusion <sup>FBI</sup> with [redacted], acted as cockeyed Marionette, <sup>FBI</sup> stooge or malicious or incompetent of her Judicial duties. In violation of U.S. Const. amendments 1, 5, 6, 8 and 14 and Az. Const. art. 6, 2 § 2, 3 and 4

Pursuant to A.B.A. standards and Judicial Canons Judges in particular should be reminded of their obligation to report unethical conduct to the disciplinary agencies. Under [Canon 3(D)(1) and (2)] of the ABA Model Code of Judicial Conduct,

Page 3 of 5

CJC-06-270

a judge [who receives information indicating a substantial likelihood that another judge or a lawyer has violated the applicable rules of professional conduct] is obligated to [take appropriate action.

Respectfully Submitted this 16<sup>th</sup> day  
of October, 2006

