

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 06-274

Complainant: No. 1296810531A

Judge: No. 1296810531B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no evidence of any ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Dated: December 4, 2006.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on December 4, 2006.

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

State of Arizona
Commission on Judicial Conduct
1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

CJC-06-274

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name:

Judge's name:

Date: Oct. 23, 2006

Instructions: Describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes misconduct. Please provide all of the important names, dates, times and places related to your complaint. You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to explain your complaint, and you may attach additional pages. Do not write on the back of any page. You may attach copies of any documents you believe will help us understand your complaint.

Nearly a month has passed since I recieved the Complaint Form I requested from your Commission I have taken the intervening time to try putting the 'process' flow of my Industrial Commission Claim into a just and lawful prospective. That has been a difficult task, given the basic concept of the "Powers-That-Be" are assumed Right, and I must challenge and be thwarted at every instance to prove: I am right, truthful, honest, am 'really' debilitated, can tolerate the untruths i.e., lies from the defense side, hold up under open attacks on my character, deal with court "unnecessary" delays, hold up under threatening type tactics and fight my feelings of an entity trying to discredit me as a deserving-citizen.

- This has been a l-o-n-g and laborous jorney that I never knew existed for a person who truly has been occupationally[on a professional basis] injured.

The individual I would like you to investigate is duty justice of the Supreme Court of Arizona. has been with the SC for years; and up to that time was somewhere in practice here in Arizona since I would like to know what law firm(s) and at what address(s) was affiliated with since beginning practice in Additionally I would like to know how familiar is with the legal representative of the (respondant) in my case.

I am concerned by any connection may have had with the law firm that was: and is now: as the defense representative for and the Insurance Carrier: was the firm who are connected (and I feel in Conflict of Interest) with the Workmans Compensation; and thusly any connection that conflicts with my case.*

*This is a person whose firm (a) Wrote (b) Revised (c) Compiled Statutes and (d) Collated the Workmans Compensation Rules of Court/Law for the Reference Book and the Hand Books for that commission.

There are copies of data supporting that fact.

I find that to be highly irregular in light of the assemblage of my personal Claim case.

QUESTIONS: Are there any other 'Connections'?

Was there an influencing factor in the ICA decision against my Claim?

If there has been any work-related connection between the duty justice and that law firm I ask to be informed immediately. There is a tendency here to something appearing suspicious.

-Or - perhaps in your further scrutiny you may find out if [redacted] senior-appearing co-representative a [redacted] (who came-on late into my case) may have been a work-connection in that past.

None of these scenarios would be beneficial to my case being denied by [redacted] in the d.j. role for the Supreme Court of Arizona on [redacted]

I have no knowledge of [redacted] personally. The photographs of the five(5) Supreme Court justices hanging across the wall in the Lobby outside the court room were the only link to those whom I would be scrutinized by one day in hearing my case. - Or so I thought. -

My thought was at that time out of all the present justices [redacted] would be the one I most assuredly would not like to see presiding over my hearing.

Photographs can be misleading, but [redacted] struck me negatively as the one who projected the most foreboding countenance.

Stern, possibly unyielding and with [redacted]

Then there was the photo of Justice [redacted] It emitted a 360° degree different feeling both in countenance and appearance. - I found out later [redacted] photos' projection is accurate. -

+Courtesy would have me include and mention the third member of the panel in the passing reference to wall photographs, and that being [redacted]

My photograph observation sees [redacted] to be stern-in-countenance and I refrain here from noting a second characteristic I suspicioned. - I did however observe both my keen observation points when just recently I watchad, and listened, to [redacted] defending a Court decision of some controversy. That broadcast most interestingly was quite insightful.+

Getting back from digression - +

*When I first saw the name [redacted] on the ORDER I shuttered.

*I later felt I had reason to.

I would like to know why there was a panel of three(3) to decide on the PETITION FOR REVIEW denial by the Supreme Court, and it took them 86 days, yet, only [redacted] to decide on the PETITION FOR REVIEW filed mid-day of [redacted] and [redacted] had the PETITION for one(1) day... if that long.....and wrote DENIAL on [redacted] - I recieved it A.M. of [redacted]

[I am aware of Protocol. I am suspicious of something more than that.]

CJC-06-214

I have no options open to me to insure I have met with proper legal process. Therefore I am depending solely on your investigative methods to establish that my Claim case appeal has been handled truly in legal boundaries and protocol and with juris prudence.

Please assist me and inform me as soon as possible of your accurate indepth findings.

Respectfully submitted,



Post Script****

I cannot express in mere words the impact these factors of my case has had on me. Fighting against disability. Fighting to be justly treated with proper compensation. Fighting to not be hindered by POWER BEHAVIORS of those in a legal system status who feel they can wield their personal authority(s) at their own whim.

I question lack of integrity.

I question Law manipulation.

I question conspiracy among peers.