

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 07-044

Complainant: No. 1301710057A

Judge: No. 1301710057B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The issue raised is legal or appellate in nature, and the more appropriate remedy would have been to appeal the judge's decision to a court with proper jurisdiction.

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: April 18, 2007.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on April 18, 2007.

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

Court Forms
Not Provided
By The Library
Sent to the wrong place
by mistake.

[Redacted]

CJC-07-044

[Redacted]

~~Court of Appeals~~
~~by the Ninth Circuit~~

[Redacted]

No.

FEB 09 2007

Judicial Misconduct
Complaint:

Statement of Facts:

Rule 81, canon 3: "A Judge Shall Perform the Duties of
Canon on Ethics: Judicial Office Impartially and Diligently."

A Judge's judicial duties include all the duties of office
prescribed by law. A Judge shall perform judicial duties
without bias or prejudice.

Rule 81, canon 2: "A Judge Shall Avoid Impropriety and the
Appearance of Impropriety in All of the
Judge's Activities."

A Judge shall at all times respect and comply with the
law, and act in a manner that promotes the integrity of the
Judiciary, and its impartiality.

28 USC § 453, Gilmore vs People of Cal, 220 F3d 987.

A Judge swears an oath to do right equally for the
poor and rich alike.

1.

Judge [] is violating existing law, canons and ethics, her oath of office.

Complainant filed for a waiver of all costs and fees because he has no money and he owns nothing. Judge [] is denying complainant access to the court solely because he is poor.

Complainant's 14th Amend. Rights, U.S. Const. are in fact being violated. Bounds, eg 430 US 817, 97 S. Ct. 1492.

Access to the court to litigate actionable claims cannot be denied merely based on complainant's poverty.

Complainant cannot be denied access to the court to litigate his case. He has an actionable claim yet he is being denied by Judge [] Johnson vs Avery 393 US 483, 89 S. Ct. 747, 21 L. Ed. 2d 718, Hull 312 US 546, 61 S. Ct. 640, 85 L. Ed. 1034, Burns vs Ohio 360 US 252, 79 S. Ct. 1164, 3 L. Ed. 2d 1209, 97 S. Ct. 1496, Because complainant is not a lock-down inmate, lock-down restrictions do not apply.

Discrimination and bias against complainant due to his poverty is an action that destroys the integrity of the judiciary, and establishes bad behavior by Judge [] as a rogue judge, and that behavior cannot be tolerated.

It is the role of the court to provide relief to people who have suffered, or will imminently suffer actual harm; because the Supreme Court decision in Bounds, which held that fundamental constitutional right of access to courts cannot be denied.

There are areas in case law that does not apply here. In this case we only deal with access, and the right of access is being denied merely because complainant cannot pay the purchase price required by Rogue Judge [] Her court and integrity must be for sale or she would not deny complainant his right of access to the court to obtain relief for harm done to him. US Const. Amend. 14.

There is no doubt that no one can obstruct, deny, hinder, or infringe in any way upon claimant's access to litigate his case before the court.

Remedy:

There is no doubt that claimant is entitled to the relief he seeks. Therefore, claimant requests that this court order the following.

1. That claimant [] is to be allowed to proceed in litigating his case before the court.

2. That claimant [] will not be charged any costs or fees due to his poverty. All costs and fees are to be waived.

3. That judge [] is to perform the above and thereafter will be barred from further involvement in any matter

3.

Related to claimant

Respectfully submitted this 26th day of Dec.
2006.

Notice served to

Note:

Respondents have enjoined because they do not want claimant to win his cases. Claimant currently has the following cases in court.