

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 07-166

Complainant: No. 1313110686A

Judge: No. 1313110686B

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: July 18, 2007.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott
Executive Director

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

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

CJC-07-166

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name: [redacted]

Judge's name: [redacted]

Date: 6-13-07

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.

I am filing a complaint on willful misconduct of Pro-temp Honorable [redacted] at my trial. [redacted] violated the professional conduct of indigent defendants criminally charged by destroying the reputation to uphold the Constitutional Protections of bias and prejudicial criminal proceedings and Judicial duties that's against Arizona Revised Statutes states under § 28-1381(G) states in a trial a defendant must have his alcohol concentration withdrawn within 2 hours to presume that a defendant was or was not under the influence or above the legal limit. In my enclosed Exhibits it clearly shows I was stopped at 0902 and the blood draw without a consent was drawn at 1300 hours. There are numerous cases here on this DUI yard [redacted] that have DUI cases overly the Two Hour limit out of [redacted] Superior Court, where Court Appointed Attorneys as well as judges sworn in to uphold the fairness and to follow the Judicial Code of Conduct which criminally charged defendants in [redacted] Superior Court are not afforded. The Constitution also protects egregious errors of Constitutional Magnitude to be held accountable starting with corrupt Judges that allow unprotected proceedings to go unnoticed. These are certainly ethical standards described in the state constitution. It is described as improper when judges are sworn in to uphold the constitution and let every man, women and child indigent criminal charged to have a fair trial and arbitrary government ^{against} bias and prejudicial advantage that's been taking place in [redacted] Superior Court for sometime now.

(Attach additional sheets as needed)