

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 09-017

Complainant:	No. 1317810033A
Judge:	No. 1317810033B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The issue concerning time limits under Rule 8 involves a legal question that can only be reviewed by an appellate court. Although the judge and complainant's attorney were in the same law firm, their professional association ended over seven years ago.

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

Dated: April 21, 2009.

FOR THE COMMISSION

\s\ Keith Stott
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on April 21, 2009.

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 09-017

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name:

Judge's name:

Date: 1-22-09

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.

IN ACCORDANCE TO CANON 3 (E) (1) (A), 3 (E) (1) (d) (ii), (iii)
DISQUALIFICATION SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE AND HIS
EX BUSINESS ASSOCIATE COUNSEL HAVE
MADE IT A POINT TO CONTINUE PROCEEDINGS THAT ARE INVALID
IN ACCORDANCE, PLUS MANDATED IN THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION UNDER
THE 6TH AMENDMENT A DEFENDANT HAS A RIGHT TO A SPEEDY TRIAL PROCESS
THAT ENDED OCTOBER 22 2008 ITS NOW 4 MONTHS PAST THIS TIME TABLE.
NEXT THE ACCUSED HAS A RIGHT TO EFFECTIVE USE OF COUNSEL IN -
WHICH IS ALLEGED TO BE MR. WHOS WALKED INTO THE COURT
PROCEEDINGS SINCE SEPTEMBER 2, 2008 AND CLAIMED TO BE CONDUCTING
INTERVIEWS WITH THE STATES INVESTIGATOR, WITNESSES, ETC.. ITS TAKEN -
5 MONTHS TO CONDUCT 9 INTERVIEWS MOST OF WHICH ARE IN CALIFORNIA.
THE PROBLEM IS NOW ITS JANUARY 22, 2009 AND 2 OF THE 9 HAVE
ACTUALLY BEEN CONTACTED. & THE DEFENDANT TOLD
JUDGE THAT MR. HAS CONTINUED TO
WITHHOLD CASE FILE INFORMATION FURTHER MR. HAS MAINTAINED
NOT TO FILE ANY MOTIONS THAT ARE REQUIRED BY LAW, AND THE
ARIZONA RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE UNDER RULE 8 PROVISIONS
AND VIOLATIONS. NOW IVE ATTACHED A FORMAL COMPLAINT THAT I
FILED AGAINST MR AND BECAUSE OF THE JUDGE
AND MR ARE EX BUSINESS ASSOCIATES NEITHER
FEEL ASSERTIVE TO HAVE THIS CASE DISMISSED WITH EXTREME PREJUDICE
ONE BECAUSE MR HAS THIS RELATION I AM UNABLE TO
EXHIBIT THE MANY ABOUT 16 VIOLATIONS U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL AND EQUAL
VIOLATIONS EXHIBITED WITH THE ARIZONA DECLARATION OF RIGHTS AS WELL.
SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE AND COUNSEL MR. HAVE

(Attach additional sheets as needed)

COMBINED their legal talents in order so the Accused/defendant is
 unable to bring a legitimate claim, or properly expose the many
 prejudices in the case. During every single proceeding I Mr.
 Accused/defendant have been trying to challenge the States
 position to withhold vital materials, so that I, and not Counsel can
 build a witness structure, or compel witnesses that would shed
 light on a given situation, or event. But because Judge Keeps
 utilizing his authority to not allow discrepancies to be brought to
 the courts attention, or criminal intent the defendant
 can not follow up with criminal formal complaints. Today on January 22,
 2009 Thursday at a Oral Argument Hearing, the state turned over
 discovery material that was sought out three years ago, 5 Attorneys
 4 cases, 3 Dismissals that should of been Dismissals with Prejudice
 being the State at that time Swore up and Down that this video of the
 Alleged Victim did NOT Exist, Now, out of No where, it shows up in
 Court today, by plus from who intentionally concealed
 this video recording for three consecutive years. Superior Court Judge
 plus Counsel made NO Attempt to
 reprimand the underminded intentions. Had I not been there in
 person their disconcerting Attitude, I'm surprised they didn't give the
 State a Metal of Honor. No instead, they descended into how they could
 continue their articulate way of making sure the defendant had no
 recourse of action, or would not get the dignified Dismissal with Extreme
 Prejudice the CASES deserve. Their only sensitivity is how they don't
 get caught for their five months of "intentional" oversight. Looking for
 manageable ways to make sure the defendants Rights and privileges
 hit "short falls", so they themselves don't receive the criminal prosecution
 they deserve, but no one can bring against them, because of their minor

INCONVENIENCE they made sure would collapse A ACCUSED ABOBNE right, had there not been the many distractions the courts, counsel AND STATE conspired to commit, I am sending you a copy of my formal made to the STATE BAR of ARIZONA that supports my position, AND hopes transparency WAIN'T BE SUCH A ISSUE IN A MORE formal COURT proceeding WHERE A EQUAL PROTECTION of Rights CAN BE MORE ESTABLISHED, plus respected. YES, I REALIZE your ACTIONS ARE SOME what limited, but THAT DOESN'T MEAN you CAN'T proceed WITH ACTIONS that would reflect the INTENTIONAL VIOLATIONS, AND REVITALIZE THE previous complaints, because AS THE MANUAL STATES CLEAR RULE 7 MISCONDUCT Distinguished From Error, stipulation there'S NOTHING HARMLESS IN CONCEALING EVIDENCE, NOR fabricating COMPETENCY issues, WITHHOLDING CASE FILE INFORMATION, AND NOT ALLOWING for COMPLETE TRANSPARENCY ON MINUTE Reports of COURT PROCEEDINGS that should ALLOW VIOLATIONS to BE EXHIBITED. THESE issues, plus the ATTACHED STATE BAR COMPLAINT AGAINST Mr. [redacted] THAT'S 7 PAGES IN length GIVE A VERY REALISTIC depiction of ONLY A FEW EVENTS that HAVE TAKEN PLACE SINCE SEPTEMBER 2, 2008, AND others prior. AGAIN, PLEASE provide A COPY, so that I MAY CONTINUE to SEEK some sort of EQUAL plain, WHERE A ACCUSED Rights ARE PROTECT by A UNPREJUDICIAL, FAIR, IMPARTIAL system the DEFENDANT/ACCUSED Mr. [redacted] HAS BEEN told; AND HEARD about, but HAVE NOT EXPERIENCED.

Alleged COUNSEL [redacted] HAS MADE THE RULE 8 DISMISSAL SO SUPERFICIAL IN HIS PRE NOTICE STATEMENT WITH WORDS USED SUCH AS: DOESN'T MEAN MUCH, CARRIES NO IMPACT, DOESN'T REALLY MATTER, BASICALLY MEANINGLESS, SO IS ANYTHING I PLAN TO FILE ON THE DEFENDANTS BEHALF, BECAUSE COUNSEL'S OPINION SHOULD SIT WITH THE STATE OF ARIZONA, AND STOP WASTING my AMENDMENT RIGHTS. WE WAIN'T

go into his Unauditory like behavior with motions that should of been filed months ago. That was barely presented January 7, 2009 and had been discussed back on September 2, 2008. If Ad Counsel had spent 5 months in attempting to misrepresent, the Accused would of spent that time trying to RESEARCH ALL the AVENUES the previous CONSPIRERS refused to explore like the Alleged interview ALL the prosecutors swore didn't exist for 3 years that Mr. [redacted] is now Alleged to be in possession of, "OH," just to make it CLEAR NOW and for the record where it may be found - those same people are now being asked to provide things, MORE things they claimed for three years not to have. Further that material is coming from CO-CONSPIRERS who CONCEALED ALL the previous requested materials. Why, would ANY COMPETENT Counsel think for ONE moment maybe it was ALL asked for before, being I'm the ONE who had to do the ASKING, THEN AS I'VE had to NOW. PLEASE, inform Judge [redacted] the defendant has Always had a witnesses structure only now due to all the CO-CONSPIRING to allow ANYONE into these proceedings would be a travesty of GREAT MAGNITUDE, but that was the intent from the VERY beginning. Today I requested to speak to a Judge to file formal criminal complaints, and the sheriffs, or Facility want allow me too. Maybe you can find out why I'm not allowed to file a criminal complaint?

Respectfully Submitting,

Defendant/Complaint