

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 09-115

Complainant: No. 1188010424A

Judge: No. 1188010424B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The issues raised are outside the commission's jurisdiction. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: June 4, 2009.

FOR THE COMMISSION

\s\ Keith Stott
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on June 4, 2009.

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

To the State Bar of Arizona and Commission on Judicial Conduct:

I ask you to take this document VERY SERIOUSLY. Please do not discount what I say in this complaint JUST BECAUSE OF WHO I AM. I just happen to be a person who asserts complaints that are meritorious. I am loud and boisterous but am serious in what I say and do. You cannot and should not ask me to produce information that a finding has been made by a court that Mr. and Ms. have been found by the court that they control and abuse members of the public in and attempt to create ruin and havoc in their lives and have told lies about me and done me harm intentionally.

But what I am saying is the truth. And I ask you to take appropriate action to redress the unlawful and ethical conduct of these attorneys and this judge, even though it is me that is complaining about them.

And they do all this wrong and malicious conduct and know that they believe that they will never be held accountable by the Bar, Supreme and not even by God himself.

Please tell me that there is somewhere out the enforcing some basic rules of decency and morals as I have seen none NONE NONE = no, not any, in all of Arizona.

But let me tell you the entire whole sad, pitiful, yet true story, and all I can do is hope that there is really some agency out there policing the real crooks and scoundrels in our society – those that have been granted a license to lie, cheat and steal by the Supreme Court and are really lecherous wolves in sheepskin clothing:

On November 16, 2008, I was arrested in , Arizona pursuant to a conspiracy to violate my constitutional rights to engage in free speech which I did by picketing and protesting in , Arizona, to complain about the illegal conduct of a business and the Police Department of the City of

I did not cause any harm and certainly had no intent to disturb anyone, at any time, except to effect a remedy against those who have caused harm to others and need to pay for the harm that has been done to those who did not and do not deserve it. And there was no evidence produced at trial that I did

disrupt any reasonable people so much that I should be convicted of disorderly conduct.

I should at least have had the discovery that I was entitled to regarding the Police Department conspiracy I alleged and proved existed, as much as I could and that it was at their insistence that a false report was made about conduct that never occurred, so that I could be stopped in my picketing activities.

I had been picketing to complain about unlawful and unethical practices by these business and their businesses along with several other people and every time I did the business owner called the police to have me and anyone picketing and protesting with me arrested or harassed.

The police almost did arrest me and others present on several occasions just for being present and simply engaging in picket and protesting activities on the public sidewalk on several occasions.

The business owners that we were picketing and protesting in front of did not like it, and although the employees of that business were engaged in harmful, criminal and violent conduct, the employees were not arrested and prosecuted for that criminal conduct.

Well, on November 16, 2008, my vehicle was vandalized in the parking lot of another business and the City Police took no action other than to take a report. No actual investigation was done.

I do not know exactly when the Police got weary of the calls, but it was before November 16, 2008 and certainly before January 2009, when they informed that I was organizing a large picket and they could do nothing lawful about it.

Back to November 16, 2008 and the discriminatory conduct of the City of
:

It was late in the day, at about 5:30 p.m., and I was present with two young boys, aged 14 and 15 who had been previously (on September 21, 2008) physically attacked by an employee of the business that we were picketing on that day, but who was not prosecuted – although he was arrested and taken into custody. We were preparing to leave the area where we were

picketing. As we were waiting for the crosswalk sign to change to cross Road (where it intersects Avenue – from the southeast corner to the northeast corner), a person who had been antagonizing the picketing from the beginning of picketing that business, , when we were approached by a male who came toward us while we were near the corner. He said something to me and I responded in a non-threatening, non-aggressive manner and he turned around and went back to the dealership. No part of my body came within five feet of his body and no part of me, including my spit, came into contact with any part of him including his body.

Well when I went across the street () to await the arrival of the tow truck that was to come and pick up my vehicle with the two tires that were vandalized and made flat by intentionally being punctured, so that the tow truck could drive the three of us and my vehicle to my home, a Police car pulled up and asked me for identification. I gave and then was harassed by the City of police officers as they prepared to write me an Arizona Traffic Citation and then to return to the dealership and obtain the statements of the alleged or purported victim and a purported witness.

The purported victim had called the police after our verbal interchange and the 911 tape revealed that the Police had instructed him or anyone at the dealership to call and make a report anytime that the picketers “interfered with them” whatever that meant. That discussion that the Police had instructed them to call about interference was never explained at trial, as the Police that had so instructed them to do that were never required to appear in court and explain that and be held accountable. Every motion that I filed and request for discovery that I filed, although seeking information that could prove that I had been set up by the Police so that I could be limited in my picketing was opposed by on behalf of the City Prosecutor, , or a whatever motion that Mr. filed, it was a foregoing conclusion that it would not be complied with. How was that arrangement made in advance or is it just an arrangement in unspoken or unwritten terms that no matter what the remedy or outcome the Prosecutor’s office seeks that they will receive it?

And then their witnesses can get on the witness stand and tell what ever lies and perjury they chose and not be held accountable for it by the court?

For instance, at trial, a witness was waiting in the hall to testify and the alleged victim made yet another false (the one he made against me was false

as well) report about the alleged conduct of that witness and alleged and tried to have her arrested in the hallway for having violated an Injunction Against Harassment that he filed to keep me from picketing. It should be noted that I have never gone onto the property of this dealership, at any time. She did not violate the order but when he called the police showed up at the courthouse with predetermined and previously prepared Arizona Traffic citations to have her and another person arrested when there was no crime, and there being no crime committed, she could not be charged with the same. The evidence about this false charging by the alleged and purported victim was kept out of the court by the misconduct of

Even though this false police report was what the alleged victim did on November 16, 2008, and tried again to do on March 2, 2009, and again on March 10, 2009 and March 11, 2009, this challenge to his credibility was upheld to being not relevant by the court, and then the judge had the nerve to find me guilty of disorderly conduct based upon the credibility of the witnesses?

How far in advance was that outcome determined? And who all was a party to the agreement that resulted in my being convicted even though the witnesses for the state contradicted themselves and then at one time even recanted their testimony and they both denied having given testimony that was clearly of record.

The judge and _____, and _____ would simply not let the truth come out in the court, more than what I had to fight to put on the record. The police put the victim up to calling (he even admits that on the 911 call that was taped and presented in court) and whatever he wanted, whether it was in the interests of justice or not, he got, even when his obvious misconduct was brought to the court's attention. The court, Judge Pro Tem _____ and at times Presiding Judge _____, neither of whom are or were honorable and upheld the Canons of Judicial Conduct (and violated all of them), just swept justice and my rights with them, under the proverbial carpet, as if they were meaningless dirt. Is that how the Bar and Commission on Judicial Conduct believe truth and justice should be treated in Arizona?

Then, even though the evidence that was put into the record consisted of rehearsed and manufactured perjury, plain and simple, and the judge commented when the testimony of the State's witnesses was false and asked

them questions and the witnesses gave answers that they later denied giving. The witnesses, although rehearsing their statements in the office of and _____, for well over one hour prior to trial, just could not get it right, their witnesses could not figure out who was supposed to be telling what lie, apparently. And _____, acting pursuant to the policy of the _____ City Attorney's office, following the protocol and put the lying witnesses on the witness stand anyway. He did not care about truth or harming anyone by having his witnesses tell lies and fairy tale fables as long as he got a conviction.

He certainly did not participate in a search for the truth but only in doing whatever horrible conduct that needed to be engaged in so long as I was found guilty, whether justice was perverted or the administration of justice was found wanting in the proceeding. He in fact tried as hard as he could to keep the truth and justice out of the courtroom including filing false pleadings, misusing the power of his prosecutorial office, suborning perjury and denying the existence of witnesses and their prior disclosure.

He maintained a legal position that was untenable and not maintainable. I was not arraigned properly. _____ and the court said it did not matter.

Then, _____ tried to have a warrant issued for my arrest by filing a false pleading which asserted that I had not appeared in court, when I did and asked him to dismiss the unlawful prosecution.

All the pleadings that he filed (which changed the facts from time to time to suit his purposes at that moment) were false and contained misstatements of fact and misrepresented the law.

He filed false pleadings. – His efforts at filing false and misleading pleadings were rewarded by the court with my conviction.

He wrongfully objected to and did not and was not forced to give me requested and identified discovery, even of exculpatory information. And he misled the court as to the nature of that discovery, that it was voluminous when it was not and was easily compiled and would have been easy to comply with.

He objected to the service of subpoenas that were issued by the court and lawfully served so that I could have the witnesses there to testify to prove

the unlawful conspiracy of the Police and the court bought it hook, line and sinker and the witnesses that I was chose to have testify were not required to appear and testify and that was apparently determined before I presented any opposition to his motion to quash as that argument was presented at the time they were required to appear but no one showed up.

I lay awake at night wondering, after proving my innocence because the witnesses were all proven to be liars for the State, why it is that the State and the City of _____ can get away with such dishonesty, all at taxpayer expense. And we wonder why our society is deteriorating like it is.

And all of this was done in the name of causing limitations on First Amendment rights and for the almighty dollar.

One such blatant lie, that the court even ruled that I proved he was a liar, was that my head could come in contact with the head of someone that was four inches shorter than me and according to the story told, would have to have occurred six inches below the height that I stand.

The witness said that this could happen because he was standing on a raised curb when an interaction between he and I took place, then got on the witness stand and then said that he was not standing on a raised curb. And denied his testimony and that he testified in that manner, but only after recanting his testimony that there was a raised curb at the intersection.

Another inconsistency proven is that the victim and the witness (who could not see anything from where he was standing at the time – which was proven beyond ALL doubt) did not even testify to the same events, although they rehearsed the same and one witness wrote down the script – which included a photo taking session – but still could not get his testimony to jive with that of the victim and the court asked him about the photo that he took and then when asked for it, denied taking the photo. They did try to coordinate the testimony by having the victim stay in the courtroom through the testimony of the other witnesses, when he wasn't in the hallway committing a crime by making false police reports and trying to have others arrested when they did nothing wrong, all because they were trying to help me and prove the actual truth.

_____ did not want me to have witnesses come and testify and reveal what a liar his witnesses were and that they were all just making up a story to get

me stop picketing. And the real kicker and icing on the cake is filing a motion to quash service of subpoenas of City employees who, at the time of the hearing on the subpoenas, never appeared. I'm still trying to understand that arrangement, other than it was developed through graft and corruption. Apparently and worked out in advance of the hearing with the Pro Tem Judge that witnesses employed by the City who had spilled the beans and admitted the evil plot by the City of and another who engaged in unlawful witness intimidation, and intimidation of others including children, would never be required to appear and testify even when called as a witness by me to prove that the alleged victim did not ever and was not telling the truth. And the court somehow found that the liars club witnesses were somehow credible enough to sustain a conviction for disorderly conduct, although the court never explained or disclosed at any hearing what exactly I had done that constituted disorderly conduct.

There is no truth to be found in , Arizona, and certainly none in the Office of the City Attorney or in any of the courtroom in the City Court building, whatsoever and I am the victim of the lack of truth there.

People should be warned at the border of not to enter if they care anything about the truth or justice of any kind. They should be warned that lies will be told about them and those lies will be proven to be false, but that does not matter, no, not in .

And we can see that the lies told by the victim would not hold up without the misconduct of in the courtroom as he told several lies in the courtroom and the court disbelieved him. He said there were several (at least two) incidents where I had contact with him, but the court found there was only one and after he told that lie he could not even hold his head up and show his face in the courtroom. And the judge entered an inconsistent order in one case from another when he held that this victim who could not look at the court after telling these lies, by finding there was not more than one incident of conduct although he testified there were at least two incidents where I spoke to him, but when asked for a conviction, the judge held this victim to be credible enough to uphold request that I be convicted for disorderly conduct, even though neither victim and witness could even establish where people were when this alleged contact took place.

Not only is _____ corrupt but the judges before he has appeared, and _____ are also both corrupt. It is improper for Judges to not allow an appeal before sentencing. And to order me to change my evidence and return admitted evidence exhibits to me was completely improper, but done by the judge to feed the _____ City money machine aka _____ City Court, where there is no justice to be found anywhere in it.

I ask that you sanction and discipline _____, his supervisor _____ and Judges (and attorney) _____ and _____ for their misconduct in the foregoing.

And when I was being sentenced pursuant to a conviction that was obtained by fraud and denial of due process, _____ called me a "sick little man."

On at least one occasion Judge Pro Tem _____ was caught where the Victim Advocate _____ was attempting to have an ex parte communication with him in the courtroom and that situation was brought to the court's attention and note was made of it on the record. What sort of ethics rules for lawyers and Canons for judges allow that?