State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 09-264
Complainant: No. 1374510219A
Judge: No. 1374510219B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and concluded that the judge may have delayed a ruling in one of the complainant's cases. However, the delay was insufficient to warrant further investigation of a judge who has already resigned from the bench. The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: December 28, 2009.

FOR THE COMMISSION

<u>\s\ Keith Stott</u> Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on December 28, 2009.

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

CJC 09-264

STATEMENT OF FACTS

•

.

Your Name:	Judge's Name:	Date <u>09/09/09</u>			
This Complaint against	entails judicial	misconduct of the			
highest order. This complaint	<u>consist of</u> <u>failure to p</u>	erform his sworn duty			
to address a timely submitted Motion For Dismissal, in a civil case of seizure for					
<u>forfeiture Case No.</u>	On September 10,2008 Judge	rendered a judge-			
ment on that particular case of	number, while having blatantly i	gnored a Motion For Dis-			
missal that had been duly subm	mitted to his Division 4 Clerk,	to the County			
Clerk of Superior Court, and t	to the <u>County Attorney's</u>	Officer			
<u>(by hand, in person) by my de</u>	esignated Power of Attorney	<u></u>			
August 26,2008 at 2:31 P.M. (S	SEE EXHIBIT A). How this document	pertinent to an on			
going case onSuperio	or Court Docket was ignored by	<u>for two weeks prior</u>			
to his trial court's order granting judgement on the pleadings is at best highly sus-					
pect and certainly questionabl	<u>le. A persistent failure to perfo</u>	orm his duty's.			
	II				
<u>This complaint also accuses Judge of flagrant abuse of discretion. Due process re-</u>					
quires that a judge possess neither actual nor apparent bias. The index of record in					
the case No. will	reveal <u>actual as well a</u>	as apparent bias favoring			
the state's position and arguments from the onset of this and it's connected case					
Also, due process	s was violated because cou	<u>ld not be fre</u> e from			
Influences of what occurred in a previously connected criminal case No.					
which was subsequently ordered	d dismissed by another judge (Ho	<u>) in</u>			
another division (Superior Ca	urt Division 3) in the same	County Courthouse.			
(SEE EXHIBIT B)	III				
This complaint further accuses	<u>s Judge of willfully and l</u>	knowingly entering into			
a depraved scheme of prosecutorial misconduct in collusion with Deputy County Attorney					
using improper methods calculated to produce a judgement of partiality					
and bias rendering favor to the state's argument .					

(Attach additional sheets, as needed)

CJC 09-264

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Your Name:	Ju	dge's Name:	_Date 0 9/09/09	
This scheme of prosecutorial vindictiveness was hatched by Deputy County Attorney				
using Judge	as they obviously cons	spired to usurp the author	<u>ity_of_Judge_</u>	
Division 1	of Superior Court	<u>County, by totally dis</u>	regarding that fact	
that jurisdiction over <u>had originally and officially been assigned to</u>				
Judge on Feb.27,2007. (SEE EXHIBIT C). In fact, Judgeadmonished				
for pyramiding the case numbers in an attempt of deception to justify a civil seizure				
after the criminal seizure had failed. Judge ordered (on Sep.18,2008) to				
appear before his court on November 17,2008 to explain why two seperate judges and two				
seperate cases had to be filed regarding the same forfeiture. Judge raised his				
concerns regarding the waste of judicial resources when two judges take time to address				
the same forfeiture case without knowledge that another case is pending. I contend				
that and	were privy to	involvement unbeknowr	<u>ist to him. This was</u>	
deliberately done by and deceive and obstruct the normal function of due				
process as it was constitutionally intended. (SEE EXHIBIT D & E). I submit that				
violated the Code	of Arizona Judicial Con	duct and should be sanction	oned for Obstructing	
Justice.				
	īV			
<u>On July 21,2008 du</u>	ring a telephonic pretr	ial conference call, over	my objections,	

On July 21,2008 during a telephonic pretrial conference call, over my objections,further exhibited misconduct prejudicial to the administration of justice when he ar-bitrarily denied my constitutional right (Seventh Amendment) to a jury trial to resolvethe dispute ofAll this was done without benefit of a deposition,without discovery, and without consideration or an answer to my filed request for anAlternate Dispute Resolution. (SEE EXHIBIT F). Instead of recusing himself for beingprejudiced by his involvement in the criminal connection to this case.furtherabused his discretion by denying my request for court appointed counsel. Fully awarethis seizure order byhad left me destitute, and unable to afford a Lawyer.

(Attach additional sheets, as needed)

CJC 09-264

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Date^{09/09/09} Your Name: Judge's Name To further substaniate this defendant's suspicions and contention that gross misconduct did occurr, I respectfully submit as (Exhibit G) The unsigned judgement by Judge with an August 2008 date designation already affixed to be signof for the Deputy State Attorney's office, when in actuality ed and dated by Judge a Motion To Set For Trial had already been ordered on August 6th, 2008 in Judge This verifies collusion. under Case No. In conclusion I present as my final Exhibit H, the cover page and page No. 6 from the Appellee's Answering Brief authored by Deputy County Attorney On page No. 6 Prosecutor references Index item 27, " the trial court (Judge) signed) a judgement in favor of the State on September 10, 2008. Index item 30 states that filed a Motion to Dismiss the next day followed by his "Notice of Appeal (Appeal from Arbitration and Motion to Set for Trial)" filed on September 30,2008, No ruling was entered with respect to the Motion to Dismiss. Exhibit A exposes latter statementsas total fabrication of the fact that he and receieved the motion on own words in the final sentence verifies my accusation of August 26,2008 and villful failure to do his sworn duties. "NO RULING WAS ENTERED, ON MY MOTION". Sept. 24, 2009 DEFENDANT ION ORE ME THIS 244 day of Appt ,2009 SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN