

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 10-347

Complainant: No. 1403610367A

Judge: No. 1403610367B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge demonstrated bias against him by violating his right to a speedy trial and interfering with his right to counsel. The commission reviewed the case history and the related minute entries and found no evidence of ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The record shows that most, if not all, of the delays in the case were caused by the complainant who repeatedly requested and rejected appointed counsel and then sought to represent himself and changed his mind. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: March 16, 2011.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott

Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on March 16, 2011.

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

CONFIDENTIAL

State of Arizona
Commission on Judicial Conduct
1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2010-347

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your Name:

Judge's Name:

Date: 12.19.2010

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.

THERE WAS RECENTLY A CERTAIN MISTRIAL ON 10.28.2010. JUDGE
HAD TO EITHER APPOINT OR ASSIGN A DEFENSE COUNSEL FROM
THE PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE. SHE APPARENTLY ASSIGNED SOME SORT
OF CONTRACTED COUNSEL AFTER HAVING A HEATED EXCHANGE WITH THE
DEFENDANT, A CERTAIN REGINALD COOKE, WHO HAS ALSO AS THE PREVIOUS
PUBLIC DEFENDER, IS INEFFECTIVE, HAS NOT BEEN FOLLOWING INSTRUCTIONS,
AND A PLETHORA OF OTHER ISSUES. JUDGE WAS ALSO ADVISED THAT
THE STATE GROSSLY EXCEEDED THE TIME LIMIT FOR ACTUAL TRIAL WHICH BY LAW
WAS SUPPOSED TO BE BETWEEN 150 AND 180 DAYS, AS OF THE DATE ON THIS
COMPLAINT SOME 715 DAYS HAS TRANSPIRED FROM WHEN THE "DEFENDANT"
WAS INITIALLY DETAINED. ITS EQUALLY OUTRAGEOUS FROM ARRAIGNMENT EARLY 2009.
JUDGE ATTEMPTED TO DEPRIVE THE DEFENDANT WHO WAS
PROPER OF ACCESS TO PRIVATE COUNSEL PER SPECIFIC REQUEST VIA
A MOTION PRIOR TO TRIAL. SHE ALSO IS EXTREMELY BIASED,
PREJUDICED AND PARTIAL TOWARDS THE DEFENDANT, APPEARS TO BE IN
BED WITH AND AN ALLY OF THE STATE. WAS ADVISED THE STATE
DID NOT COMPLY WITH DISCOVERY REQUEST FROM A PRO PER DEFENDANT
SHE HOWEVER IGNORED ATTEMPTED TO COERCE TRIAL BY CRIPPLING
DEFENSE. WAS ALSO ADVISED A COURT IN MARICOPA COUNTY WAS EXTREMELY
PREJUDICIAL TOWARDS DEFENDANT & NOT A NEUTRAL FORUM PER CERTAIN
GRIEVANCES AND LITIGATION AGAINST MARICOPA COUNTY, MCSO, THE
STATE & SCOTTSDALE POLICE, SHE OF COURSE IGNORED THIS. WAS ALSO
ADVISED THAT THE PROSECUTION OBTAINED A DEFECTIVE INDICTMENT ON
FALSE PERJURIOUS TESTIMONY, FALSE POLICE REPORTING AND ENDLESS
LIES, WITH HOLDING AND DESTRUCTION OF EVIDENCE BY THE STATE WHICH SHE
(Attach additional sheets as needed.) IGNORED