

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 11-161

Complainant: No. 1254500224A

Judge: No. 1254500224B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge made several erroneous rulings in his criminal case. After reviewing the allegations, the case history, and minute orders available online, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. Whether the judge issued correct rulings is a legal matter outside the jurisdiction of the commission. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: September 14, 2011.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George Riemer

George A. Riemer
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on September 14, 2011.

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

CONFIDENTIAL

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

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

2011-161

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your Name: _____ Judge's Name: _____ Date: 06/13/11

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.

Even with a single Superior Court seat, it is rare that the presiding judge sizes on a leading prosecutor immediately and watches that person sail through a hearing, without opposition. With two hearings - something that has only occurred without any defendant of court occasions - it is impossible to avoid a messier process. The preceding prosecutor participated June 7, 2011, Court hearing needed to be fitted in pairs, and the disclosure process could have become more easier. did not yet have a secured hearing opening, but he believed one was coming. While he had the prosecuter in mind, but need to consider and vet others. Even the leading prosecutor had ordered him as it seems while backup electronic records were developed. U.S., v. *Comprehensive Drug Testing, Inc., 513 U.S. F.3d at FN 13 (Defendant confirming the emergency 911 tapes with Digital Right Management Date) the Arizona Dept. of Public Safety (ADPS) had quickly seized an encryption "BETHM" as its' electronic record dictionary. The MASO staff enjoyed the moves-escape and/or language-style matching encryption of BETHM on February 28, 2011, which transcriptionally described defendant as being "Burglary Criminal In House Make or Black Criminal In House Make whom he never set foot in the House internal foundation. Moreover, because he is a Pro-per Defendant and because *CAT Inc., at FN 28 (quoting Taketa following Rakas at 134, 99 S. Ct 421; (Attach additional sheets as needed.)

"BCHM" stands for African American Racial Profiling; he isn't identified with gang members, or Deep South racism, it appears unlikely that the presiding judge would refuse to conform to Rule 15.1 and 15.6 by and through Lewis L. T. Journey, Paralegal at the Special Crime Bureau: Other names being mentioned for the May 16, 2011 Latent Fingerprint Order, including MCAO Investigative Division Supplemental Report of "BCHM" abbreviation provoked arresting officers justifying at the 11:09 am morning abandoned house investigation, in the form of charges that are Walker #7042 had conspired, which everyone but Rosales enjoyed, until imminent threats. Rosales is sensitive, to removal, if anything suggests that the pending motions to suppress and removal, have now, being stricken. Because he, speaking of Rosales - might have been floating his own campaign for a conviction in the Court, just as Atkins may try to present Rosales's Motion, *Rakas v. Illinois, 439 U.S. 128 (1978)

It can be construed, the Judge always concerned about leaks, to Journey first things 'The more he think about "BCHM", he doesn't think she ought to discuss (** Conflict of Interests Court appointment of Counsel - with anyone). I am.

Defendant responded with a bar complaint caused to recriminative and factum. This, in turn, caused Atkins to laugh, but only briefly, for the pressure will continue to be on Defendant
-4- (Turnover to Page 7)

with questions from the judge excluding Atkins.
Indeed earlier in June 5, 2011, Defendant request
ed Three (3) Subpoena and Advisory Counsel Atkins
of OPA (who had contractual hasn't announced/
his position for advisory counsel) hasn't called
on the Pro-per to contest any hearing.

If a subpoena is issued, the *MESO ofc. #44563
shall be court ordered to the Courtroom 703.
If any dispatch call had that much experience,
shall be addressing the state directly.

Mesa v. United States, 352 U.S. 1, 77 S. Ct.
1, 1 L. Ed. 2d 1 (1956) (quoting United States v.
Brucato, 477 Fed. 2d 117, 47-1 USTC ¶13,314, 352 U.S. at 14.

Whakanae, June 11, Motion in re / withdrawal
of 911 Tapes Hearing and In Limine has been
advanced respectively.

There seems to Defendant a misapprehension that
you said at one point that you'd only remaining
two presiding judge who are sitting on the bench,
where I've witnessed many before what happened on
the record - Yes, Defendant did so.

Levi Nash called upon a post motion to suppress
to Judge Davis and advisory counsel N. Rock
to presentation. It a matter of fact, in that conflict
with advisory counsel N. Rock, who represented
Nash from advisory counsel suppression motion
that's not happening in this case. (Please turnover).

Alice Marie Coronado-Hernandez and husband Joe Hernandez appeared in May 16, 2011 Court Proceedings as victims when Vera Coronado is the only victim, but Mr. has clearly excepted "victims" or "target" standing to assert non-victim Fourth Amendment right to acquire latent prints. See Rakas v. Illinois, 439 U.S. 128, 133-34, 99 S.Ct. 421, 58 L.Ed.2d 387 (1978) ("refusing to extend standing to a party who was not a 'victim' of the search"). Victim is in California.

Gottfried summarized where he stood, in a way that would be favorable to Maroney. The main thing is, first, he shall ask what latents are requested for, and second, its purpose. For example, a Phoenix Police Dept. female detective took latents of Pro-per Defendant to computer expert at Arizona Counter Terrorism Information Center, a joint effort among the Arizona Dept. of Public Safety, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, FBI and other agencies. In other words, from outstanding memo investigational Division Supplemental Reports, from the other, of course, people who've had experience need electroperation devices that's the equivalent. Now, I'm not going to just promote the fact that I promoted from the Motion for Classified Documents, does not mean U.S. DHS is not limited to electroperation injection for a individual that's

unnecessary.

MEMO saying such claims are false and that Defendant declined disclosure, but judicial appointment of all stripes know MEMO is trying to micro-manage No. CR: 2011-01. -OT Racial Profiling and anti-diversity sentiment runs high. (MEMO)

Leon L. Maroney swaggered around like vice roys when complaints of full disclosure of "BCHM" and Law Enforcement Relations Group T-Mobile Communication, by defendant. **Yellow H-Bird.

"Relying on extensive federal and state authority this Court has decided previously that trial judges should not weigh the evidence already considered by grand juries. Which gives defendant some running room, in trial jurors doing something couldn't do with one, that

now do with BCHM. State ex rel. Preinsberg v. Rosenblatt, 112 Ariz. 461, 462, 543 P.2d 773, 774 (1975) (quoting State of Ariz ex rel. Collins v. Kamin v. Bavard, 151 Ariz. at 1106 at 70)

Thus, the grand jurors did not consider the 911 tapes "BCHM" evidence already litigated before your Court your Honorable Ct. Justice. See United States v. Brobst, 558 F.3d 982 at n. 15. Again, Defendant requests all electronic MEMO transcripts especially 911 decrypted.

Carroll,

1/22/22

2011-161

Defendant ask the Court to Inform Honorable
that he has a Motion For Order of Supp-
ression under Rule 35.2 (confirming striking
Thirteen (13) Motion, leaving in place Motions To
Refusal of Counsel and Investigator), but ILS
has tendency to slow play - along with the more
flamboyant internal Audit Department, which may
conduct audits based on risks highlighted in the
"911" transcript reports, Auditor Ross Tate said.
See *Bartnicki v. Vopper*, 532 U.S. at 526 at
1761-62 (2001).

Also, a June 11, 2011 Motion In Mandamus to
Compel 911 Tapes and Motion In Limine Under
State ex rel. Cincinnati Enquirer v. Hamilton
County, Ohio, 75 Ohio St.3d at n.11, 662 N.E.2d 334
(1996) (quoting *United States v. Mc Nab*, 318
U.S. at 334, 63 S.Ct. 608 (1943); and *State v. Terrazas*,
109 Ariz. 500. respectively, is being impeded in such
fashion.

Growing up in Phoenix, Arizona, the heart of what
would become our Nation's backdoor, the National
Department of Homeland Security, needs to start
tinkering in placement agents inside (MCSO)
911 Communication center who can be unthink-
ingly doing "Bettin". It is believed that (MCSO) is
experimenting with L-3 communication of X-
ray provisions. It was a time when the Nation's
* in elevators.

airports and the race to see through garments regularly, made front page headlines, now, it's the norm.

Do, Defendant want to play the rare card? No But why is "BCHM" not decrypted? Until that abbreviation point, electronic encryption had been too obvious - Vopper at 526, so they been pronouncing prearranged signals. But since now, the defense recognition could move this content to the (MCEC) 911 Communication Center from the drawing board to reality.

Defendant requests this inaction not to be an Honorable records. Knowing (MCEC) winning potential, Moroney and Susan L. Lauder herself decided to look for an investor with business experience to guide (MCEC) ofc. #4563. But when a Non-Conflict of Interest Counsel comes on board, he can possibly hold Moroney at bay, or at minimum, but this Court has to guide Honorable Gottfried.

Defendant went deep inside himself and decided, No, I am not starting dichotomy. Moroney's Council Emergency Dispatch 911 Communication Center (MCEC) designed various ethical Morse-code and/or language style marking protocols than any one could believe in a year while contemplating. But (MCEC) wanted to keep the pool facial

balance provision intact. So they love how Ross
Tate supports their linguistic engineers

Luckily, a (MCEO) (M/CSO) etc. #44563 is
a experienced individual (and fellow computer affi-
riado) convinced him that he/she could start
to racial profile and still remain an (MCEO)
engineer, without license to do so, as Natl. Home
land Security shall. See State Bar of Arizona
Complaint. Please, Do Not Hold Against Him.

This may be looked at as OAS
advisory counsel conflict of interests being a
respondent may make no effect to defend. Gray et
al. 292 (quoting Griffin - - -

Cordial,

Defendant In Pro-per

As. The card presented it self, defense may have
to play it. Because, why would the etc. #44563
indicate Burglary Crime In House. What when
burglary is a crime - right? See. Gray v. Alexandria
WHC, 506 U.S. at 4.2 at #273 (repeating "sex-based"
discrimination w/ racial-base - - See Maher supra,
432 U.S. at 470-71, 478, 27 S. Ct. at 2380-2381, 2385.
Horn, supra 448 U.S. at 322-324, 100 S. Ct. at 2691-
2692 (confirming Natl. Homeland Security 'racial-profi-
ling-funding restriction' (MCEO). Enclosure.

BFO/9/1