

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 11-199

Complainant: No. 1424310600A

Judge: No. 1424310600B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a court of appeals judge engaged in misconduct by entering an order denying his motion for an emergency injunction. In an amended complaint, the complainant alleged that two more court of appeals judges and two superior court judges were co-conspirators in denying his constitutional rights.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judges engaged in conduct that violated the Code of Judicial Conduct and, if so, to take appropriate disciplinary action. The purpose and authority of the commission is limited to this mission.

After thoroughly reviewing all of the information provided by the complainant, which included multiple documents, the members of the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that none of the judges violated the Code in this case. The commission has no jurisdiction to determine the legal sufficiency of court rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: October 7, 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 October 7, 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

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name: Pro Se Lead Plaintiff/Appellant **Judge's name:** Hon.
Date: 8/9/2011

Instructions: You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Please describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times and places that will help us understand your concerns. You may attach additional pages but not original court documents. Print or type on one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your files.

I. Hon. Judge DENIAL ORDER June 17, 2011, crafted fictitious text attributed to the Superior Court's Minute Entre Dismissal ORDER (Maricopa County Superior Court No. CV2010-) to establish '*...grounds...*' for his (Judge) Denial of Appellant's Motion for an Emergency Injunction. Judge knew his lie is a 'knowing' fraud within the meaning of A.R.S. #13-105, 5, 6, 9, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 33, and 35 and 13-2311 as the Superior Court's Minute Entre Dismissal ORDER (Maricopa County Superior Court No. CV2010-) said no such thing as Hon. Judge said the Superior Court used as '*...grounds...*' to Dismiss. In Hon. Judge lie in *italics* below, he said the Superior Court's Dismissal ORDER was based on the following: "*The superior court dismissed appellant's complaint on grounds of lack of standing and because neither the State of Arizona nor the Secretary of State is a proper defendant*".....the *italic* text is a flat-out lie and does not exist....no such wording can be found anywhere in the Superior Court's Minute Entre Dismissal ORDER and (2) this lie was then used by Hon. Judge to '*rig/fix*' his course of action and ultimate outcome of Appellant's Motion for an Emergency Injunctive Relief : Deny Appellant's Injunction. The Appeals Court own documented prima facie fraudulent* use of text in Hon. Judge Appeals Court ORDER June 17, 2011, significantly and materially '*fix/rigged*' the outcome of the whole and not just a piece of CA-CV2011- ; and, brings Hon. Judge Appeals Court June 17, 2011, Denial ORDER into violation of the Appellant's Fourteenth Amendment due process and equal protections and Title 18 #241 and #242 and Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) 13-2311A, 13-2310A, 13-2407A 1, 2, and 3 and 13-2810A 4 and 13-2814.

*A.R.S. 13-2311-Fraudulent schemes and practices; willful concealment.

A. Notwithstanding any provision of the law to the contrary, in any matter related to the business conducted by any department or agency of this state or any political subdivision thereof, any person who, pursuant to a scheme or artifice to defraud or deceive, knowingly falsifies, conceals or covers up a material fact by any trick, scheme or device or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing such writing or document contains any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry is guilty of a class 5 felony.

II. Hon. Judge lie trespassed against Pro Se Lead/Appellants et al in CV-
CA 2011- as follows:

1. Violation of Appellant's Fourteenth Amendment Due Process and Equal Protections to receive a fair hearing in an un-biased Court room.
2. Violations of Pro Se Lead/ Appellants et al Fourteenth Amendment protected rights under U.S.C. Title 18, #4, #241 and #242 and # 371, and # 1001. (a) (1), (2) and (3), and # 1018 and # 1038b and #1623(a).and #1346 and #1349 and Title 28 § 1746.
3. Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) 13-1003 Conspiracy A, B, C & D
4. A.R.S. 13-1006 A 1, 2, &3, B
5. A.R.S. 13-2310A & E
6. A.R.S 13-2311 A & B
7. A.R.S 13-2407A1, 2, and 3, B. and C
8. A.R.S. 23-2701 1 & 3
9. A.R.S. 13-2702 A1&2
10. A.R.S. 13.2703 A and B
11. A.R.S. 13-2707
12. A.R.S. 13.2809 A1 and 2
12. A.R.S. 13.2810 A4
14. A.R.S. 13-203. Causal relationship between conduct and result; relationship to mental culpability: A1 & 2, and B 2

III. Even a non-legally trained person of reasonable intelligence that reads the Superior Court's Dismissal Order and then comparatively reads Hon. Judge Denial Order can see the Denial Order rests on a lie. Hon. Judge knowingly (1) Inserted lying text into his Denial Order (2) Used the lie to make his Decision. (3) His Decision trespassed Appellants et al Fourteenth Amendment Due Process and Equal Protection guarantees to receive a fair hearing.

IV. Pro Se Lead Plaintiff/Appellants et al, Moves for (1) Mistrial of CA-CV 2011- citing judicial Misconduct; (2) Change of Venue from Appeals Court Division One, (3) Motion for an Emergency Injunction to Enjoin the Defendants from ceding the political and jurisdictional sovereignty of the Appellants and the State of Arizona to the National Government under the un-Constitutional PL 99-503 pending disposition of Appellants Appeal (4) Motion to Quash Superior Court Invocation of Rule 38.1

V. Pro Se Lead Plaintiff/Appellants CA-CV 2011- provided Arizona Supreme Court Chief Judge Hon. Berch a second petition on July 10, 2011 seeking a civil administrative vs. felony disposition to Hon. Judge prima facie felony/misdemeanor conduct in CA-CV 2011- Petitioner first petition re. CA-CV 2011- to the Arizona Supreme Court seeking an administrative disposition of Hon. Judge conduct was rebuffed by Administrative Personnel and the Petition was returned by U.S. Mail to Appellant To date, both petitions for a civil administrative disposition to Hon. Judge lying conduct have languished leaving Appellant as Pro Se Lead Plaintiff/Appellants, no other means to secure the Appellant's Fourteenth Amendment Due Process and Equal Protections in an unbiased Judicial Forum except through disposition via felony/misdemeanor complaints of Judicial Misconduct by Hon. Judge