

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 11-247

Complainant: No. 1428200307A

Judge: No. 1428200307B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge improperly denied his request to proceed pro per and ignored his statements that his attorney was working against him.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judge engaged in conduct that violated the provisions of Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution or 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 reviewing the complaint along with the supplemental information provided by the complainant, the members of the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judge did not violate the Code in this case. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: November 10, 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 November 10, 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

2011-247

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your Name: _____ Judge's Name: The Judge that date Date: 9-18-11

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.

ON SEPT 8, 2011 DEFENDANT WAS AT A WITNESS PRELIMINARY HEARING, WHEN DEFENDANT ADDRESSED THE COURT WHILE ON RECORD COMPLAINING ABOUT HIS FELL IN ATTORNEY WHO WAS GOING TO HELP THE STATE PROSECUTOR FIND PROBABLE CAUSE, WHICH IS NOT THE TRUE NATURE AND CAUSE OF THE ACCUSATIONS. THIS IS THE REASON WHY THAT FELL IN ATTORNEY FOR MICHAEL SULLIVAN WANTED TO WITHDRAW FROM THE CASE. DEFENDANT ADDRESSED THE E.D.C. COURT ON SEPT 8, 2011. THAT OFFICER MULLEN WAS THREATEN ME ON AUG 28, 2011 WAY BEFORE AN ARREST. THE TRUE NATURE OF THIS CASE IS DEFENDANT WAS GIVEN A CITATION 23-8 AND THREATENED FOR NOT WANTING TO SIGN THE CITATION. DEFENDANT CALL 911-NON-EMERGENCY TO REPORT THIS THREAT ON THE ARRESTING OFFICER #9221. DEFENDANT CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA, ARTICLE II SECTION (2), (3), AND THE UNITED STATE CONSTITUTION 1ST, 4TH, 5TH, 14TH AMENDMENT VIOLATION WAS NOT RECOGNIZE BY THE COURT NOR JUDGE ON SEPT 8, 2011. THE SUBJECT MATTER IS THE TRUE NATURE WHICH IS THE CITATION #14232604 FOR VIOLATION OF CITY CODE 23-8. CONTENDING. THE E.D.C. JUDGE DENIED LEWIS THE RIGHT TO REPRESENT HIMSELF ON THAT DATE. THE E.D.C. JUDGE SHOWED NO CONCERN ABOUT ME BEING THREAT BY THIS OFFICER MULLEN #9221.

(Attach additional sheets as needed.)