State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 11-249	
Complainant:		No. 1418010004A
Judge:		No. 1418010004B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge ignored the law.

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, the members of the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judge did not violate the Code in this case. The commission has no jurisdiction to determine the legal sufficiency of the judge's decisions. 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

2011-249

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

•	Your Name:	Judge's Name:	Date:	9-21-11
]	provide all of the important plain paper of the same size back of any page. You ma	n your own words what the judge did that you believe to names, dates, times, and places related to your core to explain your complaint, and you may attach add y attach copies of any documents you believe will help	mplaint. You can litional pages. Do	use this form or not write on the
		ice The United States Legal Sys	indes pensable stem is base	d upon
-	composed of Mu	that AN independent, impartial, a new memor of integrity, will	inferbret e	and Apply
-			and the cole	of LAW.
-	InHesent in Al HAT Judges, inc	lividually And collectively, Must	respect AN	d Honor Hle
-	Judicial office b confidence in	the Legal system.	AA WATWAM	ud enthrice
-	Judges stank At All times, A	nd avoid both impropriety a	. Judicial and the A	office
	of imbrobies b		bareonal I!	ies. They L greatest
•		mpetence."	ndence, in	ytilaitaq.
_	Superiour Co	ourt Judge. HA	is violated	Hle
	Acisona code of	sufidence in the duticional: 2	Compliance. 2(Impartia	lity and
2	compuication).	B) (Energy the right to be How	d); And 2.9(Ex parte
_	Me to plend NO	11 Judge boke Contest to my charges when ?	Rule 1.1 b	y not allowing file prizona
	·	•		•

Rules of criminal procedures clearly Alones a defendant Heat option. He specificly said that I did not have a right to plead NO contest to the court. As I said, Arizona Law begins to differ. Also Rule 2630 was broken by using me to enter in a plead bargin with the state on 8-11-11.

Du 9-81-11 Judge broke Rule 1. Again by Not Allowing me the Right to challenge his diction, when arisona Rules of Jimminal Rocedure, Rule 161 (6) clearly states that I may exacts that right at Anytime. But the said I could only exercise that right at trial. Then he bake Rule 1.2 by resising to state on the record his authority to not follow the Arizona Rule. He would not even require state areser to his diction at all, the violating Rule 2.2 of the code. Also, is it not exparte communication when the state can whisper with the hidge? Because that's what they secretary and then the secretary with the hidge? Because that's with the propers at my court takes.

This is the 3^{sd} complaint on a dodge that I three filed, and it seems that no one cases about the Judges' Misconduct. If the Law states that I have a custian Right and a Judge Hatanthy devices me that Right with absoluty no provision of law supporting his position, is that not a violation to the Arizona Code of Judicial conduct? What about when a Judge resuss

to questions on legal support of His position?

Rule 1.2, (Promoting Confidence in the Judiciary)

A Judge estall act at all times in a manner that

promotes public confidence in the independence,
intergrity, and impactiality of the Judiciary, and
shall avoid both, impropriety and the apparance
of impropriety.

Rule 1.1, (compliance with the Law)

A Juggle shall comply with the Law, including

the code of Judicial conduct.

These are quotes (abriausly) from the cade it self And lust as deviately the Judge the broken the provision's of it by not complying with the law And by acting secretive About it. And if a Judge does the Alberties the Alberties, they the Alberties at the cade so that people are not confined and think attenties. Because when I good the code of Judicial conduct, I got the impression that this was the Angency that dealt with Judges who violate the Rules of procedure. If I am nistaken, then I appropriate and address of the appropriate.

And Hority. Thous you.