

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-225

Complainant: No. 1449610307A

Judge: No. 1449610307B

ORDER

The complainant alleged several superior court judges are violating his post-conviction relief rights as well as the rights of several other defendants by not ruling on motions. He further alleges an attorney who is now a judge and another judge engaged in illegal conduct involving his child custody rights.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judges 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 information provided by the complainant and the electronic court records in the various cases mentioned by the complainant, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judges did not violate the Code in these cases. The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of the judges' various rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: September 13, 2012.

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 13, 2012.

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

AUG 20 2012

Re:

AUGUST 14, 2012

JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT

MS. PERKINS,

I AM WRITING TO YOU TO INFORM YOU OF AN ONGOING PERVERSIVE CONDUCT VIOLATING PRO-SE CRIMINAL DEFENDANTS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS.

IT IS BECOMING COMMON PRACTICE FOR AT LEAST A FEW JUDGES TO NOT RULE ON DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS VIOLATING THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION ARTICLE 6 § 21 THE SUPREME COURTS RULE 81 CANON 3 (8)

I KNOW OF SEVERAL PRO-SE DEFENDANTS THAT DO NOT GET THEIR TIMELY FILED MOTIONS RULED ON. THIS ENABLES THE AG'S OR COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICES TO LATER ARGUE THAT THE DEFENDANT IS PROCEDURALLY PRECLUDED TO SEEK HABEAS REVIEW.

THE JUDGES THAT I KNOW ARE INVOLVED ARE:

THESE ARE DIFFERENT CASES, AT LEAST 5 CASES AND NUMEROUS MOTIONS. MOST MOTIONS ARE A FIRST TIME REQUEST FOR EXTENSION TO FILE.

OUR SITUATION IS UNIQUE AS WE DO NOT HAVE ACCESS TO COPIES OR EVEN A LAW LIBRARY REGULARLY DUE TO STAFF SHORTAGES ETC...

WE HAVE GONE AS MUCH AS 3 1/2 WEEKS WITHOUT LEGAL ACCESS.

SOME OF THE MOTIONS I SPEAK OF ARE:

CR-

7/13/09 MOTION TO HOLD DEFENSE COUNSEL IN
CONTEMPT FOR VIOLATING COURT ORDERS
TO TURN OVER THE DEFENDANTS TRIAL FILE -
NO RULING

11/22/09 MOTION TO EXTEND TIME FOR FILING PCR.
(FIRST REQUEST AREP 32.4) - NO RULING

PREJUDICE - I WAS UNABLE TO PRESENT A MEANINGFUL RULE
32, AS MANDATED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, BECAUSE THE COURT WOULD
NOT FORCE COUNSEL TO TURN OVER HIS FILE. THE SECOND PREJUDICE IS BY
THE COURT NOT RULING ON THE (1ST TIME) REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF
TIME TO FILE. THE AG'S OFFICE IS NOW ARGUING ON HABEAS REVIEW THAT
I SHOULD BE PRECEDURALLY PRECLUDED SINCE MY PETITION WAS UN-
TIMELY

CR-

ON 4/06/12 THE DEFENDANT REQUESTED AN EXTENSION TO FILE HIS
PETITION FOR REVIEW AND CITED GOOD CAUSE. THE COURT DID NOT RULE.
ON 5/30/12 THE DEFENDANT REQUESTED AN EXPEDITED RULING FOR THE
RECONSIDERATION ON HIS REQUEST FOR EXTENSION TO FILE, AGAIN THE
COURT REFUSED TO RULE. PREJUDICE IS NOW THE APPEALS COURT WILL NOT
ACCEPT HIS PETITION FOR REVIEW FILED ON 5/23/12. ON 6/05/12 THE
DEFENDANT FILED A SUCCESSIVE RULE 32. ALL HAVE GONE UN-RULED
UPON.

CR-

THIS DEFENDANT REQUESTED TRANSCRIPTS ON 6/06/12. NO RULING.

HE FILED A REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE. AGAIN NO RULING.

CR-

CR-

CR-

MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL 2/10/12. NO RULING. PREJUDICE BY DEFENSE COUNSEL ON FIRST RIGHT OF APPEAL. REQUEST FOR COURT ORDER FOR ATTORNEY'S FEE FILED ON 3/18/12. NO RULING. MOTION TO RECONSIDER FILED ON 5/30/2012. NO RULING.

THESE ARE JUST A FEW OF THE MORE FLAGRANT EXAMPLES OF THE MARICOPA COUNTY JUDGES UNWRITTEN POLICY THAT IS WIDE SPREAD DENYING DUE PROCESS TO PRO SE DEFENDANTS. THERE WILL BE SOME DIFFERENCES IN FILING DATES PURSUANT TO STATE V. PRUITT. DOCUMENTS MAILED FROM PRISON ARE CONSIDERED FILED THE DAY IT IS PUT IN THE PRISON MAILBOX.

PLEASE LOOK INTO THESE MATTERS AS PRO SE LITIGANTS ARE BEING PREJUDGED BY THE INACTIONS OF MARICOPA COUNTY JUDGES.

SINCERELY,

cc:

ON A SEPERATE ISSUE, WHICH IS AN ETHICAL ONE?

I WENT THROUGH A NASTY CHILD CUSTODY CASE WITH TWO PROMINENT VALLEY DIVORCE ATTORNEYS. AT ONE POINT, I WAS OFFERED \$100,000⁰⁰ THROUGH MY ATTORNEY WHO RECEIVED THE OFFER FROM OPPOSING COUNSEL TO GIVE UP CUSTODY OF MY DAUGHTER. THERE IS DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE OF THE OFFER. ONE OF THE ATTORNEY'S, 6 MONTHS LATER, WAS APPOINTED TO BE A JUDGE IN MARICOPA COUNTY

SHOULDN'T THIS OFFER HAVE BEEN REPORTED TO THE JUDGE ASSIGNED TO THE CASE? IS THIS AN ETHICAL VIOLATION?

IF THIS IS THE TYPE OF PERSON BEING APPOINTED TO THE BENCH, IT IS NO WONDER THAT THE AFORE MENTIONED ACTIONS, OR INACTIONS, ARE HAPPENING.

AT ANOTHER POINT DURING MY CUSTODY BATTLE, A DOCUMENTED FBI INFORMANT CONTACTED MY PREVIOUS DIVORCE ATTORNEY WITH SERIOUS ALLEGATIONS OF ILLEGAL CONDUCT BETWEEN OPPOSING COUNSEL AND THE JUDGE ASSIGNED TO THE CASE.

I WAS ONLY ABLE TO VERIFY THAT THE TWO WENT TO LAW SCHOOL TOGETHER. UNFORTUNATELY I WAS ARRESTED ON UNRELATED CHARGES PRIOR TO VERIFYING THE REST OF THE INFORMATION.

WE DO NOT HAVE INTERNET ACCESS; HOW CAN I FIND OUT IF TWO PARTICULAR JUDGES HAVE ANY COMPLAINTS AGAINST THEM?