

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-241

Complainant: No. 1449900631A

Judge: No. 1449900631B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a municipal court judge improperly interfered with his examination of defense witnesses, and a superior court judge was complicit in denying him justice by dismissing his appeal on a technicality.

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 all of the information provided by the complainant, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judges did not violate the Code in this case. The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of the judges' rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: October 4, 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 October 4, 2012.

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

7-30-12

SEP 07 2012

Mr. George Riemer,

Per our (short) telephone conversation wherein I requested this Departments mailing address and confirmed your office has electronic access to the documents within these court files.

Please review the following Lower and Superior/Appeals Court actions, rulings and/or decisions. I respectfully request that you obtain and listen to/review said CD of Lower Court proceedings as same is blatant egregious malicious with impunity

MISCONDUCT by Lower Court JUDGE and DISGRACEFUL, if not also criminal.

Followed thereafter by ACCOMPLICE and PARTNER IN CRIMES: JUDGE

Case No. LC2011-

Lower Court Case No.

I requested a copy of the proceedings in writing, rather than CD, due to Post Concussion Syndrome symptoms, in which I provided a copy of a letter dated 9-3-10, from The Social Security Administration stating therein:

"YOUR NEXT DISABILITY REVIEW WILL BE SCHEDULED ABOUT MAY OF 2017".

Judge so stated in denying my Appeal that my:

"merely mentioning an argument is not enough".

However, the Plaintiff "merely mentioning":

"keep away from the dogs", is (so)?

PLUS, I ARTICULATED MUCH MORE THAN "merely mentioning a(n)y argument".

My request was DENIED. WHICH, IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING, VIOLATED MY RIGHTS UNDER:

"THE" AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT", among others.

AND THEN, AFTER SAID COURTS DECISION TO DENY MY APPEAL, BASED ON:

"SAID COURTS SERIOUSLY FLAWED OPINION THAT;

- 1) this individuals merely mentioning: "keep away from the dogs".
was allegedly sufficient to preserve their UNLAWFUL ORDER.

2) WHILE MY STATING IN AS ARTICULATE DETAIL AS POSSIBLE:

"ALL of "THE" VOLUMINOUS SPECIFIC

INDIVIDUAL BLATANT/EGREGIOUS/with malice/with impunity/(possible criminal offenses)

COMMITTED BY THE LOWER COURT AND NOW PERPETUATED BY SAID "SUPERIOR" COURTS'

KNOWINGLY VOLUNTARILY BECOMING COMPLICIT, IF NOT WORSE, WITH ALL SAID ACTS.

3) AND THIS IS "justice" IN PHOENIX, MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA, USA?

LOL/LOL/LOL/LOL/LOL/LOL/LOL/LOL/LOL/LOL/LOL/LOL/LOL/LOL/LOL/LOL/LOL/LOL/LOL

I NOW respectively request a fair and just REVIEW

RE: what I believe far exceeds JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT by both herein named courts".

"IF I had "kept away from the dogs",

THE DOGS WOULD BE DEAD.period. DUE TO NO WATER ON TOO MANY 100+ DEGREE DAYS,

IN WHICH ALL IT TAKES IS BUT ONE (1) SUCH DAY WITH NO WATER FOR DOGS TO DIE.

One other reason this individual kicked me to the curb WHILE I WERE STILL CURRENT WITH MY RENT WAS THAT:

"I HAD CONTACTED ANIMAL CONTROL AND REPORTED her TO SAME AND she, ESPECIALLY BEING AN: EXTREME CONTROL FREAK of EXPONENTIAL NARCISSISTIC PROPORTIONS

was NOT IN CONTROL of ME, LET ALONE of her own self".

Owner of the house' son, 27-28 years at that time, was NOT @ HIS MOTHERS HOME 80+% OF THE TIME, FROM FEBRUARY THROUGH APRIL 2011, SOME 70 DAYS AN NIGHTS, plus or minus.

Ms. would take her ONE (1) DOG WITH HER WHEN SHE WENT TO SLEEP AT NIGHT,

LEAVING BOTH OF HER 27-28 YEAR OLD SONS

PIT BULLS alone.

THE plaintiff' son owned TWO (2) said PIT BULLS, daughter, Cinnamon, then some 19 months and about 40 pounds, and the mother of Cinnamon, then some 3-4 years and about 50 pounds.

The herein plaintiff, Ms. BRAGGED/BOASTED IN THAT SHE NAMED THE MOTHER PIT BULL:

"CANNABIS" (POT)".

Ms. each and every night:
LEFT BOTH PIT BULLS UNATTENDED AT NIGHT AND FREE TO ROAM THE HOUSE ALL NIGHT,
EVERY NIGHT (WHILE I WERE ATTEMPTING TO SLEEP); EXCEPT FOR THE MANY, MANY NIGHTS
CINNAMON WOULD, FROM THE SOFA IN THE LIVING ROOM:

HOWL AT THE TOP OF HER YOUNG AND HEALTHY LUNGS USUALLY @ ABOUT 4:00 A.M.

because plaintiff, Ms. son and OWNER OF SAID PIT BULLS WAS OUT:

"BY HIS OWN ADMISSION: "druggin' around"

(Plaintiffs son, DID agree to as name for his Pit Bull)

AND herein plaintiff, Ms. some 95+% OF THE TIME,
WOULD NOT OPEN HER DOOR TO ALLOW CINNAMON IN WITH HER;

AND WHO DO YOU THINK GOT OUT OF BED 95+% OF THE TIME
(some SEVENTY (70) NIGHTS during February 2011 TO April 2011)
USUALLY ABOUT 4:00 A.M. TO TEND TO then 19 MONTH OLD CINNAMON.
(NO ? here as IS rhetorical.period.)
DURING ALL OF SAID NIGHTS, WHERE and/or WITH WHOM did CINNAMON SLEEP.
(NO ? here as is rhetorical)
Monday through Friday plaintiff was at work and plaintiffs son
"chronically/perpetually absent"

all three (3) dogs were "HOME ALONE" (except, for me, of course):

and I was suppose to: "stay away from the dogs":
HOW, was I supposed to? (? IS HERE, AS ANSWER IS REQUIRED)!

"THE" most blatant and obvious aspect of testimony that this "NARCISSISTIC OBESE female
gave" was about:

"how she did not go out with me";

"in which I SO STATED AS AN INTEGRAL ASPECT OF MY APPEAL:
"I NEVER asked her to go out with me;

I WAS NOT NEVER EVER interested.period. NOT IN ANY MANNER, SHAPE NOR FORM".period.

AND ANY individual let alone an actual sitting "SUPERIOR" court judge (and Lower court judge)
could AND should have:

"Seen "this" PRECISELY for what it is plain, simple RETALIATION for my NOT being
interested in "her".period.

And not necessarily, solely, due to her size, rather;

1) her REFUSAL TO ATTEMPT TO ADDRESS HER OBESITY and IMMINENT HEALTH RELATED ISSUES;

2) her BLATANT/EGREGIOUS/CONSTANT FELONIOUS ANIMAL CRUELTY ON A DAILY BASIS TO her OWN DOG,

PLUS ALSO ON A DAILY BASIS TO her SONS TWO (2) PIT BULLS;

"so help ME God".

I was NOT told what type of "pets" lived in the house when I first called, FOR OBVIOUS REASONS.

however, I AM an animal lover of most pets and all three of these dogs took to me, instantly (which I AM absolutely certain brought jealousy from plaintiff's son and from plaintiff, her self). STILL, I would NOT have even gone to look at the "ROOM FOR RENT"

IF plaintiff had been HONEST UP FRONT with me

which further speaks volumes RE: her character and credibility, or lack thereof. APPARENTLY, I should have seen "this coming" STRAIT AWAY, AS:

"LIARS FROM DAY ONE (1) ARE LIARS EVERYDAY".Amen!".

and BOTH herein Lower and Superior/Appeals Courts share equal and/or greater lack of credibility as plaintiff and ALL are as COMPLETELY TOTALLY COMPLICIT AND GUILTY AS "the" other";

"with malice"; "with impunity".

With history now having ACCURATELY recorded "the" events of and "their" failed attempts to cover up by:

"THE CATHOLIC CHURCH", "PENN STATE", et al, and the recent events of "The Secret Service",

"LAWFUL/PROPER/ETHICAL ACCOUNTABILITY IS simply IMMINENT".

Look no further than is no longer with us, his family".

This man had his own statue while still living and was once (past tense) of impeccable character and reputation

does NOT even have "these", anymore".

HOWEVER, these courts are still here and "both of these courts" must be held lawfully and ethically accountable.

In that Mr. and his then employer for about half of a century have been (PAST tense) held ethically, if nor (yet) lawfully so,

these courts and their mere alleged human judges, so shall also, so help me God".

I have learned over the years that the one (1) thing that The Laws of This Land AND God have in common

is that neither are known to move swiftly. however, WHEN either and/or DO so move they both ARE known to move

Mightily with Power and Authority to render Justice.

and NOW we will see IF this Arizona Commission of Judicial Conduct is just.

Thank you,

cc: Commission on Judicial Conduct
1501 West Washington Street # 229
Phoenix, Arizona
85007

cc: file