

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 13-007

Judge:	No. 1459810885A
Complainant:	No. 1459810885B

ORDER

The complainant alleged a pro tem superior court judge violated his constitutional rights.

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

Dated: February 20, 2013.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George Riemer

George A. Riemer
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on February 20, 2013.

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

2013-007

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your Name:

Judge's Name:

Date: 12-27-2012

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 11-27-2012 @ approx 8:45 am I defendant went before
recommender @ the Maricopa County Superior Court, where the
recommender judge advised was totally ignorant of
misconduct action judge used that decided to deprive my freedom
of speech defense right of the constitutional policy 1st Amendment
I defendant had received; was refuse by judge
while trying to verify the truth of the assuming allegation in they
said case #2012. A aggravated assault on
police officers said happen to V-01; I Ap-01 defendant above had
nothing to do with V-01 getting assaulted judicial. So during the
hearing I defendant Ap-01 tried to acknowledge the recommender
Speaker of the assumption accusation of the police officers said
Case #2012. had decide to refuse me defendant Ap-01 rights
of the rule 1st Amendment Freedom of Speech for my production
movement defense's individual rights. that judge wasn't
to deprive those allegation of the 14th Amendment of my independent
Civil right's Constitutional privileges right's Judicial Commission that
recommender wasn't to avail those phase of Ap-01 defendant
right's defendant have in they said case #2012. 142941 defendant
Ap-01 had nothing to do with; to be receiving unconstitutional actions
of due process of the Course Constitution law policy regulation Amendment's
right's by recommender of law Commission Judicial here in the
State of Arizona on as defendant in they said case #2012. of suspense
to have been done under police officer's said Victim-01 I Ap-01

(Attach additional sheets as needed.)

had nothing to do with relation suppose to been done against victim
 Commission Judicial or any pre-incident contacted against V-02 either, I defendant
 tried to explain my words to the judge to understand in Maricopa
 County Superior Court in PEE; downtown Commission Judicial; to understand I Ap-02
 defendant had nothing to do with the case #2012. then the
 Judge recommender in PEE; downtown Maricopa County Superior Court got
 a attributed, then straight up denied me Ap-02 defendant's freedom of speech
 & speech right to the Constitution 1st Amendment & 14th Amendment that Maricopa County
 Superior Court judge recommender had no right to deprive the policy
 Amendment's unduly; after asking me defendant Ap-02 questioners
 about the civil case #2012. police officers had arrested defendant me for
 suspicious of assassin's unnecessary; unreasonable while other Migrations
 Person's was in the area doing the time Victim-02. incident
 "contacted suppose to happened; I Ap-02 had nothing to do with or
 my relation incident contacted with; I defendant tried to explain
 information of information; knowledge of accusation to the Superior
 Court Judge that suggested process ruling over the charge to a regulation sentence
 & rule 22 recommender order over the case #2012. in Maricopa County
 Court in PEE; downtown Commission Judicial before the ruling was entered; I
 defendant tried to speech on my on behalf onto the recommender
 when she got a attributed out of hand for no apparent reason, during the time
 I defendant began to try to explain on my on freedom of speech behalf;
 Judge denied me defendant with her attributed misheard actions. that her
 words of order spoken for me defendant to stop speaking, cause she seem
 as she couldn't hear to understand my statement; then order me defendant
 unduly from my Constitution freedom of speech rights 1st;
 was obligated that shouldn't have been availed rights of privileges of my rights on
 defendant. defense laws to the Constitution imposition to defendant innate
 rights behalf in the Constitution established amendment that wasn't to be deprive
 from defendant civil rights; would like matter's investigated
 Commission Judicial for action to be taking do to above information complaint statement I
 defendant am placing this judicial complaint from against Maricopa County Superior
 Court Judge recommender for depriving my defense privileges of my freedom of speech
 Constitution Amendment rights judicial Commission that wasn't to be deprive from my defense
 shall before the judge about they case #2012. after recommender Judge ask
 question...