

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 13-157

Judge:	No. 1061014703A
Complainant:	No. 1061014703B

ORDER

The complainant alleged three superior court judges violated his constitutional 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 review, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judges did not violate the Code in this case. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: August 1, 2013.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George Riemer

George A. Riemer
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judges on August 1, 2013.

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

JUN 24 2013

JUNE 19, 2013

Commission on Judicial Conduct
 1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229
 Phoenix, AZ 85007

RE: ABUSE OF DISCRETION, JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT, ETHICS VIOLATIONS:
 HAVING BEEN COMMITTED IN

DEAR CONCERNED:

FOR THE SAKE OF CLARITY, THE CONTENT OF THIS LETTER SHALL BE DELIVERED BY THE AUTHOR,

IN THIRD PERSON FORMAT, INCLUDING ALL ARTICLES FOR REVIEW. ALL RELEVANT ISSUES ARE APPENDED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF OCCURRENCE, WITH ALL EXHIBITS INDIVIDUALLY PREFIXED INFORMATIONALLY.

WAS ARRESTED ON MARCH 30, 2012 IN ARIZONA, AND CHARGED WITH TEN FELONY COUNTS OF VARIOUS NATURE. LACK OF EVIDENCE PRESCRIBED DISMISSALS IN ALL BUT THREE OF THE ORIGINAL TEN CHARGES; AND ON APRIL 10, 2012, THE AUTHOR WAS INDICTED ON TWO COUNTS OF ATTEMPTED ARMED ROBBERY AND ONE COUNT OF FLEEING FROM A LAW ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE

AS SUPPORTED BY THE RECORD, HAS BEEN REFUSED WHATE PROTECTION AS ESTABLISHED UNDER U.S.C.A. CONST. AMEND. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, AND 14; OCCURRING AT EVERY JUNCTURE AND ALL LEVELS OF THE PROCEEDINGS. A TRIAL HAS BEEN THE AUTHORS ONLY OBJECTIVE JUDICIAL INDICEMENT; UNFORTUNATELY, AS TRIAL COURT, ATROCIOUSLY HAS SUBJECTED TO A SERIES OF DEMONSTRATIONS WHEREBY

JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATIVE CAN ONLY BE DETERMINED AS ARBITRARY, CAPRICIOUS, DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE, MISCONDUCT, ABUSE OF POWER, ABUSE OF DISCRETION, BIASED, AND PREJUDICIAL. WITH OCTOBER 12, 2013 AS SCHEDULED TRIAL DATE - NINETEEN MONTHS AFTER ARREST - THE NATURE RELEVANT TO JUSTICIABILITY IN THIS INSTANCE MUST COME INTO QUESTION.

INITIAL COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL FABRICATED A MOTION FOR MENTAL HEALTH EXAMINATION AND STAY OF PROCEEDINGS ON AUGUST 7, 2012; THE TRIAL COURT WAS DUPLICIOUS IN ACCEPTING. AT THE TIME IT WAS WELL ESTABLISHED COUNSEL'S ASSISTANCE HAD BEEN INEFFECTIVE; AND IT WAS IN RESPONSE TO REFUSAL TO PLEAD GUILTY THAT THE AFOREMENTIONED MENTAL HEALTH MOTION WAS CREATED. FORTUNATELY, COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCES TO COUNSEL'S SUBTERFUGE CREATED AN OPPORTUNITY FOR APPOINTMENT OF NEW COUNSEL. REPRESENTATION REMAINED INEFFECTIVE; ADAPTANT TRIAL-OBJECTIVE BEING THE ROOT OF THE PROBLEM.

ON DECEMBER 10, 2012, THE TRIAL-COURT GRANTED THE AUTHOR PRO SE STATUS; APPOINTING ADVISORY-COUNSEL AT THE SAME TIME. THE RECORD REVEALS THIS BEGAN AN ORCHESTRATED MANIPULATION ON THE PART OF THE TRIAL-COURT AND THE

JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT TOOK AN EPIC PROPORTION AND REMAINED ISOLATED FROM ANY FORM OF ASSISTANCE.

ON MARCH 15, 2013, THE AUTHOR WAS BEGUILED BY NEWLY APPOINTED ADVISORY-COUNSEL, IN OFFICIALLY RELENGISHING PRO SE STATUS; AND ON APRIL 16, 2013

WAS NAMED TRIAL-ATTORNEY SINCE THAT TIME, COUNSEL HAS DONE NOTHING RELEVANT TO PREPARATORY DEFENSE; REFUSING TO RESPOND TO ALL ATTEMPTS AT COMMUNICATION. AGAIN, TRIAL COURT HAS DEMONSTRATED DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE; FAILING TO RESPOND TO THE AUTHOR'S REQUESTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE INTERVENTION.