

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 14-374

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a pro tem superior court judge made improper rulings in a criminal case.

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.

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

Dated: December 17, 2014

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

George A. Riemer
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on December 17, 2014.

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

2014-374

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name:

___ Judge's name: ___

___ Date: ___

Instructions: You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Please describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times and places that will help us understand your concerns. You may attach additional pages but not original court documents. Print or type on one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your files.

JUDGE INSISTED I "PLEAD GUILTY" AT TRIAL, CASE

CT, TWICE ASO TOLD JURY IT WOULD BE "SHORT TRIAL". ACCEPTED ATTORNEY'S
MOTION EVIDENCE INADMISSIBLE, YET WOULD NOT STOP TRIAL. SAID: "A RATIONAL TRIER WOULD
FIND DEFENDANT GUILTY." WAS BIASED - WHETHER JURY HEARD HIM OR NOT. ALSO,
ILLEGALLY RAISED MY BAIL TO CASH WHEN I HAD NOT BROKEN TERMS OF
BOND. SENTENCED ME TO CATEGORY 2, WHEN CAT. 1 INDICA-
TED. I SENTENCED TO PRESUMPTIVE YEARS. OTHERS IN SIMILAR
CASES GET YEARS. MITIGATING HEARING DENIED, YET FACT I
DID NOT WAIVE RIGHT TO HEARING RECORDED.*

(COPIES OF TRANSCRIPT CAN BE SENT. I AFFIRM STATEMENTS ARE
TRUE. ATTACHED CLIPPING, PLUS OTHER EXPERIENCES.)

- COURT ALSO STATED "BURDEN OF (ALL) PROOF OF (ALL) ELEMENTS
IS ON STATE" YET VACILLATED ON THIS POINT WITH JURY INSTRUCTIONS. JURY
INSTRUCTIONS STATED THIS, THEN CONTRADICTED ON POINTS OF PRIOR POSSESSION, AND
SERVICEABILITY OF EVIDENCE. JURY INSTRUCTIONS PROVIDED BY ALSO SEEM
TO "FUDGE" A VERDICT. NEBULOUS LANGUAGE.

* PER ARS 13-703 (L), (B)(2)(H), 2.5 YEARS INDICATED; PLUS ARS 13-703 (K)
(E)(1), (E)(L), AND 13-701 (F); MITIGATING HEARING FACTORS MUST BE TAKEN IN
(ARS 13-703(Q) & (P))

(OTHER CASE LAW AND FEDERAL/ARIZONA LAW AND COURT PROCEDURES CAN ALSO
BE QUOTED REGARDING FLAGRANT VIOLATIONS AND BIASES BY BOTH COURT AND STATE.)