

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 15-323

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court judge was prejudiced against him and violated his constitutional rights in a criminal matter.

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.

Commission members Margaret Downie, Peter Eckerstrom, Anna Mary Glaab, Art Hinshaw, and J. Tyrrell Taber did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: February 5, 2016

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 February 5, 2016.

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

2015-323

# Judicial Complaint Statement of Fact

has a personal vendetta  
 against me because I'm a  
 and a victim of  
 abuse. has refused to grant me a  
 hearing to present evidence of my  
 as a to properly  
 reduce my prison sentence  
 see has Order: proceeding dismissed.  
 Motion's denied  
 See Prisoning

is personally  
 adverse to allow me to present this evidence,  
 post-conviction, has an apparent  
 personal animosity against me  
 and told me that he was going to  
 " because

I  
 He refuses to allow me to present  
 evidence of my  
 my and my victimization  
 from  
 over →

When the sentencing lawyer  
filed a motion requesting a  
Mental health exam,  
denied the motion.

What kind of Judge refuses to even  
look at the evidence of

; except a bias one?  
When I presented a

new claim that  
was disbarred for violating his  
clients' constitutional rights and  
being under the influence of

in Court;  
denied that claim without  
an evidentiary hearing.

What is  
a version to claims as  
mitigation evidence. Was he a victim,  
himself; a perpetrator, or both.

I can't read his mind. I do  
know he has acted, contrary to  
my Constitutional rights

time  
these Facts are the truth