

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 16-235

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge made a series of procedural errors in a family law proceeding and filed a false professional misconduct complaint against him.

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(a).

Dated: October 19, 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 October 19, 2016.

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

Comp

2016 - 235

TO: ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT
1501 W. Washington Street, Suite #229
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

By:

COMPLAINT AGAINST

is at

has strong reason to believe actions are
prejudicial, fabricated undisclosed agenda based in bias and prejudice. It appears the
Arizona Bar is collaborating with the Judge in deliberately forcing the surrender of
violating constitutional liberties.

2.

This clearly shows there is no " position with the Bar.
and the Bar are collaborating in a prejudicial agenda against

3. In a trial conducted by the judge singled out
who was not at counsels table as he was not the attorney representing the
case that day. reprimanded interrupting the proceedings,
in front of the entire courtroom, staff, peers and other attorneys. Ridiculing him for not
wearing a jacket in the courtroom. had on a dress shirt/pants with a tie.
The client his office represented was an undocumented, spanish speaking immigrant.

4

another client who

represented

stated And even though the judge deliberately violated the law, which is a real ethical violation, the commission could find no ethical wrong doing by the judge.

5. This is a formal public record of the unethical misconduct by and it appears to be supported by the court and the Bar Association. The Bar Association has not been conducting itself as a neutral party. It has conducted itself in a manner that appears to be supporting speculative allegations in the prejudicial misadministration of justice. And wherein, as we have learned, the Bar Association no longer has jurisdiction to assert and unlawfully enforce it's penalties upon United States Citizens due to the fact that it is out of compliance with it's treaties with the United States and the Bar Association has not renewed it's charters to operate in the United States of America. All parties operating under the Bar Association under the color of law, enforcing unlawful conduct on citizens will be required to answer to their actions and the unlawful effects of the misadministration of justice. We are including this information to the Judicial Commission because it appears the Judicial Commission, the Bar Association, the Judges and the courts are all operating together without neutrality.

6

in a dishonest fabricated complaint with the Bar Association based only on speculative opinions, based on what alleges transpired in a hearing where the court did not have jurisdiction, wherein the Judges alleged speculations wield no judicial power. This is unethical conduct in the extreme.

7. When a judge violates the law, statutes and court rules, as as as
outlined below, especially when it is brought to his and the court's attention, and it is
deliberately not corrected, it is unethical. Any reasonable person or public citizen can
see that this is egregiously unethical. It remains to be seen still that even when it is
pointed straight out to the Judicial Commission, may still be disregarded as with the
other judge, due to the fact that it is not a neutral party but an alliance to the Judges (to
limit exposure) especially a judge who is part of the commission.

8. **Jurisdiction and Procedural Due Process.** The court possesses jurisdiction only to
the extent granted by the Constitution and Legislation. The court does not have legal
authority to pass any binding judgment or assertions on a case if the court does not
have both subject matter jurisdiction as well as personal jurisdiction. The court's
rights are granted thru procedural due process.

Procedural due process is imposed by the **Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth**
Amendment to the United States Constitution.

"No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities
of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or
property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the
equal protection of the laws."

XIV Amendment prevents the state from denying any person equal protection of
the laws.

had a judicial and ethical duty required by law to treat the
father and his attorney with fairness. The same fairness given
to the Mother & favored mother & against
father &

Principles of Personal Jurisdiction: Three fundamentals of personal jurisdiction
constrain the ability of courts in the United States to bind individuals or property to it's
decisions: CONSENT, POWER and NOTICE.

Every act of jurisdiction (personal & territorial) exercised by a judge without his territory, either by pronouncing sentence or carrying it into execution, is **Null**. An inferior court has no jurisdiction beyond what is expressly delegated;

1 Salk. 404, n.; Gilb. C.P. 188; 1Saund. 73; 2 Lord Raym. 1311; Bac. Ab. Courts & c., C, et seq; Bac. Ab. Pleas, E 2.

Principles of Personal Jurisdiction: Three fundamentals of personal jurisdiction constrain the ability of courts in the United States to bind individuals or property to its decisions: CONSENT, POWER and NOTICE.

ARS 12-122: General Power of Superior Court, If a court does not have personal jurisdiction over a party, its rulings or decrees cannot be enforced upon that party.

"Procedural due process" requires that the defendant receive lawful notice required by law of the pending action and an opportunity to be heard.

A. _____ ongoing conduct against _____ is guised in racial discrimination. _____ is a _____ in Arizona

A landmark case in racial discrimination is

B. In _____ unethical misconduct, in addition to illegally conducting a hearing, he implemented orders against father when father was not served, when father was not heard in court, when father did not give his consent and stripped father of his parenting rights when the court did not have personal jurisdiction over the father.

C. In _____ unethical misconduct he granted mother orders of child support, spousal maintenance and parenting time when mother did not serve father, when mother did not enter documents or meet the prerequisites required by family law procedures to the court or to the father to establish temporary orders. _____ issued orders, without jurisdiction, against the requirements of the rule of family law procedure while stripping father of his rights.

D. In [redacted] unethical conduct he inserted alleged facts in the record before the facts were ever raised by any of the parties in the case regarding the pivotal issue of Notice in support of [redacted] statements she raised after the judge. What the judge alleged was false and so was [redacted] statement, both deliberate, dishonest misrepresentations on the record, unethical disregard to the law, as we will prove in regard to the issue of "notice." What [redacted] and [redacted] were colluding in regards to "notice" to the father was not possible. Additionally, [redacted] did not verify any of [redacted] alleged non-evidence that father was served. He went along with [redacted] false allegations and misrepresentations, after the judge set the stage for her false assertions. And he disregarded the truth and fact that failed to meet the prerequisites required by family law procedure to implement temporary orders against father. To say the least, [redacted] misconduct was unlawful, unethical & unfair.

E. [redacted] actions were unethical and unfair, not only did the court not have jurisdiction, the Judge was in violation of the due process clause of 14th Amendment, by favoring the mother and [redacted] against the father and [redacted]

9. Notice and Service of Process

ARS Rules of Civ. Proc. Rule 4.1 Process of Service. Process of service is only effective by confirmation of the signature of the party being served or signature on a return receipt signed by the person served. And also requires the serving party shall file an "Affidavit of Service" with the court to verify the party was served. If the defendant is not served, the court has no jurisdiction.

No Affidavit of Service was filed with the court that the order to appear or petition for temporary orders was filed or served by [redacted] There is no record in the docket entries (history) that an "Affidavit of Service" was filed in court as required by 4.1.Proof of service, the Affidavit of Service was filed with the court is required by law.

**THE COMMISSION'S POLICY IS
TO POST ONLY THE FIRST FIVE
PAGES OF ANY DISMISSED
COMPLAINT ON ITS WEBSITE.**

**FOR ACCESS TO THE
REMAINDER OF THE
COMPLAINT IN THIS MATTER,
PLEASE MAKE YOUR REQUEST
IN WRITING TO THE
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL
CONDUCT AND REFERENCE
THE COMMISSION CASE
NUMBER IN YOUR REQUEST.**