

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 16-303

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge was biased against him and violated his constitutional rights 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(a).

Commission member Peter J. Eckerstrom did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: January 31, 2017

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 January 31, 2017.

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

2016-303

Commission on Judicial Conduct

1501 W. WASHINGTON ST. SUITE 229

PHOENIX AZ 85007

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

2138 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON DC 20515

UNITED STATES SENATE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

224 DIRKSEN SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON DC 20510

RE:

DEAR COMMISSION:

I RECENTLY WAS IN FRONT OF JUDGE
OF THE

DURING A "SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE" THE FOLLOWING EVENTS
AND COMMENTS WERE MADE TO ME BY JUDGE :

I, Judge LEFT THE BENCH AND CAME TO SIT
ACROSS FROM ME DURING THE SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE,
THIS WAS AFTER A PRIVATE MEETING IN "CHAMBERS"

WHICH I WAS NOT PRIVATEY TOO. AFTER BEING SEATED
HE MADE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

A. "

"

B. "

" "

C. "

" ?

?

?"

D. "

"

DUE PROCESS REQUIRES THAT A JUDGE POSSESS NEITHER
ACTUAL NOR APPARENT BIAS. TUMELY V. OHIO 273 U.S. 510 522
IF ACTUAL OR APPARENT JUDICIAL BIAS EXISTS;
28 U.S.C. § 144 AND 455 PROVIDE MECHANISMS
FOR THIS JUDGES RECUSAL.

Judge FORCED ME INTO A PLEA DEAL
VIOLATING HIS LOYALTY OATH OF OFFICE: AZ CONST. ART. 6 § 26
U.S. CONST. ART. 6 § 3

I REQUEST THAT A FULL INVESTIGATION BE CONDUCTED
INTO THIS JUDGE, AND THAT UNTIL THE FINDINGS ARE RELEASED
HE BE SUSPENDED WITHOUT PAY. THIS MAN HAS
NOT ONLY VIOLATED MY RIGHTS, BUT HAS PUT HIMSELF

ABOVE THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION IN WHICH
HE HAS SWORN TO COMPLY WITH.
A.R.S. 16(A) RULES OF CRIM. PR.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED