

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 16-315

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge attempted to coerce him into revealing information that he believed was confidential between him and his attorney in his 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.

After review, 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: December 21, 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 December 21, 2016.

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

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Comp
2016-315

IN THE CASE OF
ON

vs.

I APPEARED BEFORE

COURT WITH

, MY

NEW COURT-APPOINTED ATTORNEY,
ALSO PRESENT, AS INSTRUCTED ON

BY THE

, WAS

. ALTHOUGH I'D PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED A WRITTEN MOTION REQUESTING HER REMOVAL FROM MY CASE, FOR WITH HOLDING INFORMATION AND INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE, POINTEDLY REMARKED THAT HIS MOTIVES, WHICH WERE SEALED BY COURT ORDER, WAS SOLELY DUE TO HER REQUEST, NOT MINE. INCIDENTALLY, IVE BEEN INCARCERATED SINCE AFTER INTRODUCTIONS IN COURT ON

ASKED

IF THE "MATTER",

ALLEGEDLY BETWEEN SHE AND I, HAD BEEN RESOLVED, TO WHICH SHE RESPONDED NO, IT HAD NOT. SHE THEN REQUESTED, AND WAS GRANTED PERMISSION TO APPROACH THE BENCH, AND

THEN

GESTURED FOR ALSO TO APPROACH. THE TWO COUNTY ATTORNEYS HOWEVER REMAINED WHERE THEY WERE SEATED. THE MICROPHONE WAS THEN MUTED AND THEY COLLABORATED FOR WHAT SEEM TO BE

. WHEN THE ATTORNEYS RETURNED FROM THE BENCH, INSTRUCTED ME IF

I POSSESSED ANY DOCUMENTS FROM MY 15.1 BRADY DISCOVERY INFORMATION AND MATERIALS, WHICH COULD POTENTIALLY AFFECT THE INTEGRITY OF PEOPLE INVOLVED IN THIS CASE, THAT I WAS TO RETURN IT

()

IMMEDIATELY. STATING THAT I DID NOT UNDERSTAND, I ASKED THE [REDACTED] FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE DOCUMENT'S HE ALLUDED TO. IGNORING MY RESPONSE, [REDACTED] THEN DEFERRED TO [REDACTED] FOR INSTRUCTIONS ON COMPLIANCE WITH HIS ORDER. ODDLY, HE THEN ASKED IF I UNDERSTOOD, AND USING WHAT I PERCEIVED AS A SUBTLE FORM OF COERCION, ATTEMPTED TO SOLICIT A VERBAL STATEMENT OF UNDERSTANDING FROM ME. THEN, WITH A SHOCKINGLY AGGRESSIVE TONE, [REDACTED] BALKED AT ME TO RETURN THE INFORMATION WITH IN [REDACTED] DAYS. AGAIN, STATING THAT I DID NOT UNDERSTAND WHICH INFORMATION HE WAS ALLUDING TO. HE AGAIN REDIRECTED ME TO [REDACTED] FOR COMPLIANCE INSTRUCTIONS TO HIS ORDER. IN RETROSPECT,

[REDACTED] APPEARED TO BE METICULOUSLY CHOOSING HIS WORDS THAT WOULD BE REMAINING ON THE PUBLIC COURT RECORD. THIS ALARMED ME. TO MY KNOWLEDE, ATTORNEY/ CLIENT RELATIONSHIP IS ONE WITH ENDOWNED CONFIDENTIALITY. I FIND [REDACTED] SUBLIME SUGGESTION AND DETERMINED INSINUATION THAT I BREACH MY PROTECTED PRIVILEGE BOTH BIASED, AND A SEVERE VIOLATION OF BRADY (MOTION), AS WELL AS MY VI, VIII, IX, AMENDMENT RIGHTS UNDER THE U.S. CONSTITUTION.

2016-315

BY THEIR ACTIONS, LIABILITY WILL BE ATTACHED TO
THE BOND/POLICY OF THE CORPORATE ENTITY FOR
MARICOPA COUNTY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$

()

FOR VIOLATION OF MY RIGHTS, FALSE ARREST, FALSE
IMPRISONMENT, MALICIOUS PROSECUTION, NEGLIGENCE,
INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS,
AIDING AND ABETTING TORTIOUS CONDUCT, PUNITIVE
DAMAGES, AND NOMINAL AWARD.

()