

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 17-160

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge issued erroneous rulings and had a conflict of interest.

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: August 2, 2017

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

George A. Riemer
Executive Director

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on August 2, 2017.

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

CONFIDENTIAL

Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct
1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2017-160

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name: _____ Judge's Name: _____

Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

NOT KNOWING WHO TO SEND THIS TO, I SENT IT FIRST TO THE,
THEY SENT IT BACK WITH THIS AND ANOTHER FORM.
I AM ATTACHING WHAT I SENT TO THE,

TO THIS

Thank you

Judge DECISIONS TO SUPPRESS EVIDENCE & STATEMENTS.
AFTER OFFICERS GAVE STATEMENTS UNDER OATH ADMITTING I LAWYERED UP &
MY LAWYER REFUSING TO ARGUE JUDGE DECISIONS: JUDGE
DECISION TO DENY. EXHIBITS SHOW DECISION & STATEMENT "

(IS NOT PART OF MIRANDA LAW). IT STATES ALL QUESTIONING MUST STOP UNTIL A LAWYER IS PRESENT. THE JUDGE BLATANTLY TURNED A BLIND EYE TO THE LAW. IN SEVERAL OTHERS OF MY CASE. TESTIMONY & DVDS SHOW THE TRUTH

secondly 1

did EVERY THING IN A TIMELY MANNER & PASSED IT TO JUDGE
JUDGE JUDGE STATE - THEY LEFT THE DECISION UP TO

IN MY POST CONVICTION APPEAL
REPLY I LISTED SEVERAL POTENTIAL WITNESSES TO BE SUBPOENAED &
JUDGE WAS ONE OF THEM. SO IF HE REVIEWED MY CASE AS HE SAYS IN HIS MOTION TO DENY - & SAW HIS NAME IN MY (PCR REPLY). HE SHOULD OF REMOVED HIMSELF AS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST HE SHOULD OF NEVER RULED ON THIS.

WHICH HE VIOLATES MY DUE PROCESS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO PROCEED W/ MY CASE AT THE NEXT LEVEL. 3 EXHIBITS SHOW ALL JUDGE STATEMENTS BACKING MY COMPLAINT. JUDGE DIDNT FOLLOW PROPER LAW IN THIS CASE FROM START TO FINISH - BY HIS STATEMENTS & RULING TO DENY MOTION WHERE OFFICER TESTIMONY CLEARLY SHOW MIRANDA LAW VIOLATIONS