

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 18-267

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge held secret meetings, did not allow him to be heard, and delayed production of minute entries.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if a judicial officer 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 judicial officer 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 Art Hinshaw did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: December 12, 2018

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on December 12, 2018.

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

Complaint againsts: :

Master Calendar

Judge (

)

Comp

Re?

File
Date

Complaint Statement of Facts: Misconduct involving a
violation of Code of Judicial Conduct

Defendant

Rule 51 - Rule 2.2, 2.3(A)(1) of 2.6) And in violation of AZ

Const. art 2 sec 11 Justice in all cases shall be administered equally
and without unnecessary delay.

On Honorable held

conference which deprived right to Verbatim Record and open
Adjudication Arizona Declaration of Rights Arizona Declaration of
Rights art 2 sec 11 A.R.S. Ariz Const Etc

Petitioner attaches the minute entry to
this complaint; "Prior to commencement of today's proceedings
a bench conference is conducted off the record between Court and
Counsel; Then does not allow Petitioner to Introduction
to allow for oral objection end 10.1

Next The Court Summarizes the bench Conference Producing a
False Record that Defendant filed a continuence it was Counsel
for the Defendant filed and Defendant's

Motion to Remove Counsel filed "IT is Ordered

denying The Defendants' Motion to Remove Counsel.
 This clearly shows a meeting of The Minds which Deprived
 Petitioner of his 1st Amendment Right to Fair and impartial
 hearing to address grievances possible through the 14th and
 and his Right To Appeal in all cases Re Const. 2 & 24 and
 Petitioner's Right to defend in Person and his Right to
 Verbatim Record Petitioner includes with This Complaint

Motion To Remove Counsel and Signets

AR.S SUP Ct, Rule 42 Rules of Prof Conduct, & 4 Violations

② was initiated by defense Counsel after

A brief visit before The hrg. when he asked if I
 filed a motion to remove him he became irrational Then
 stormed out of visit going straight to Bench to initiate a
conference in violation of R.S. 4 (a) (b) (c) (d) (e) and (f)
 in bad faith knowingly participating in a violation of The
 Code of Judicial Conduct and Rule 42 code of Professional
 Conduct without open justification please note Counsel filed on

A Continuance till this date without doing
anything in my case. Petitioner was finally allowed to
 address The Court at minute entry
 in which I Objected To Any Continuance and Orally
 objected To These Proceedings in Oral 10.1

③ Untimely filing of Minute entry taking
to file minute entry subjected Petitioner to Actual
 prejudice denying Fundamental Rights to Access to defend
 in Special Action to higher Courts 1st right through The
 14 Amendment Rights violated

Petitioner Respectfully Submits This Complaint
in The interest of Justice