

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 19-024

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge did not allow him to speak and refused to hear evidence in his criminal proceeding.

The role of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine whether a judicial officer has engaged in conduct that violates the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct or Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution. There must be clear and convincing evidence of such a violation in order for the Commission to take disciplinary action against a judicial officer.

The Commission does not have jurisdiction to overturn, amend, or remand a judicial officer's legal rulings. The Commission reviewed all relevant available information and concluded there was not clear and convincing evidence of ethical misconduct in this matter. The complaint is therefore dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Commission member Diane M. Johnsen did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: May 22, 2019

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on May 22, 2019.

To The Commission on Judicial Conduct  
 Complaint of Misconduct

RE:

Hello, I Need to Report that  
 Commissioner held a fraudulent  
 hearing today in which she pretended  
 this party was showing no regard  
 for rules and speaking over  
 her when I was not. She  
 ended the hearing without  
 conclusion. She gave this party  
 at his own hearing barely  
 minutes to speak in which she  
 continued to interrupt and  
 refused to hear evidence  
 regarding the weight of the  
 evidence against the accused  
 Pursuant 18 USC § 3142(a)(2); see  
 Lopez-Valenzuela v. Arpio (4th Cir.  
 2014) or Ariz. R. Crim. P. Rule Rule  
 7.3(c)(2). She refused to hear  
 exonerating evidence to the  
 determination of the allegations  
 in the previous  
 of " " alleging the

defendant's dangerousness. If she was to be the presiding judge over the case she should have a clear interest in being familiar with the exonerative arguments and evidence as have a more accurate interpretation of the allegations and to consider a dismissal in the interest of justice or to be compelled to release the defendant, which the U.S. and AZ law requires in Rule 7.2(a).

Furthermore the Defendant informed the court on [redacted] that he wanted to file a written supporting Affidavit for the hearing. However [redacted] received the Affidavit w/ Exhibits, [redacted] on [redacted] and returned it to the Det. on [redacted] unfilled the day before the hearing. [redacted] also refusal to allow the Det. to read the motion in court.

Dated