

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 19-228

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

October 9, 2019

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge failed to advise him of the dangers of self-representation and refused to allow him to withdraw from self-representation during trial.

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 Colleen E. Concannon did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on October 9, 2019.

ComD
2019-228

To: COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT, DEFENDANT COMES NOW FORTH
DUE TO NEWLY DISCOVER EVIDENCE OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT BY JUDGE
OF COUNTY COURT.

UPON DUE DILIGENCE OF ARIZONA RULES OF COURT RULE 6.1 (E) AND
RULE 6.1 (C).

UNDER RULE 6.1 (C) THE DEFENDANT MUST SIGN A WRITTEN WAIVER AND
BY LAW BE ADVISED OF THE " WITH OPEN

EYES. IN DEFENDANT'S EVIDENTIARY HEARING THERE WAS " OR

" THE DEFENDANT ADVISED THE COURT HE WAS UNDER
MEDICATION. JUDGE IGNORED THIS ARIZ.

RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE RULE 6.1 (C) ON TOP OF NOT GIVING A
HEARING VIOLATING ARIZONA CONSTITUTION ARTICLE II § 8, AND THE
ARIZONA STATE RULES OF COURT. THE U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO
COUNSEL DURING ALL CRITICAL STAGES, CONST. AMEND 6. (SEE COURT RECORD
PAGE # AND INCLUDING PG. DEFENDANT OBJECTED ON

FURTHERMORE ARIZONA RULES OF COURT RULE 6.1 (E) WAS VIOLATED
BY JUDGE. AGAIN IN TRIAL DENYING THE DEFEN-

DANT TO " FROM SELF-REPRESENTATION, THE JUDGE SIGNED
THE WAIVER FORM WITH DEFENDANT AND SWORE ON THE RECORD IN

THE COLLOQUY THE DEFENDANT COULD " AT "

(SEE RECORD HEREIN). THE LAW 6.1 (E) RULES OF CRIMINAL
PROCEDURE " STATES AS " STATES

A DEFENDANT "

" THIS WAS CONSUMMATED IN A WRITTEN AGREEMENT DUTY.
1)

The Right to Counsel is one of the most pervasive constitutional rights. These rights were violated and ignored knowingly and intentionally. Violation of Arizona State Rules of Courts, Rules of Criminal Procedure Rule 6, 6.1 (C) and 6.1 (E). were compromised unethically, on the record in trial and by the Breaching of a Contract.

Violations of the Arizona Supreme Courts Judicial Ethics Rule 81. ETHICAL RULE 1.2. (5). PROMOTING CONFIDENCE IN THE JUDICIARY. Actual improprieties include violations of " ; Court Rules, or provisions of this Code,

Judge VIOLATED THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA RULES OF COURT AND THE FEDERAL AND STATES CONSTITUTION CONTRACT CLAUSES. THE HON. Judge " " HIS WRITTEN SIGNED "AND VERBAL PROMISE DOCUMENTED IN COURT TRANSCRIPTS.

CASE NO. (SEE PAGE)
UNDER ARIZONA STATE CONSTITUTIONS " §25 BILL OF ATTINDER; EX POST FACTO LAWS; IMPAIRMENT OF CONTRACT OBLIGATIONS §25. No Bill of Attinder, EX POST-FACTO LAW, OR LAW IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF A CONTRACT SHALL EVER BE ENACTED

"U.S. CONSTITUTION"
U.S. CONTRACT Clause States UNDER Article 1, §10 NO CONTRACT SHALL BE ABRIDGED, OR BREACHED.

THE JUDGE BREACHED HIS CONTRACT ON THE Courts RECORD. DENIED THE DEFENDANT " " AND RETAIN HIS OWN COUNSEL FOLLOWING HIS VERBAL AND WRITTEN SIGNING THE PROMISED AGREEMENT IS GROSS, AND FRAUDULENT. CONTRACT LAW STATES NON-BREACHING VICTIM IS ENTITLED COMPENSATION.

THE DENIAL OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS THAT ARE SWORN TO BE UPHOLD BY THE OATH OF ALL JUDGES, THUS, THE JUDICIARY PLAYS A CENTRAL ROLE IN PRESERVING THE PRINCIPALS OF JUSTICE AND THE " " "

THE RULES IN THE CODE ARE RULES OF REASON THAT SHOULD BE APPLIED CONSISTENT WITH CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS, STATUTES, OTHER COURT RULES, AND DECISIONAL LAW, AND WITH DUE REGARD FOR ALL RELEVANT CIRCUMSTANCES. THE RULES SHOULD NOT BE INTERPRETED TO IMPINGE UPON THE ESSENTIAL INDEPENDENCE OF JUDGES IN MAKING JUDICIAL DECISIONS.

THE EFFECT OF THE IMPROPRIETIES BY THE JUDGE DELIBERATE VIOLATIONS OF LAWS OF THE STATE, FEDERAL, STATE CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEES OF COUNSEL AND DUE PROCESS ARE GROSS AND EGREGIOUS, THAT COST THE DEFENDANT TO BE CONVICTED WITHOUT ADEQUATE REPRESENTATION OF COUNSEL. THE " " OF A WRITTEN CONTRACT ARE NON-JUDICIAL ACTS. DEFENDANT SEEKS JUSTICE TO PIN-POINT AND DISCIPLINE THE PROPRIETOR - JUDGE (CAN ALSO BE PURSUED) . . .

ARTICLE 6.1 OF THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION AND CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT RULES HAVE BEEN BLATANTLY VIOLATED FOR THE COMMISSION TO SEEK APPROPRIATE ACTIONS OF DISCIPLINARY ACTION BY THIS PROOF, AND THE RECORDS OF THE EVIDENTIARY HEARING NOW PROVIDED AND AVAILABLE. EVIDENTIARY HEARING RECORDS CORROBORATE THE DEFENDANT'S ALLEGATIONS " WAS DONE

IN THE " " NOR ANY " OF COUNSEL. Coupled with the " " and (ABRIDGING THE CONTRACT IS A GROSS IMPROPRIETY AND INJUSTICE OF DENIAL OF RIGHT TO COUNSEL. Coupled with the violation of U.S. CONSTITUTION CONTRACT CLAUSE.

CONCLUSION

THE COURT RECORDS CORROBORATE THE DEFENDANTS ALLEGATIONS
IN " " THEY ARE AGAINST ARIZONA RULES OF COURT,
RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURES CITED HEREIN. THE " " OF
THE " " AND SIGNED ARE EVIDENCE OF
UNETHICAL ACTIONS THAT VIOLATE THE JUDICIAL ETHICS RULE CITED
UNDER RULE 81, AND RULE 2.1. (5), OF THE " "

IMPROPRIETY INCLUDES CONDUCT THAT VIOLATE THE LAW, COURT
RULES, OR PROVISIONS ARE FACTS IN EVIDENCE MERIT DISCIPLINARY
ACTIONS. WHEREFORE IN THIS COMPLAINT WITH " " OF
THE " " IS BROAD BREACH OF
ARIZONA STATE LAWS, STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.
NO ONE SHOULD BE DENIED BY ABUSE OF PROCESS; CIVIL RIGHTS
IGNORED BY THE AFORESAID " " NON-PARTIAL DECISIONS BY
HON. JUDGE THAT DEPRIVED THE DEFENDANT THE LAWS
OF THE ARIZONA RULES OF COURT AND BOTH FEDERAL AND STATE
CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO COUNSEL, AND BILL OF ATTAINDER CONTRACT
§ 25, AND U.S. CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE 1, § 10 CONTRACT LAWS THAT STATE
NO " " OR " " ALL ARE EQUAL BEFORE
THE LAW, AND ARE ENTITLED WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION TO EQUAL PROTECT-
ION OF THE LAW. ALL ARE ENTITLED WITHOUT TO EQUAL PROTECTION AGAINST
ANY DISCRIMINATION IN VIOLATION IN VIOLATION OF THIS DECLARATION
AND ANY INCITEMENT TO SUCH DISCRIMINATION. EVERYONE HAS THE RIGHT
TO LIFE LIBERTY AND SECURITY OF PERSON. EVERYONE IS ENTITLED IN
FULL RIGHT TO AN EFFECTIVE REMEDY BY THE COMPETENT NATIONAL
TRIBUNALS FOR ACTS VIOLATING THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS GRANTED
HIM BY THE CONSTITUTION OR BY LAW. . .

JUDICIAL BREACH OF STATE LAWS & CONTRACT

DEFENDANT

ASK FOR APPROPRIATE REMEDY

IN RECONSIDERATION OF THIS COMPLAINT. THE PROTECTIONS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTIONS CONTRACT CLAUSES OF BOTH U.S. CONSTITUTION AND THE ARIZONA STATES CONSTITUTIONS BILL OF ATTINDER §25. THE ARIZONA STATE RULES OF COURT RULES 6, 6.1, (E) AND 6.1 (E). FARRETTA V. CALIFORNIA 422 U.S. 808, 45 L.ED. 2D 562, 95 S.Ct. 2525 (1978). AND ARIZONA SUPREME COURT RULES OF THE JUDICIAL ETHICS. DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS CAN BE FOUND IN THE ARIZONA RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURES RULES AFORESAID LISTED IN THIS COMPLAINT HEREIN.

Respectfully Submitted:

Dated: -

**THE COMMISSION'S POLICY IS
TO POST ONLY THE FIRST FIVE
PAGES OF ANY DISMISSED
COMPLAINT ON ITS WEBSITE.**

**FOR ACCESS TO THE
REMAINDER OF THE
COMPLAINT IN THIS MATTER,
PLEASE MAKE YOUR REQUEST
IN WRITING TO THE
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL
CONDUCT AND REFERENCE
THE COMMISSION CASE
NUMBER IN YOUR REQUEST.**