

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 19-258

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

November 13, 2019

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge improperly asserted jurisdiction over him in a criminal case.

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 Commission Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Commission members Christopher W. Ames, Colleen E. Concannon, George H. Foster, Jr., Christopher P. Staring and J. Tyrrell Taber did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on November 13, 2019.

CONFIDENTIAL

State of Arizona

Commission on Judicial Conduct

1521 W. Washington St., Ste 239

Phoenix, AZ 85007

Complaint Against A Judge

Name

Judge's name

In this criminal case, in Arizona, County of \_\_\_\_\_ complaint asserts that the Court of \_\_\_\_\_ never required subject matter jurisdiction and therefore, was without any " " or " " to proceed with a trial or make a judgment against him without such jurisdiction existing. In addition, the statute by which this complaint was charged via indictment, tried, convicted and sentenced was found in its entirety to be unconstitutional and therefore, was unconstitutional from its inception, see (Appendix, Exhibits) submitted from between \_\_\_\_\_ in pending <sup>proceeding</sup> ~~proceeds~~. See also Minute Orders ("MO") dated on \_\_\_\_\_

There is no dispute or even a response by deputy county attorney \_\_\_\_\_ as order, challenging that this action in \_\_\_\_\_ and cause be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

Nothing can be regarded as law in this state which fails to conform to the constitutional prerequisites which calls for an enacting clause and title. There is nothing in the complaint, information, or indictment in this case which can constitutionally be regarded as law, and thus there is nothing in them which this complainant can be answerable for or which can be charged against him. Since there is no valid constitutional law charged against complainant there are no crimes that exist, consequently there is no subject matter jurisdiction by which complainant can be tried in \_\_\_\_\_ County Court.

1. The court's failure to uphold these clear and plain provisions of the state and federal constitutions cannot be regarded as mere error in judgment, but is deliberate USURPATION."

2. To assume jurisdiction in this case would result in TREASON. The judge of this court took an oath to uphold and support the Constitution of Arizona, and his blatant disregard of that obligation and allegiance can only result in an act of treason.

3. In this instance the court's departure from the clear meaning of the Constitution, it can only be regarded as a blatant act of TYRANNY. Any exercise of power which is done without the support of law or beyond what the law allows is tyranny.

It has been said, with much truth,"

Also, it has been repeatedly said

and affirmed as a most basic principle of our government that,"

"The constitution requires that

all laws have enacting clauses and titles. If these clear and unambiguous provisions of the State Constitution can be disregarded, then we no longer have a constitution in this state, and we no longer live under of laws but a government of men, i.e., a system that is governed by the arbitrary will of those in office. See Arizona Supreme Court Rule 51, Rules of the Supreme Court, Amended December 24, 2009, Canon 1, provides: "A judge shall uphold and promote the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety; and Canon 2, provides: "A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially, competently, and diligently." Here, in this instant matter: Complainant's jurisdictional claim may be raised at anytime and, via, the "and" exercised by the judge of complainant is be held in prison unconstitutional, on an invalid statute, without the enforcement of law or any charge accordingly.

**Request/Authorization for Qualified Legal Copying**

INMATE NAME (Last, First M.I.) (Please print)	ADC NUMBER
INSTITUTION/UNIT	DATE (mm/dd/yyyy)

**To be completed by the inmate / paralegal**

List each document separately. Forms packages count as one item. Unrelated exhibits count separately.

**ATTACH DOCUMENTS**

**PARALEGAL REVIEW**

No.	Document Name	Number of Pages	Number of Copies	Number of Pages	Number of Copies	X Unmodified
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						

**Designated Staff**

Request received and forwarded to Paralegal for action.

DESIGNATED STAFF NAME (Last, First, M.I.) (Please print)	DESIGNATED STAFF SIGNATURE	DATE RECEIVED (mm/dd/yyyy)	DATE FORWARDED (mm/dd/yyyy)

**Paralegal**

I have reviewed the request for legal copying. Take the following action:

- Copy: Unmodified
- Copy: Modified as indicated above
- Non-qualified legal copies, non-legal matter
- Paralegal requests meeting with inmate – approval suspended

PARALEGAL'S NAME (Last, First, M.I.) (Please print)	PARALEGAL'S SIGNATURE	DATE RECEIVED (mm/dd/yyyy)

**Designated Staff**

No. of Copies Made _____ @ \$ _____ each = Total _____		
DESIGNATED STAFF NAME (Last, First, M.I.) (Please print)	DESIGNATED STAFF SIGNATURE	DATE (mm/dd/yyyy)

Distribution: White - Library  
 Green - Legal Access Monitor  
 Canary - Inmate  
 Pink - Paralegal  
 Goldenrod - Inmate