

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 19-338

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

February 5, 2020

The Complainant alleged a pro tem municipal court judge was biased against him and improperly seized his firearm.

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 member Denise K. Aguilar did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 5, 2020.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

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

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

2019 - 338

**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.

Judge \_\_\_\_\_ informed the Defendant that he was the Judge who signed the original Order of Protection, that after \_\_\_\_\_ stated that I was found guilty of \_\_\_\_\_ Complaint \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_ from Judge \_\_\_\_\_ (Courtroom: \_\_\_\_\_) that there was sufficient grounds to deprive the Defendant of his personal property (Firearm: Glock 17mm Serial Number: \_\_\_\_\_). The \_\_\_\_\_ stated that the firearm was seized from the Defendant during arrest on the above mentioned complaint. The police report clearly stated that the firearm was seized for safe-keeping and was not seized for evidence of any crime. But \_\_\_\_\_ sent a letter of intent \_\_\_\_\_ after Defendant was incarcerated and was requesting to deny Defendant of his property for \_\_\_\_\_ from date of arrest. The Judge clearly showed bias against the Defendant and must have forgotten the rules of illegal search and seizure laws of the United States of America. The Defendant also believes that all Judges seen in the building located at \_\_\_\_\_ have communicated with the Judge \_\_\_\_\_ or read her notes in the subsequent Court cases that followed Complaint \_\_\_\_\_ and have conspired to deny the Defendant of a fair and impartial hearing afforded to all innocent Defendants until \_\_\_\_\_ proves beyond a doubt that the offender is guilty. In this matter, \_\_\_\_\_ has imagined a future set of events, and decide to try, convict and sentence the Defendant on circumstances they believe may occur. Once again Due Process issues are on vacation in this courtroom.