

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 20-129

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

July 16, 2020

The Complainant alleged a superior court commissioner had violated his constitutional rights.

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 Louis Frank Dominguez did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on July 16, 2020.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2020-129

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.

Shows a pattern of Legal error and intentional disregard of the Law under Canon 2 Rule 2.2. Impartiality and Fairness by violating Substantive Rights specifically The Bail Reform Act 1984 a Substantive Due Process right put in place by congress in violation of Her own oath to the U.S. Constitution, the Due Process Clause, the Supremacy Clause, the Judiciary Act, the 14th and 5th Amendment and any other Federal Rights supporting against Involuntary Servitude or Slavery Protected and Abolished by the 13th Amendment. Also a violation of Canon 2 Rule 2.1 the right to be heard according to Law. ART 2 § 22 of Arizona's Constitution was deemed to be unconstitutional and when violated the Substantive Due Process of Men who all had exculpatory evidence that would have changed the outcome of their case. see and also in State v. , state v.

ool. In each case the defendants had every reason to hope and believe that the Law would be fairly interpreted and impartially executed to insure the defendants to have free and quiet exercise of Liberty.

My complaint is an unauthorized deprivation of Liberty.

We believe the judicial decisions have two uses: (number one (1)) to determine the case decided fairly (2) to indicate to the public how other similar cases will be decided when they arise.

has fraudulently appeared to have jurisdiction in the cases stated above, not truthfully or legally but personally setting her own precedent of how cases will be handled when American defendants are falsely accused by we believe that decision to violate substantive Due Process denying Bail and Full Blown Adversarial hearing is beyond error and it is constitutionally fatal not only to the defendants but also to the public causing the public not to know that their tax-payer dollars are used for involuntary servitude not to mention psychological deprivations, denial of choice of Attorney ultimately causing denial of presumption of Innocence.

We believe that the Constitution was designed to include the whole Human Family pointing to the fact that decisions are in violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

It is difficult in this day and age to realize or trust the Court officials of County's public opinion in relation to substantive Due Process rights that is afforded to Americans.

The Constitution was ordained and established by the people of the United States, through the action, in each state, of those persons who were qualified by its laws to act thereon in behalf of themselves and all citizens of the state. Does these American defendants not qualify as those persons or people of the United States?

Under the Constitution the citizens mentioned in this complaint against the judge are equal to and have the same rights as

decisions caused these defendants to lose out on their God-given Liberties, Body, property, Life, medical Liberties.

We believe it is important the commission of Judicial Conduct must take these matters seriously as Substantive Due Process remedies are protected under 42 § 1983 for all U.S. citizens

Is the Bail Reform Act not an Act of Congress. I therefore claim abused

her power overstepping the injunctions put in place by Congress in order to knowingly and intelligently cause a condition of Involuntary servitude and an unlawful conviction, an unauthorized deprivation of Liberty. (Rule 7.2 (a)(b) of Arizona Rules of criminal procedure) and (A.R.S § 13-3962 and A.R.S section 13-3972) were all violated.