

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 20-239

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

November 25, 2020

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge improperly failed to issue a signed order.

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 Gus Aragón did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on November 25, 2020.

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

Re: Formal Complaint against judge

To whom it may concern,

I'm writing to file a formal complaint against judge
for his refusal to sign a final Order pursuant
to Rule 58, Ariz. R. Civ. P. Judge knowingly
and intentionally refused to sign the Order for
appellate purpose. A Notice of Appeal has been filed.
Please find a copy of my pleading requesting the
signing dated _____ and his minute
entry filed _____ Judge _____ knows he's
required by Rule to sign but refuses. Judge
has violated not only the Rules of Civil Procedure,
he has violated CANON Rules.

I request your office conduct a thorough and unbiased
investigation.

Cordell

Plaintiff Pro Per

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA

Plaintiff,

v.

Defendants.

Cause No:

MOTION TO CLARIFY;

MOTION TO SIGN ORDER

Plaintiff,

acting pro per, hereby seeks clarification on certain parts of its minute entry filed and received

① Why was a hearing not conducted for public records requests denied by defendants for "security reasons". Plaintiff is entitled to challenge these "security reasons" in court or to have an in-camera review. This part of the ruling violates Plaintiffs due process rights under the Az Constitution.

② All public records requests are lawful on their face. All citizens are entitled to access to All government records

that are not an ongoing investigation,
③ Due to the fact that Plaintiff is investigating various fraud and cover-ups, he is entitled by law to public records. Plaintiff seeks clarification of sentence # 2 of paragraph 1 of page 2. What is "lawful" as all records requests are lawful unless proven unlawful by competent courts and "ordered by the Court" - what Court. Plaintiff asserts the ruling is not only vague and ambiguous, but it is arbitrary and capricious as well and seeks signing pursuant to Rule 58, Ariz. R. Civ. P. for appellate purposes if needed after clarification. Plaintiff asks for clarification and signing prior to the expiration of the 30 days for Notice of Appeal for abuse of discretion.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this day of

ORIGINAL filed this
day of to:

CLERK OF THE COURT

COPIES filed this
day of , to:

HONORABLE

attn:

Defendant who sent me a letter and a
copy of the ruling before receiving Court's ruling

By:
1

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA

HONORABLE

CLERK OF THE COURT

v.

MINUTE ENTRY

_____ The Court has received and considered Plaintiff/Appellant's Motion to Clarify: Motion to Sign Order, filed on _____ Accordingly,

_____ **IT IS ORDERED** denying Plaintiff/Appellant's Motion to Clarify: Motion to Sign Order.

NOTICE: LC cases are not under the e-file system. As a result, when a party files a document, the system does not generate a courtesy copy for the Judge. **Therefore, you will have to deliver to the Judge a conformed courtesy copy of any filings.**