

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 20-270

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

December 16, 2020

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge improperly took no action on her pleading and improperly held her to the same standard as an attorney.

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), and the request to appear is denied.

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 December 16, 2020.

Comp  
2020-270

**Attachments:** Malpractice Case.docx; Minute Entry Judge Malpractice Case.docx

**From:**  
**Sent:** 7  
**To:** Commission on Judicial Conduct <CommissionJudicialCo@courts.az.gov>  
**Subject:** Minute Entry for (

This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct

Dear Sirs:

Please read my letter to Judge \_\_\_\_\_ in the  
He quoted one Civil Rule of Procedure as the reason he "  
" in his file drawer and "

In my motion for relief from his interim ruling I included:

1. 6 U.S. Supreme Court Rulings
2. 1 Arizona Supreme Court Ruling
3. New Evidence
4. Concealment of Material Fact by Opposing Counsel
5. Abuse of Discovery by Opposing Counsel
6. Elder Law (Fed. and State) and Vulnerable Adult Law Arizona
7. False statements by Defendants \_\_\_\_\_ and his clients  
and
8. Perjury (all the above)
9. Malfeasance.

I am including in the attachments:

- a. my 5 page letter to Judge \_\_\_\_\_ about the above Minute Entry.
- b. Plaintiff's Pro Se Motion for Relief from Interim Ruling & Affidavit.

I would like for this entire case to be reviewed by the commission including all evidence that was dumped by the court.

If there is a way to have a hearing about this matter, it would be appreciated.

Thank you.

Pro Se Plaintiff in the above case.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF**

Case No.:

Plaintiff,

vs.

Defendants.

**PLAINTIFF'S, PRO SE RESPONSE TO  
INTERIM COURT RULING IN FAVOR OF THE  
DEFENDANTS  
MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT TO  
FIND FOR THE PLAINTIFF**

**-U.S. SUPREME COURT PRO SE RULINGS  
-ABUSE OF DISCOVERY PROCESS  
RULE FEDERAL RULE 60(B)(3)  
-ARIZ. RULE 26.1, 12-2602  
-NEW EVIDENCE - CONCEALMENT OF A  
MATERIAL FACT BY THE DEFENDANTS  
-PLAINTIFF IS A  
AGE  
-DEFENDANTS ARE NOT HELD TO COMPLY  
WITH ELDER LAW(STATE & FEDERAL  
STATUTES) + VULNERABLE ADULT LAW PER:  
AZ SUPREME COURT RULING RE:**

**-FALSE STATEMENTS, FRAUD, PERJURY,  
MALFEASANCE TITLE 28-SEC2462  
CURRENTLY 5 YEARS TO FILE ON THE  
FEDERAL LEVEL  
ASSIGNED TO THE HONORABLE**

Pro Se Decisions by the U.S. Supreme Court in favor of the Plaintiff.

Elmore v. McCammon (1986) 640 F. Supp.905 – The right to file a lawsuit prose is one of the most important rights under the constitution and laws.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Jenkins v. McKeithen, 395 U.S. 411, 421 (1959); Picking v Pennsylvania R. Co., 151 Fed 2<sup>nd</sup> 240; Puckett v. Cox, 456 2<sup>nd</sup> 233 – Pro Se pleadings are to be considered without regard to technicality; pro se litigants' pleadings are not to be held to the same high standards of perfection as lawyers.

Conley v Gibson – Justice Black , Pro Se Rights Section It was held that a Pro Se complaint requires a less stringent reading than one drafted by a lawyer.

Roadway Express v Pipe, 447 U.S. 752 at 757 (1982) Due to ...desire to seize tactical advantage lawyers have long engaged in dilatory practices...the glacial pace of much litigation breeds frustration with the Federal Courts and ultimately disrespect for the law.

Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F. 2d 946 (1973) There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of an exercise of his constitutional rights.

The Plaintiff cannot be held to Civil Rules of Procedure, since these technicalities are the same high standard as an attorney. cannot be sued by the defendants because she is only exercising her constitutional right to represent herself when her attorney, withdrew from this case with this court's permission. How can this court then allow the defendants to sue for even filing this lawsuit when this court allowed him to withdraw in the first place?

This court's decision to allow Attorney to withdraw left plaintiff without counsel; and, without the ability to hire new counsel; since the court allowed the motion for summary

**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.**