

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 20-322

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

February 10, 2021

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge was prejudiced against him and made rulings contrary to law.

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 Joseph C. Kreamer did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 10, 2021.

2020-322

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your name:

Judge's name: \_

Date: \_

**Instructions:** You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Please describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times and places that will help us understand your concerns. You may attach additional pages but not original court documents. Print or type on one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your files.

IN "BEGINNING" JUDGE "ARBITRA-  
RY RULES ROUTINELY PERPETUATED VIOLATIVE DECISIONS OF HER COLLEAGUES-  
FORMER THROUGHOUT MY CASES WHOSE DISCRIMIN-  
INSTRATIVE SEXIST ANIMUS AND/OR IMPLICIT RACIAL BIAS PROVIDED UNLAW-  
PREJUDICE ALLEGED IN <sup>MY</sup> PREVIOUS COMPLAINTS TO THIS COMMISSION.  
WITH CONSISTENTLY PARTIAL RULE, JUDGE REPEATEDLY CON-  
DONED OFFICIAL SLANDER ALLEGING A LITANY OF FALSE CLAIMS JUSTI-  
FYING LENGTHY PERIODS OF VIOLATIVE INCARCERATION (APPROX \_\_\_\_\_)  
AND THAT FRAUDULENTLY OBTAINED CONVICTIONS, AS A RESULT OF  
FLAGRANT DUE-PROCESS AND CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED-RIGHTS  
VIOLATIONS.

LAST MONTH I BECAME AWARE OF THE ARIZONA  
REVISIONS TO POST-CONVICTION PROCEDURAL  
RELIEF STATUTES.

JUDGE VACATING ORDER FAILED TO  
DESIGNATE MY PETITION REQUESTING TERMINATION OF PROBATION  
AND OTHER RELIEF AS AN <sup>CC</sup> \_\_\_\_\_  
Pursuant to newly revised Rule 33.3(b)  
AZ CRIM PROC. STATUTES, EFFECTIVELY OBSTRUCTING OVERDUE  
POST-CONVICTION RELIEF WITH SANCTIONABLE CONDUCT.

JUDGE BIAS INMATELY PROVIDED ABUSIVE RULINGS THAT  
THROUGH THE YEARS EXACERBATED EFFECTS OF ADULT PROBATION  
DEPTS' IMPOSED AND PROLONGED HARSH S.O. RESTRICTIONS.

COUNTY OFFICIALS WERE PERMITTED ADDITIONAL TIME FOR THESE  
UNDESIRABLE MEASURES TO BECOME AN INTOLERABLE, COERCIVE TOOL  
MANIFESTED TO IMPLICIT A VOLUNTARY ADMISSION OF GUILT STATEMENT-

(2 of 6)

cont.

(Attach additional sheets as needed)

A VIOLATIVE ADULT PROBATION DEPT. POLICY OBJECTIVE THAT  
DELIBERATELY BREACHES FIFTH AMENDMENT CONSTITUTIONAL PROTEC-  
TION IN AN UNCONSCIONABLY DEVIANT UNDERTAKING.

THROUGHOUT MY CASE(S) BY DUTIFULLY FACI-  
LITATING UNDUKE SLANDER AS VALID TESTIMONY,  
CONDONING CASE-FILE MISHANDLING, MALICIOUS  
TRADECRAFT, AND PERMITTING OTHER FORMS OF OFFICIAL  
MISCONDUCT INTENDED TO MANIFEST DELETERTOUS  
EFFECTS OR DETRIMENTAL CONSEQUENCES FOR ME  
VIOLATIVE OF FEDERALLY IMPUGNED CONDUCT CLAUSES,  
JUDGE \_\_\_\_\_ INCURRED SANCTIONABLE BREACH OF  
HER SWORN OATHS/AFFIRMATION.

COUPLED WITH ONGOING COVID-19 PRECAUTIONS,  
THE DENATURED OFFICIAL INDIFFERENCE TO MY CASE  
PERPETUATES UNTENABLE LEGAL CIRCUMSTANCES FOR  
ME THROUGHOUT THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE.

TIMELY INTERVENTION AND RELIEF IS IMPERATIVE.

NOTHING FURTHER

COUNTY

CLERK OF THE COURT

HONORABLE

v.

JUDGE

ORDER/ HEARING VACATED

On \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ Defendant filed a *Motion to Terminate Probation, Set Aside Conviction, Restore Rights, and Designate as a Misdemeanor & Financial Relief for Unlawful Incarceration*. The motion itself contains only a title lists no bases for the requested relief. The prosecutor objected to addressing the motion at \_\_\_\_\_ on the basis of victim's rights. The matter was set for a hearing in front of Commissioner \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_ hearing, Defendant made an oral motion to continue, which the Court granted and set this matter for a hearing in this division on \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ Defendant subsequently filed a *Motion to Request Advisory Counsel* (filed \_\_\_\_\_)

The Court has reviewed the file in this matter and notes that this is a successive petition:

- Defendant filed a PCR petition, which was dismissed via minute entry Ruling filed \_\_\_\_\_
- Defendant filed a *Motion to Terminate Probation* on \_\_\_\_\_, which the Court denied in a minute entry Ruling filed \_\_\_\_\_
- Defendant filed a *Motion to Modify Probation Conditions* on \_\_\_\_\_. The matter was reassigned to this division on \_\_\_\_\_ an erroneous minute entry was filed \_\_\_\_\_, and after being brought to the Court's attention, the motion was denied a second time via minute entry Order filed \_\_\_\_\_
- Defendant filed a *Motion to Revoke Probation* on \_\_\_\_\_ which the Court denied via minute entry Order filed \_\_\_\_\_

COUNTY

- Defendant filed a *Motion to Reject Probation* on [redacted] and a *Motion to Appoint Advisory Counsel* on [redacted]. The Court appointed counsel and held a hearing on [redacted], at which Defendant's motion was denied.
- Defendant filed a *Memo to the Court* on [redacted], requesting the same relief he requested at [redacted] which the Court denied via minute entry Order filed [redacted].
- Defendant filed a document styled *Motion to Overturn Convictions* in [redacted], which referenced this case number, which the Court denied via minute entry Order filed [redacted].

Regarding Defendant's *Motion to Request Advisory Counsel*, the Court notes that pursuant to Rule 6.1(b) of the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure, Defendant does not have a Right to A Court-Appointed Attorney for purposes of arguing this motion. Moreover, given that the Court has addressed Defendant's issues in multiple prior rulings, the Court finds that the interests of justice do not require that the Court appoint an attorney for Defendant.

IT IS ORDERED DENYING Defendant's *Motion to Request Advisory Counsel*.

Furthermore, upon review of the file, for the reasons previously set forth in the above detailed rulings,

IT IS ORDERED DENYING Defendant's *Motion to Terminate Probation, Set Aside Conviction, Restore Rights & Designate as a Misdemeanor & Financial Relief for Unlawful Incarceration*.

Due to the Court's ruling via minute entry,

IT IS ORDERED vacating the Status Conference on [redacted]

COUNTY

CLERK OF THE COURT

HONORABLE

v.

JUDGE

ORDER

Defendant filed a "Memo to the Court" in his pending criminal case  
The Memo requests that the Court set a hearing and "

The Court considered the Memo, the case file, and information  
provided in previous hearings in considering Defendant's memo.

Defendant has failed to state a legal basis for his requests and has failed to identify a  
claim for which the Court can provide the relief requested in the context of his criminal case.

IT IS ORDERED DENYING Defendant's motion.