

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 20-323

Judges:

Complainant:

ORDER

February 10, 2021

The Complainant alleged four appellate court judges improperly declined to hear his petition for special action and improperly characterized his request for relief.

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).

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

I understand the commission cannot reverse court orders or assign a new judge to a case.

I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing information and the facts I have provided upon which my allegations (of judicial misconduct) are based are true and correct.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

INSTRUCTIONS

Use the following space or plain paper of the same size to explain your complaint. Explain why you believe what the judge did constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list the names, dates, times, and places relevant to your allegations. Additional pages may be used and relevant copies of documents may be sent with your complaint (please do not send original documents). Use one side of each page only and write legibly or type your complaint. Please keep a copy of your complaint for your records.

IN A DISTURBING COINCIDENCE, AFTER PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF _____, A FOUR MEMBER PANEL OF _____, COMPRISING _____ ON _____ DECIDED TO ACCEPT JURISDICTION OF CASE WHICH SOUGHT APPELLATE REVIEW AND ENSURING RELIEF OF MY ONGOING LEGAL PERIL DIRECTLY ATTRIBUTABLE TO HARMFUL PREJUDICE, MALICIOUS TRICKERY AND WRONGFUL CONVICTIONS OBTAINED WITHIN _____ DURING PROCEEDINGS.

INTENTIONALLY OR NOT, BY FAILING TO ADHERE TO REVISED PROCEDURAL RULES MANIFESTLY INTENDED TO DESIGNATE AND FACILITATE A PETITION FOR REVIEW LIKE MINE AS AN, "APPLICATION OR REQUEST FOR RELIEF - HOWEVER TITLED," A HARMFUL MISARRANGE OF JUSTICE OCCURRED IN HIGH COURTS' PROCEEDINGS.

FURTHERMORE, CONSIDERING HIGH COURTS' DESIGNATION OF MY PETITION AS "MISCELLANEOUS", DESPITE IDENTIFIABLE OVERTONE AND FEATURES SPECIFYING "SPECIAL ACTION" STATUS AND AFTER ENDURING _____ OF BUREAUCRATIC DELAY ONLY TO BE DENIED JUST REVIEW OF MY REQUEST, BEST DEPICTS A DISMAL PENCHANT AMONG LOCAL OFFICIALS FOR DENYING WARRANTED OR OVERDUE RELIEF TO INDIVIDUALS IN SIMILAR PROTECTED CLASSES, CIRCUMSTANCES OR IN CASES LIKE MINE. "THE STATES" COLLECTIVELY BREACHED RULE 33.3(b) AZ CRIM PRO. STATUTES BY FAILING TO DILIGENTLY, FOR POST-CONVICTION RELIEF AS LAWFULLY REQUIRED, DULY INCURRING SANCTION.

RE:

v
Court No.

Court No.
Court No.

GREETINGS:

The following action was taken by _____ of the
_____, in regard to the above-referenced
cause:

ORDERED: The court declines to accept jurisdiction of the
petition for special action.

A panel composed of _____
_____ participated in the
determination of this matter.

Clerk

TO: