

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 21-229

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

January 12, 2022

The Complainant alleged that a superior court judge violated the law and was biased against him.

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 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 members Christopher W. Ames, Barbara Brown, and Delia R. Neal did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on January 12, 2022.

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  
29  
30  
31

In pro per

THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
In the Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct  
1501 W. Washington St., Ste. 229. Phoenix, AZ 85007.

Individual  
Complainant  
-----  
THE HONORABLE  
COURT JUDGE  
Respondent

File No.:  
The Hon. Commissioner(s):  
**COMPLAINT**  
Re.:  
Court:

The Honorable (“ ”) willfully, openly and blatantly violated  
and (“ ”) rights under Arizona’s due process of law clause; *Ariz. Const.*  
*art. 2, § 4.*

deliberately violated Canon 1.1, “A judge shall comply with the law, including  
the Code of Judicial Conduct”; and 1.2, “A judge shall act at all times in a manner that promotes  
public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and shall  
avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety”; *Ariz. Co. Jud. Cond. 1.1 and 1.2.*

For reasons that only can explain, he flat out refused to hear the above-captioned  
case which was for expedited injunctive relief to have (“ ”)  
dismantle an demolition fence that they had place around the home and home  
space; and to compel to cease and desist their illegal possession of the property  
and lot.

took an incredibly unreasonable amount of time to decide the action, even in light  
that sometimes it is excusable for the Court to take longer than normal due to case load.

1 Again, for reasons only can explain, he granted , who was represented by  
2 (“ ) of Arizona, to answer the  
3 Motion for Summary Judgment <sup>1</sup> which was filed because failed to establish an answer or  
4 meet the legal qualifications to have the above-captioned case dismissed. The ruling itself was  
5 aimed at punishing the and it further blatantly and openly violated the Rules of Civil  
6 Procedure: “Unless a specific rule states otherwise, an opposing party must file any responsive  
7 memorandum within after the motion and supporting memorandum are served;” *Ariz. R.*  
8 *Civ. P. 7.1(3).*

9 Then, in a very strange event that displayed instant hatred for *pro se* litigant  
10 (“ ), suddenly changed course in the midst of allowing the  
11 previously mentioned unlawful to answer summary motion, and decided to  
12 dismiss the case on a prior motion that (bar no.: ) (“ ) of  
13 filed in substitute of presenting an answer to the Complaint. further invited  
14 to submit for fees.

15 In the meantime, the transcripts of the Court telephonic hearing of  
16 were completed near the end of the decision. The filed a Motion for  
17 Reconsideration and submitted as new evidence the relevant transcript that displayed  
18 Court Judge (“ ) first inquiring if had a garnishment to  
19 erect the fence around the property to which clearly answered, “  
20 ” then went on to agree with the that, if was acting on  
21 anything rendered in Court, it had to stop because the Court, on  
22 vacated the Court proceedings. Further, if was acting on something outside  
23 of the Court proceedings, then the should seek action in Court.  
24 would admit in the same Court proceeding that, in  
25 fact, was attempting to acquire title to the home.

26 responded by stating that he did not believe eviction action in Court had  
27 jurisdiction to hear title ownership cases and continued to advise the to file an action

---

28  
29 1. cried to that, because the did not answer Motion to Dismiss  
30 directly, opting rather to file a Motion for Summary Disposition, needed to  
31 respond to the Yet again, without any challenge to on facts or legal  
procedure, gladly granted motion.

1 with Court.  
2 The filed an action in Court for expedited injunctive relief to have  
3 remove the fence and stop their illegal possession of the property; and for declaratory  
4 judgment that did not have claim in either the proceedings of the Arizona  
5 where this entire dispute was initiated; or the rental agreement between  
6 and the to which neither or  
7 had executed. The Arizona Court was clear in v. ( ) that, in order for  
8 to have claim in the contract, and the would have had to  
9 specifically agree to that term and name specifically.

10  
11 Under Arizona law, a person who is not a party to a contract can recover under  
12 that contract only if he is a primary beneficiary under the terms of the contract:  
13 The Arizona rule is that in order for a person to recover as a third-party  
14 beneficiary of a contract, an intention to benefit that person must be indicated in  
15 the contract itself... The contemplated benefit must be both intentional and direct,  
16 and it must definitely appear that the parties intend to recognize the third party as  
17 the primary party in interest.

18 *Nahom v. Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Arizona*, 180 Ariz. 548, 885 P.2d  
19 1113(1994)

20 The case was assigned to

21 Introduction

22 On ruled that and had submitted an insufficient case,  
23 quoting, "  
24

25 was opining that he would not consider any issues of the Court or  
26 Court in the division of Court

27 Yet again, in blatant and open hatred for litigants in *pro per*, and more specifically  
28 dismissal was based entirely on openly and blatantly lying to the  
29 Court that had a writ of restitution issued on <sup>2</sup> from the same  
30 Court proceedings that scolded the that he would not consider.  
31 went on to state that was attempting to collect storage fees spanning back to that date.

1 Even after the pointed out that the writ of was deleted by  
2 Court on and that the had legal possession of their home  
3 and home space, with the blessing of and went ahead and erected the  
4 fence anyway: openly sending an embarrassing message for all to see that the were not  
5 welcome back to their home.

6 Regardless, and in open contradiction, accepted lies based in the very  
7 Court proceedings that supposedly would not consider and dismissed the above-  
8 captioned case in favor of

9 To further add deliberate salt in the wound of awarded  
10 almost \$ in punitive fees and the Judge further arrogantly bullied  
11 by stating in his ruling that: whether he ( ) was right or wrong, it didn't matter.

12  
13 Exhibits Before Told the Entire Story

14 As stated, did not answer the Complaint before did not  
15 offer any supporting counter exhibits, law, and statute or rule to dispute the Complaint.  
16 Even if deemed that wrote an incomprehensible Complaint, which is absolutely  
17 untrue, the exhibits before showed criminally illegal collection practice which led  
18 to erecting the criminally illegal fence and illegal block of allowing the to access  
19 their home and home space.

20 1. The exhibited the Court denial of the request for injunctive  
21 relief, to which advised the to file an original action in Court.

22 2. The exhibited debt collection letter which actually stated that  
23 the were still tenants of and that the were further \$ arrears in  
24

25 2. Either was equally considering the Court proceedings or he was not.  
26 could not grant a decision based on the Court action, but turn around and deny the  
27 any claim in the same Court rulings. More importantly, was granting  
28 motion on a vacated proceeding. The Court in its division of Court  
29 deleted the entire argument that was making to to have the case  
30 dismissed. The placed the vacate order and the Court transcripts in front of  
31 as new evidence on the Motion for Reconsideration; but again, clouded  
by his ridiculous and illegal bias over a litigant's credentials or race, even stated in his ruling  
that, right or wrong, it didn't matter.

1 rent. All lies.

2 3. The exhibited their response letter that was issued within the statutory  
3 timeframe as instructed in the Arizona ; ARS 32-1001 et.  
4 seq.

5 4. The exhibited threat letter that would sell the  
6 trailer at by authority of claiming lien in a defunct and invalid rental  
7 agreement entered into by and and  
8

9 5. Finally, the exhibited pictures of illegal fence around the  
10 trailer and lot.

11 The Transcript Explained Everything

12  
13 Although was not considering anything from the (procedural or  
14 meritorious), nonetheless was essentially correct in not considering the procedures of  
15 Court and the division of Court Unfortunately, had no desire to  
16 apply the legal principle of parallel litigation equally; only ruling against the while  
17 affording absolute impunity.

18 However, regardless that the instant dispute stemmed from the Court proceedings,  
19 the was very much relevant to the case before as  
20 claimed lien in that contract as justification for the fence. The had every legal right  
21 to challenge and/or reliance on the defunct and invalid contract, even in the  
22 Court.

23 Further, the vacate order issued by the division of Court on  
24 which deleted writ was equally very much relevant as admitted in his  
25 Motion to Dismiss in the Court that motivation for its illegal possession of the  
26 home and home space was because they had a writ of restitution issued on  
27

28 It should further be noted that, in Court before claimed that  
29 was merely attempting to take over the title to their trailer. This is why advised  
30 the to file an original action in Court.  
31

**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.**