State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 21-230
Judge:	
Complainant:	

ORDER

January 12, 2022

The Complainant alleged that a justice of the peace lacked legal authority and made incorrect legal rulings.

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 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.

Attachments:		
From:	<	>
Sent:		
To: Commission o	n Judicial Conduct <co< td=""><td>mmissionJudicialCo@courts.az.gov></td></co<>	mmissionJudicialCo@courts.az.gov>
Subject: Help:		

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

- 1. I have a claim that is properly filled out; I have experienced exposure to individuals who are working for the Court..., who believe, through implied political authority that they have authority under legal delegation doctrine for the Court Jurisdiction that allows them to make legal decisions about claims; the court does not have the training, in general, to deny my claim based on an intelligent understanding of what is going on - rather it is reflective of political whimsy. 2. My claim has a context to it under a section that " ' a claim; it alleges facts; they are not facts and cannot be proven. It is a summation of events that have occurred; the documents I can submit will prove that an accident has set me back significantly. 3. The court has rejected my claim because I am suing a with I am not suiing in other words, because I am suing the in the said document,
 - their employer, will have to decide through internal subrogation whether they can represent their employees for the decisions they made on behalf of the organization to which Court does not understand this and wants me to sue they represented. The rather, not the employees, or rather, more specifically, the (They want me to change the name in the claim to represent not the someone with the correct degree would not ask me to be the to tell them they have authority to void this issue.) The point is to go after the employees for lacking the efficiency of due process and specifically single them out in court so that has to defend them, technically speaking. I KNOW they are employees - the emphasis is on the lacking efficiency of due process to pay out a \$ claim over
- 4. I have personally passed the State's exams for and (i.e. Arizona). The documents have been served properly. The court has denied many inquiries and failed to follow the law under many issues of due process under the -

They are negating any diplomatic due process conversations to negotiate what is wrong with claim; they do not have the knowledge.

5. The claims logical context presents a claim that is valid and should not be denied for

expressed by individuals who assume they have delegated authority. I disagree that they have the knowledge to make a decision. The judge is not under the either. 6. The claim is a generalized document that offers context and names involved; from my perspective, in order to NOT promote a diametrically opposed perspective without expressed intent, it appears that supports Judge conflict with the outcome of the said decision. (Why? I don't know? Maybe he has a alignment, in general in supporting deep pockets? Not a big deal.) There is no actual evidence that they are supporters. It is not a problem. 7. He is protective of - we all are. That being said, his supporters are driving a decision from non-contiguous locations for non-stable and adversarial responses. There is no dialection for the resolution of a claim - rather they are children, young adults, who have perceived through unexpressed, assumed delegated and authority that is not expressed in any way, shape, or form; they are practicing law and are using that they do not understand - such as ex parte conversations. 8. Today, I have yelled at a worker at the court clerk with her at the top of my lungs, yelling , to stop rambling to bring about a resolution to differences of opinion; she hung up. The express delegated authority of Judge is part of our system of government is the corporate body that allows him to serve at our express Let through the State Constitution, the laws that are written down, and the founders to which gave him election - he serves the community - not funders; again, I have no evidence that he is supported by Judge has authority not legal authority - the are not fungible. To have authority - he has to carry a with the I am not supposed to be smarter than the judge. 9. He serves the elect and the elite and has to balance the scales of justice - he has not done so. He has discredited me, his staff, and his education. 10. If I suggest and allege that Judge has slept with in school to get through his training, does it seem conflicting that someone would experiment with crime to find out what the law is? The problem: we do not violate the law in a setting to find out what crime is. 11. Through violations of doctrine, express authority, I need some assistance in moving the case; I would like a change in venue - to a location who understands the context of claim as a reflection of a generalized problem - it is a generalized claim - not the My goal is not to attack - rather to serve a default judgement. The mathematics of the for the case are not adding up right - and you have an " type mentality for his court, his children, and the people who work for him. They are consuming precious mentality.

12. Please help vette this issue. I have no problem with people learning, but when I am told that I

authority is.

professor was from

to clean the state up with

need to talk to you about how I was being treated by younger adults. Thanks.

certificate to start prosecuting the

My take - it matters. I hope all is well. It's all water under the bridge. I just

director's position at

from

I can tell you I am in a fit-to-be tied situation. He was in

and was an

in Arizona for

I get pretty upset.

have to get a

sleeping with

and graduated

I appreciate your attention. My

for my director lying about being

appointment. Right now, after leaving the

authority is not expressed;

13.

understand what is going on.

(mobile)

on the definition of independence

Proper IN THE COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF Case Number: Plaintiff, RETURN OF SERVICE VS. Defendant. Received these papers on the day of to be served on Process Server, do hereby affirm that on the day of by delivering a true copy of the Civil Summons; Complaint; Notice to Plaintiff and as a Process Service Coordinator. a person authorized to accept service at the served a Defendant to: address of: and informed said person of the contents therein, in compliance with state statutes.

At the time of service I was at least years of age and not a party to this action. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Arizona that the foregoing is true and correct.

Height:

Weight:

Hair:

Sex: Race/Skin Color:

Description of Person Served: Age:

Glasses:



County

Courts, Arizona

Court	CASE NUMBER:	
Plaintiff(s) Name / Address / Email / Phone	Defendant(s) Name / Address / Email / Phone	
Attorney for Plaintiff(s) Name / Address / Email / Phone	Attorney for Defendant(s) Name / Address / Email / Phone	
CC	OMPLAINT	
I allege that:		
This court has jurisdiction over this matter		
Venue is proper because:		
Defendant resides within the precinct boundaries of		
The debt or obligation that gives rise to this action of The accident occurred at at the intersect	ccurred within this court's precinct, at the following location:	
Other, pursuant to ARS 12-401.1-19:	<u>-</u>	
I also allege that (state the factual basis for each claim):		
, also allogo mar (cano mo rastan sasto lei caon siami)		
1. Participants and lied a	about acausing an accident on	
endorsed the lie. There was no	hit me in a car accident on .	
2. I was the of cars; was hit at	standing still at the stop light by	
was following too closely; she could not see the b	pottom of my tires at the stop light.	
3. The causal problem is a lacking efficiency of due	process to subrogate the claim from . Limits of liability	
are \$ on policy. I am sui	ing for a lacking efficiency of due process	
4. & for following too closely. My	is demolished. cannot change the limits of liability.	
I have no recourse other than legal penalty to get the	companies to subrogate the claim.	
I am asking the court to award me judgment against the defendant(s) in the sum of \$		
I am also asking for reimbursement of my court costs and into	erest at the legal rate from the date of judgment.	
Letate under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and	correct	
I state under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and	correct.	
Date		
Plaintiff		
	court advised of your current address and telephone number. th a Notice of Change of Address form.	
Please inform court staff if interp	reter services are required	

Yes, I need interpreter services. Language:

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.