State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 21-234
Judge:	
Complainant:	

ORDER

January 12, 2022

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge had poor judicial demeanor and denied his right to be heard.

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.

Executive Director Commission on Tudicial Conduct 1501 W. Washington Street, ste. 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

RE:

County

Court

Deer

It is extremely recessory to file a complaint against County Court Tudge, Mr. was assigned to pre-

side over defendants case after Judge filed a Nottee of RECUSAL It is very impor-

tent that this case is reviewed from the stort

The Office resigned to

no fault of the defendants. Next counsel,

is now ecerrently sanctioned for

his mis conduct in this case.

and are further entangled and under investigation by the Afrizona

(sage 1 of (4)

Defendants complaints and accusations against all parties are honest, vaid, and sin-core.

Please review the conference held by Tudge as well, as defendents view is that actions were not fair in regards to comments surrounding sentencing and pending Motion.

Defendant then filed motion directly after this leaving which now leads to this complaint against

On new counsel,

met with defendent moments prior to
the scheduled heaving.

dishevited at best, having not and
wearing shoes in

showed disdain of a high degree and made rade, and sevenstre remarks regardinghow many counsels defendent had, and also regarding defendents motions filed. Because of this, it was elear defendent according to be receiving fair representation. It became hostile prior to entering the count.

Elpon commencement of covert, went full bore ahead demanding trial occur in and struck down all defendants motions and concerns.

further denied to even hear the (page 2 of 6)

Motion for Reconsideration to Dismiss filed by that included the rulings and sanctions against from the Arizona Court Judge

Ouring this initial hearing showed

great concern and panie about having only a

preparation prior to the expected trial

cluster, Because of this and the mutual hostility

with defendant, goaled defen
dant into representing himself as a way out

of such responsibility and for appointment
Because it was apparant did

not want to represent defendant, waiver of

counsel occurred. At this fine a

nument then occurred as scheduled

a late afternoon hearing stating;"

Once defendant took over as covensel made it clear that nothing would stop him from having the trial in Because of this defendant made a plea offer to the State which was accepted later.

Please review this entire case. Defendant was basiely forced into this position. Nothing in this case was done in a manner by law to recieving a feir and (Bage 3 of 6)

importial trial and for hearing on this case, hearing after When seewing the Stated outside the waiving counsel ", at which cevertroom; time defendant berated him for unprofessionalneckism. During the berating ed defendant with facial expressions, puffing out his lips, making his eyes large, and shaking his head back and torth. Hopetully there is a comera there you may review to see the proof of this account. actions and decisions were so intimidating, defendant believed it would be fittle to move forward being illequiped and obviously despised by all parties within the courthouse.

It cease moment challenge this cocert in such a manner. I'll show you what happens when you do, read between the lines moment that frightened defendant into resolving this case unfavorably.

In short a entire review of defendants case will show defendant was sleking to address a false charge and to know exactly what cutegory of fender he was, one with whether priors that were over

(page 40+6)

would be used as mitigating factors.

Defendant was deried his desire to a speedy trial. All counsels provided sub par representation and absolutely no trial preparation ever occurred prior to

Being appointed to preside overdefendants case.

then basiely forced the defendant into offering a plea because of his centeasonable and for prejudicial rulings out of anger for the case having taken so long to resolve. This was elearly not the defendants fault.

Defendant in hindsight sees that he took the "time in a plea deal because it was looking as if he was going to be convicted of a crime that never occurred (the indictment) and sentenced as a Certegory offender (only being category).

All the levents of were steering in that divertion as defendants inguiries over animounted to no
Clarity despite Tudges (
and) being aware of these concerns
by the defendant.

Please Note that defendant is speaking in general and not of speatice lan-(page 5 of 6) 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.