

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 21-282

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

February 9, 2022

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge impersonated a federal official.

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, Joseph C. Kreamer, and Delia R. Neal did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 9, 2022.

CONFIDENTIAL

State of Arizona  
Commission on Judicial Conduct  
1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2021-282

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Judge's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

1. expense report  
2. Verizon wireless GPS reports.

For his complaint, \_\_\_\_\_ alleges the following violations: (1) Rule 81, section 1.1 - compliance with the law, 2.3 - bias, prejudice, harassment, 3.15 - responding to judicial and lawyer misconduct. The Commission has authority and jurisdiction pursuant to Arizona Constitution, article 6.1, sections 3 and 4. The presumptive sanction mandates forfeiture of benefits should the Commission determine and establish that criminal misconduct causing intentional harm and injury occurred. (see ARS 13-413)

The complainant accuses \_\_\_\_\_ of: (1) ARS 13-2702 - perjury, (2) ARS 13-2409 - obstruction, (3) ARS 13-2810 - interference, and (4) 18USCA 242 - deprivation (see *US v. Gwaltney*, 790 F.2d 1378 (1986)). Pursuant to Rule 42, Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct it is asserted that \_\_\_\_\_ has violated Rule 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4. (In re Phillips, 226 Ariz. 112 (2010) controls this complaint).

On \_\_\_\_\_, at sentencing in the above-captioned matter, and in \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ traveled on a state taxpayer expense account to testify that he was a \_\_\_\_\_ - and that \_\_\_\_\_ "should be sentenced to the aggravated maximum term of imprisonment." It should be noted that the

