State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 21-329
Judge:	
Complainant:	

ORDER

April 7, 2022

The Complainant alleged that a superior court judge improperly dismissed a case, violated the law, and threatened and bullied a county attorney.

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 and Delia R. Neal did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on April 7, 2022.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2021-329

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

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

Merit of Complaint about Judge conduct on

Title: new precedent has been established

1. This is a complaint because Judge has set a new precedent state wide regarding ex-wife operating in stealing property from ex-husbands months removed after the divorce- the theft percentage of of victim's property which was protected by adjunction and court orders from family court Judge allowed the theft with impunity and immunity: Note- the theft was of everything the victim has worked for over the past years ALL personal property and amenities belonging to the home take out of his home while away at work. MONTH process from start to finish. start/ end

Phase one

is the Defendant: on she entered the home of [ex-husband] [married months only]

Defendant- removed of everything out of the home and garage everything/ in property value.

Couple was divorce

Victim-

Defendant officially Moved out of couple residence

Note: *during the divorce proceeding* Judge address all property issue and Defendant is on recording stating she had no property of hers within the home to get out-nothing. Again, her statement to the Judge is on the court hearing record.

Phase two

Enter-Sheriff's department interviews conducted ov	er a -month time			
frame; all resulting in Defendant's stating she had nothing to do with any theft				
and if she did it would be under community property right	<u>:</u> sent			
detective to talk with judge	about the community			
property status- Judge stated the content inside is n	ot community Just the			
structure "the building": the couple's community ended				
Law enforcement was free to move forward- now enter	County attorney			
office and the community p	roperty was a "sticking			
point" that was cleared up also by the Attorney's office which allowed the state of				
Arizona to charge the defendant with/ 1)theft 2)Burglary 3)false information to				
law enforcement. The case was drop after the fourth month under speedy trial				
rule				

Phase three

It was discovered that the stolen property that defendant claim she knew nothing about was found in her own apartment- "search warrant issued" three property unit detective did remove of the stole property and returned items to the legal owner the victim Note- no community property blocks

Remember: A Judge signed the search warrant. Note-All this had to be explained before warrant would be signed.

Phase four

State of Arizona re-file charges – Grand Jury returns "True Bill" we have an indictment Now-

A) Defendant still has control of remaining stolen property in her personal storage unit. Primary items are amenities that came with the home at the time of purchase- with the exception of a dining room set with chairs which is personal property of the victims

Now you're up to speed on the basics of this case

Phase five

In comes state Attorney - which I constantly asked that he be removed from this case to no avail. His lies were endless. Nevertheless, after asking for a trial to be set- I was told "The State" will not provide a trial- because this is seen as a "couple dispute" nothing more: [I was shocked]

- 1) Complaint- I was denied a trial within month even after a "true bill" in hand
- 2) Complaint- equal protection of the law was completely denied within the months- was the decision maker.
- 3) Complaint- on judge dismissed the true bill and let the defendant go on theft and burglary and The State refuse to Appeal the dismissal also drop the false information to law enforcement:
- 4) Judge threaten Attorney because of a deal- to have the victim's stolen item returned to him in exchange for reduction of charges to defendant. The treat was to report to the bar for helping the victim.

continue; phase five

The State of Arizona: filed its brief of why this case cannot be dismissed

Stating if the case is missed the court would be rewriting the court order of the court disallowing the defendant to enter the property which she was order not to unless current conditions were met. Those condition were never met by defendant. Judge as well aware of his actions-

The victim was denied his due process rights because of Judge bullying of Attorney in open court and in private in chambers. did not want to upset at the expense of the victim constitutional rights

Phase Six

The results of this dismissed case in is the following- now every ex-wife in "the State of Arizona" can use this case to Justify theft of their exhusband home property- meaning- to steal "all" - of his personal property with any amenities that are in the home- Aswell lie to law enforcement about the crime and have complete immunity from accountability; due to Judge ruling of dismissal – <u>Attorney</u> stated this very position to the victim:

By the way – The state of Arizona will not tell me the legal grounds her "true bill" and crime was dismissed on. In other words what possible authority did have by law to steal and keep everything I own in the world-that worked for years to have. Which I paid for from my own labor / of home property. How can this possibly happen!

Judge acted in a deeply misconduct manner on /

The will have to know about this and the also – this is a new precedent in law Burglary and theft done by an Ex-wife is now legal and lying to the will be completely over looked regardless of the statutes.

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.