State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 22-066

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

January 11, 2023

The Complainant alleged improper and erroneous rulings by a superior court judge hearing a criminal case.

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 Michael J. Brown and Joseph C. Kreamer did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on January 11, 2023.

CONFIDENTIAL State of Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct 1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2022-066

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.

* see enclosed (13-page) COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

* see enclosed EXHIBITS INDEX (with Exhibits A to L)

2

-	
•	
1	
2	
5	
6	SUBMISSION TO THE ARIZONA
<u> </u>	COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT
9	COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE
_10	
_11	File this Complaint Against a Judge to the Commission on Judicial
_12	Conduct requesting you take appropriate actions against Judge for the
_13	following reasons:
14	Judge participated in a conspiracy to illegally convict Defendant of
_15	(Case No.) by illegally overturning a 404(b) Ruling (previously
	in Defendant's favor) which allowed perjucious testimony in trial Also, Judge himself
	committed perjury, at both Defendant's trial and sentencing, and illegally sentenced
IB	Defendant to more time than the absolute maximum prescribed by Legislation for
_19	, showing multiple occurences of judicial misconduct, bias and prejudice
_20	which warrants review, as argued in the following memoradum of points and
	authorities.
_22	
_23	DATED this
_24	
-25	
_242	
27	
~ 60	Page 1 of 13

•	
	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES
_²	A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office, including administrative duties, without bias or
	prejudice" see Rule 2.3(A) of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct. In addition "faljudge shall require
_4	lawyers in proceedings before the Court refrain from manifesting bias or prejudice" (Id@ Rule 2.3 (C)). A
5	judge must avoid conduct that may be reasonably perceived as prejudiced or bias. A judge who manifest
<u> </u>	bios or prejudice in a proceeding impoirs the fairness of the proceeding and brings the judiciary inte disrepute
7	Morecver, "[a] Judge shall uphold and apply the law, and shall perform all duties of judicial office fairly
_ <u></u> £	and impartially" (Id@Rule2.2); see also Canon 2 of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct. A judge shall
. <u>q</u>	comply with the law, including the Cede of Judicial Conduct." (Id@Bule W) Judicial miscenduct
	accurs when a judge deliberately or knewingly and arbitrarily disregards the legal standards, cousing
11	delay and expense. See, https://definitions. usiegal.com/j/judicialmisconduct.
_12	An essential element of fairness is for a judge to be impartial and not to be bias or prejudice towards
_13	a defendant. Accordingly, due process requires that a judge possess neither actual nor apparent
<u></u>	bias. <u>Rippo v. Baker, 1375.Ct. 905, 907 (2017</u>). Even if a judges impartiality may be reasonably
_15	questioned, section 455 (a) requires recusal. See 28 USC\$455(a); see also, Sac Paulos Am. Tobacco Cer
_14	535 US 229, 233 (2002)
	<u>CLAIM i. Judge</u> participated in a conspiracy to illegally overturn
_18	Defendant's favorable 404(b) Ruling, thus aiding concenspirators
i9	to illegally and wrongfully convict Defendand of
20	
	Here, Judge participated in a conspiracy (with States Prosecutors and
22	and Trial Defense Attorney , which directly allowed perjurious
_23	testimony of State (civilian) witness at Defendant's trial (with others) by overturn-
_24	ing favocable 404(b) Ruling, which allowed co-conspirators to illegally and wrongfully convict
_25	Defendant et
_24	On , Prosecutor filed (sic) States Notice of Intent to Use Other Acts
_27	Evidence. Subsequently, the 404(b) Hearing was conducted on (DAX-1) and on
_2e	(DAY-2), which concluded the yoy (b) Hearing. The Court (Judge)
	rageceria

<u></u>	tock the case under advisement and on (nearly 4-months later) ruled in Favor
_2	of Defendant Prosecutor attempts to seek clarification on different occassions, yet when
_3	told tofile a motion, he ignores Judge advisement. For example, on
_4	during a status conference, asks the Court "if the court has maybe a balf hour sometime in
S	the near future for me to brief one issue and clarify the Courts ruling. So we have a very clear
_6	record for trial as to what and what is not admissible." see, Reporter's Transcript of Status
	Conference, Dated , attached hereto as EXIMIBIT A, at Pg4, 1014-17. Judge states"1
	don't knew exactly what it is you are going to be asking me certain specific events ior to
<u>s</u>	reconsider certain events, I want you to be very specific." (Id at Pg4, Lo18-24). responde
_1e	"Lam concerned about the things that were mainly heard the NIGHT of this alleged
	(incident]" (Idat Pg3, Ln8-9) (emphasis added). Judge interjects "what I would ask is that
_12	you WRITE UP what you are seeking from the Court (exactly) what you want clarified and/or
13	reconsidered MAK[ING] IT VERY CLEAR 30 I Know and I can correct it or I can simply try to issue a
_14	ruling." (10 at PS 5, La 14-19) (emphasis oulded). Judge further states "Of course, I want Mo
	also know what you are asking, so that she can also respond very specifically to that issue and focus on
_14	it, (1d at Pg 5, Lo22-24). The Court rules to give uptil to file this "Motion
_17	never files it. About months later, during a
18	Status Conference (6-weeks prior totrial), states on court record that "I had intended to
<u>i9</u>	ask the Court for a clarification with regards to a 404 roling. I NEVER FILED THAT so I'll get
_2&	that filed." see Reperter's Transcript of Status Conference, Dated , and attached herete
	as EXHIBIT B, at Pg4, in 22-24, (emphasis added). Judge responds we gave you a specific
_55	deadline It was on and I said: Counsel shall file any motions regarding 404(b)
_23	issues no later than if you do file something you should probably address why
24	it wasn't filled by that date." (Id at Pg.S, 13-17). Again, does not file a "Motion :
_25	The day before trial, during the Final Trial Management Conference, Judge
_26	Prosecutors and and Defense Attorney wece present, however Defendant was
27	not there, as Ms. told him this was just for jury question arre reprisement and he
_25	should prepare for trial tomorrow. The Judge, Prosecutors and Defense Attorney then met
	Page 3 of 13

.

•

ein chambers" see Final Trial Management Conference Minute Entry, Dated and attached herete as EXHIBIT C, at Pg 1. During this "chamber discussion" an agreement was reached which Z effectively overturned the 404(b) Ruling, previously in Defendants favor. This allowed States 3 totestify in trial. It's noteworthy, this "Ruling" over turning the 404(b) Witness 4 is not noted las it should be on the Minute Entry, but only evidenced by the transcripts of the ETMC, where the following discussion occurs on court record: Judge initiates this topic 4 by stating," There was an issue you asked about possibly getting clarification on one of my rulings, 4 and then we kind of passed the deadline." which responds "Right" Judge then states "I think it may have had to do with could observations from the day of the death come then states ... And I would tell you that my initial forward." responds "Right" 10 thinking is things that people OBSERVED ON THAT DAY may be relevant to what ultimately 12 happened, not as a bad act but as what happened that day. So initially I would tell you that _12 probably could come in, if it's an observation there" Fink further states "Ithink THE RULING 13 was hepefully explanatory. see Reporters Transcript of Dated 14 and attached hereto as EXHIBIT D. Pg19, LA20-Pg20, LAIT. (emphasis added). It's interesting to note that "THE RULING" is emitted from the Minute Entry. see EX. C. Pgi-2. Also note that Defense 16 did not argue or object to this "Ruing", which is a clear violation of Ariz.R. Attorney. 17 Crim.P., Rule 16.1 (b) which states in relevant part that "Parties must make ALL MOTIONS on laterthan 15 clays_____ before trial", and Bule 16.1 (d) which states in relevant part that "A court MAY NOT "Consider an issue 19_ previewsly decided in the case...". This "ruling" was made against the rules provided. The 22 "Motion" was a covert, off-the-record, orally presented; again against the rules, and was not 31 a benign issue, as it allowed perjured, witness-tampered testimony to begiven at trial .22 by State's (civilian) witness 2.3 and others. Defense Attorney was not a willing participant of this conspiracy to illegally overturn 24 this 404(b) Buling, but (weeks later) coerced into allowing the perjured testimony (new 25 ollowed by this SUBSEQUENT RULING) which is aviolation of the Rules of Professional Conduct, 24 21 EREH (a) and (e), by Presecutor and/or the Code of Judicial Conduct, Rule 1. 1 and 2.3 by of which one, or both, coerced Ms. to allow perjured testimony, as evidenced _2£__ Page 4 cf 13

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.