

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 22-216

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

December 14, 2022

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge improperly denied a request for self-representation and a request to record court proceedings, and also showed poor demeanor.

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 member Colleen E. Concannon did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on December 14, 2022.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

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

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

22-216

**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.

A YouTuber by the name of \_\_\_\_\_ is currently defending himself in \_\_\_\_\_ courtroom. They have had several pretrial hearings. \_\_\_\_\_ has repeatedly stated, and filed a motion, to represent himself. \_\_\_\_\_ is insistent that he cannot do so. Hearings started in \_\_\_\_\_ and continue.

On \_\_\_\_\_ filed his motion to represent himself. Despite properly filing the motion, \_\_\_\_\_ still pretends she hasn't received it. She could have asked her employees to check and see if any paperwork was missing, or she could have asked to see a copy of the signed and dated forms to confirm its existence, but she still refuses to acknowledge that the paper may have been properly filed. This is openly dishonest and manipulative.

She realized that \_\_\_\_\_ might be allowed to defend himself, but then she insisted that he answer certain questions that are highly demeaning. For example, she asked him in court whether he can read. How disgusting is that. Did she ask the prosecutor if he can read? No. And the defendant had already filed his own paperwork. How could she reasonably get paperwork from a man asking to defend himself, and then ignore that while accusing the man of being illiterate? It just shows she doesn't respect him at all. She doesn't want to deal with someone going pro se, because then she has to work harder, so she ignores him and insults him. She knows that if he overreacts, she can lock him up or put him in contempt. All the while, she's the one who needs to be reprimanded.

The form she is demanding he complete is not required by law. She said that it is required by case law, but she never said which case, or when. Actually, when \_\_\_\_\_ asked her in open court which case it was, she said that she had already told him on a previous day, but of course she hadn't done so. This means she is playing attorney from the bench, which is actually a criminal act, and she's also lying about what she already said. Surely she knows she didn't cite the specific case law, because it doesn't exist in the first place, and she's just telling one more lie to cover up another lie.

This is a man who wants to go pro se. The judge has repeatedly lied to prevent it. How is that for justice? But that's not all. \_\_\_\_\_ also wants to record his case with a personal audio recorder. Arizona's court rules specifically allow this, as long as one informs the judge. The judge does not have discretion to deny recording, except under specified circumstances (e.g., juveniles), none of which apply here. However, she threatened him and made him stop recording. So now he can't use that recording to effectively defend himself. It's also a First Amendment violation, which is potentially a 42 USC 1983 civil violation and a 42 USC 1985 crime, conspiracy to deprive someone of rights. It also means the media can't obtain coverage as they should, as the law intends. \_\_\_\_\_ told the judge the state court rules and gave her a copy of it, but she wouldn't take 2 minutes to read them. She doesn't know the law and she doesn't care. She's unfit to be up there, she knows it, and people's lives are getting ruined.