

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 22-220

---

Judges:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

October 12, 2022

The Complainant alleged the judicial officers considering an appeal did not follow the law and participated in a cover-up of criminal acts by the lower court.

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 Michael J. Brown did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on October 12, 2022.

COMPLAINT AGAINST JUDGE

01. Complainant filed his NOTICE REQUESTING POST-CONVICTION RELIEF Under Rule 32  
 and PETITION FOR POST-CONVICTION RELIEF in \_\_\_\_\_ in the  
 Court of \_\_\_\_\_ County.

02. FOR ASSIGNMENT TO JUDICIAL OFFICER FOR RULING was ORDERED by Judge  
 to Judge \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_

03. RULE 32 PROCEEDING DISMISSED by Judge \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_

04. Judge \_\_\_\_\_ engaged in deceit as evidenced in remarks, "Pending before the  
 Court are Defendant's Notice Requesting Post-Conviction Relief filed on \_\_\_\_\_  
 and Petition for Post-Conviction Relief filed on \_\_\_\_\_"

05. According to Black's Law Dictionary, pending is "remaining undecided; waiting decision."

06. Judge \_\_\_\_\_ claim of "Defendant's Notice Requesting Post-Conviction Relief  
 filed on \_\_\_\_\_ and Petition for Post-Conviction Relief filed on \_\_\_\_\_"  
 were "pending" was a deliberate falsehood, as both those filings were already ruled on by  
 Judge \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_ - The record is the proof.

07. According to Black's Law Dictionary, falsehood is "1. A statement that is untrue, esp.  
 one deliberately so; a lie. 2. The practice of telling lies; mendacity. 3. The state of not  
 being true; falsity. 4. Perjury."

08. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 13-2702. Perjury - "(A.) A person commits perjury by making either:

(1.) A false sworn statement in regard to a material issue, believing it to be false.

(2.) A false unsworn declaration, certificate, verification or statement in regard to a material issue that the person subscribes as true under penalty of perjury, believing it to be false. (B) Perjury is a class 4 felony."

09. "The State must file its response no later than 15 days after the defendant files the petition." Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.9(c)(1).

10. Judge is evidenced of a deliberate denial of due process, knowingly violating rules of protocol, and dismissing Rule 32 proceedings without any objections by the State.

11. In Ruling on a Post-Conviction Relief Petition, "the Court must make specific findings of fact and expressly state its conclusions of law relating to each issue presented." Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.13(d)(2).

12. In Ruling on a Post-Conviction Relief Petition, "the Court is required to decide every issue or claim on its merits. A failure to do so means the Petition was never heard and violated Defendants due process rights." Lewis v. Mayle, 391 F.3d 989 (CA 9 2000).

13. Judge knowingly violated Defendants due process rights and did not even address the Petition with claim filed on November 2, 2021.

14. Complainant filed his PETITION FOR REVIEW in the  
on (Exhibit - 01).

15. The COURT ORDERED the Clerk of County Court to transmit the record on appeal on or before pursuant to Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.16(j) and 33.16(j). (Exhibit - 02).

16. He transmitted the record on appeal to the (Exhibit - 03).

17. Presiding Judge Judge and Judge of the delivered their DECISION on (Exhibit - 04).

18. Judge is evidenced of nonfeasance, perjury, criminal conspiracy and deprivation of rights under color of law by remarks in DECISION filed on "It is petitioner's burden to show that the superior court abused its discretion by denying the petition for post-conviction relief... We have reviewed the record in this matter, the superior court's order denying the petition for post-conviction relief, and the petition for review. We find that petitioner has not established an abuse of discretion. We grant review and deny relief." (Exhibit - 04).

19. Judge claims to have "reviewed the record in this matter, the court's order denying the petition for post-conviction relief, and the petition for review" - yet knowingly never addressed the fact Judge of the court lied about a petition on. "pending," and never addressing the petition on that was assigned to him. Judge committed perjury, criminal conspiracy, and cover-up of perjury with an absolute abuse of discretion.

20. Compliment,

Judicial Conduct of Judge

Now notify the Arizona Commission on

knowingly: (1) violating the Arizona

Code of Judicial Conduct; (2) committed criminal acts that reflect adversely on the integrity of judicial proceedings; (3) engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit and misrepresentation, and; (4) engaged in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The record is the proof. (Exhibit - 04) (ROA).

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED on this day of

NOTARY PUBLIC

DATE

DATE

COMPLAINT AGAINST JUDGE

EXHIBIT - 01

**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.**

COMPLAINT AGAINST JUDGE

01. Complainant filed his NOTICE REQUESTING POST-CONVICTION RELIEF Under Rule 32  
 and PETITION FOR POST-CONVICTION RELIEF in the  
 Court of County.

02. PCR ASSIGNMENT TO JUDICIAL OFFICER FOR RULING was ORDERED by Judge  
 to Judge " "

03. RULE 32 PROCEEDING DISMISSED by Judge " "

04. Judge engaged in deceit as evidenced in remarks, "Pending before the  
 Court are Defendant's Notice Requesting Post-Conviction Relief filed on  
 and Petition for Post-Conviction Relief filed on."

05. According to Black's Law Dictionary, pending is "remaining undecided; awaiting decision."

06. Judge claim of "Defendant's Notice Requesting Post-Conviction Relief  
 filed on and Petition for Post-Conviction Relief filed on."  
 were "pending" was a deliberate falsehood, as both those filings were already ruled on by  
 Judge " " - The record is the proof.

07. According to Black's Law Dictionary, falsehood, is "1. A statement that is untrue, esp.  
 one deliberately so; 2. lie. 3. The practice of telling lies; mendacity. 4. The state of not  
 being true; falsity. 5. Perjury."

08. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 13-2702, Perjury - "(A) A person commits perjury by making either:  
(1.) A false sworn statement in regard to a material issue, believing it to be false.  
(2.) A false unsworn declaration, certificate, verification or statement in regard to a material issue that the person subscribes as true under penalty of perjury, believing it to be false. (B) Perjury is a class 4 felony."

09. "The State must file its response no later than 45 days after the defendant files the petition." Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.9(2)(1).

10. Judge is evidenced of a deliberate denial of due process, knowingly violating rules of protocol, and dismissing Rule 32 proceedings without any objections by the State.

11. In Ruling on a Post-Conviction Relief Petition, "the Court must make specific findings of fact and expressly state its conclusions of law relating to each issue presented." Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.13(d)(1).

12. In Ruling on a Post-Conviction Relief Petition, "the Court is required to decide every issue or claim on its merits. A failure to do so means the Petition was never heard and violated Defendants due process rights." Lewis v. Mayle, 391 F.3d 979 (CA 9 2004).

13. Judge knowingly violated Defendants due process rights and did not even address the Petition with claim filed on

14. Complainant filed his PETITION FOR REVIEW in the  
on (Exhibit-01).

15. The \_\_\_\_\_ ORDERED the \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_ County  
Court to transmit the record on appeal on or before \_\_\_\_\_ pursuant  
to Ariz.R.Crim.P. 32.16(j) and 33.16(j). (Exhibit - 02).

16. The \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_ County Court transmitted the record on appeal  
on \_\_\_\_\_ to the \_\_\_\_\_ (Exhibit - 03).

17. Presiding Judge \_\_\_\_\_ Judge \_\_\_\_\_ and Judge \_\_\_\_\_  
of the \_\_\_\_\_ delivered their DECISION on  
(Exhibit - 04).

18. Judge \_\_\_\_\_ is evidenced of nonfeasance, perjury, criminal conspiracy  
and deprivation of rights under color of law by remarks in DECISION  
filed on \_\_\_\_\_ "It is petitioner's burden to show that the superior court abused  
its discretion by denying the petition for post-conviction relief... We have reviewed the  
record in this matter, the superior court's order denying the petition for post-conviction  
relief, and the petition for review. We find that petitioner has not established an abuse  
of discretion. We grant review and deny relief." (Exhibit - 04).

19. Judge \_\_\_\_\_ claims to have "reviewed the record in this matter, the  
court's order denying the petition for post-conviction relief, and the petition for review,"  
yet knowingly never addressed the fact Judge \_\_\_\_\_ of the \_\_\_\_\_ court  
lied about a petition on \_\_\_\_\_ "pending," and never addressing the petition  
on \_\_\_\_\_ that was assigned to him. Judge \_\_\_\_\_ committed  
perjury, criminal conspiracy, and cover-up of perjury with an absolute abuse of discretion.

20. Complainant,

Judicial Conduct of Judge

Now notifies the Arizona Commission on  
knowingly (1) violating the Arizona

Code of Judicial Conduct; (2) committed criminal acts that reflect adversely on the  
integrity of judicial proceedings; (3) engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud,  
deceit and misrepresentation, and; (4) engaged in conduct that is prejudicial to the  
administration of justice. The record is the proof. (Exhibit-04) (ROA).

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED on this      day of

NOTARY PUBLIC

DATE

DATE

1 COMPLAINT AGAINST JUDGE

2  
3 EXHIBIT - 01  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**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.**

2022-220

COMPLAINT AGAINST JUDGE

01. Complainant filed his NOTICE REQUESTING POST-CONVICTION RELIEF Under Rule 32  
and PETITION FOR POST-CONVICTION RELIEF on \_\_\_\_\_ in the  
Court of \_\_\_\_\_ County.

02. POR ASSIGNMENT TO JUDICIAL OFFICER FOR RULING was ORDERED by Judge  
to Judge \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_

03. RULE 32 PROCEEDING DISMISSED by Judge \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_

04. Judge \_\_\_\_\_ engaged in deceit as evidenced in remarks, "Pending before the  
Court are Defendant's Notice Requesting Post-Conviction Relief filed on \_\_\_\_\_  
and Petition for Post-Conviction Relief filed on \_\_\_\_\_"

05. According to Black's Law Dictionary, pending, is "remaining undecided; awaiting decision."

06. Judge \_\_\_\_\_ claim of "Defendant's Notice Requesting Post-Conviction Relief  
filed on \_\_\_\_\_ and Petition for Post-Conviction Relief filed on \_\_\_\_\_"  
were "pending" was a deliberate falsehood as both filings were already ruled on by  
Judge \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_ - The record is the proof.

07. According to Black's Law Dictionary, falsehood, is "1. A statement that is untrue, esp.  
one deliberately so; 2 lie. 2. The practice of telling lies; mendacity. 3. The state of not  
being true; falsity. 4. Perjury."

08. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 13-2402. Perjury - "(A) A person commits perjury by making either:  
(1.) A false sworn statement in regard to a material issue, believing it to be false.  
(2.) A false unsworn declaration, certificate, verification or statement in regard to a material issue that the person subscribes as true under penalty of perjury, believing it to be false. (B) Perjury is a class 4 felony."

09. "The State must file its response no later than 45 days after the defendant files the petition." Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.9(2)(1).

10. Judge is evidenced of a deliberate denial of due process, knowingly violating rules of protocol, and dismissing Rule 32 proceedings without any objections by the State.

11. In Ruling on a Post-Conviction Relief Petition, "the Court must make specific findings of fact and expressly state its conclusions of law relating to each issue presented." Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.13(d)(1).

12. In Ruling on a Post-Conviction Relief Petition, "the Court is required to decide every issue or claim on its merits. A failure to do so means the Petition was never heard and violated Defendants due process rights." Lewis v. Mayle, 391 F.3d 989 (CA 9 2004).

13. Judge knowingly violated Defendants due process rights and did not even address the Petition with claim filed on

14. Complainant filed his PETITION FOR REVIEW in the  
on (Exhibit-01)

15. The ORDERED the of County  
Court to transmit the record on appeal on or before pursuant  
to Ariz. R. Crim. P. 32.16(j) and 33.16(j). (Exhibit - 02).

16. the of County Court transmitted the record on appeal  
on to the (Exhibit - 03).

17. Presiding Judge Judge and Judge  
of the delivered their DECISION on  
(Exhibit - 04).

18. Judge is evidenced of nonfeasance, perjury, criminal conspiracy  
and deprivation of rights under color of law by remarks in DECISION  
filed on "It is petitioner's burden to show that the superior court abused  
its discretion by denying the petition for post-conviction relief. . . We have reviewed the  
record in this matter, the superior court's order denying the petition for post-conviction  
relief, and the petition for review. We find that petitioner has not established an abuse  
of discretion. We grant review and deny relief."

19. Judge claims to have "reviewed the record in this matter, the  
court's order denying the petition for post-conviction relief, and the petition for review,"  
yet knowingly never addressed the fact Judge of the court  
lied about a petition on "pending," and never addressing the petition  
on that was assigned to him. Judge committed  
perjury, criminal conspiracy, and cover-up of perjury with an absolute abuse of discretion.

20. Complainant,

Judicial Conduct of Judge

Code of Judicial Conduct; (2) committed criminal acts that reflect adversely on the integrity of judicial proceedings; (3) engaged in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit and misrepresentation, and; (4) engaged in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice. The record is the proof. (Exhibit - ~~CA~~ ROA).

Now notifies the Arizona Commission on  
knowingly: (2) violating the Arizona

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED on this day of

NOTARY PUBLIC

DATE

DATE

1 COMPLAINT AGAINST JUDGE

2  
3 EXHIBIT - 01  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**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.**