## State of Arizona

## COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 22-300
Judges:	
Complainant:	

## **ORDER**

June 2, 2023

The Complainant alleged improper rulings by two superior court judges hearing a family 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 member Denise K. Aguilar did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on June 2, 2023.

From:	
Sent:	

To: Commission on Judicial Conduct

Subject: Attention Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please confirm receipt:

Attention Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct:

Please the below complaint from against Judge and the

Judge This complaint details multiple violations of the Arizona Code of Judicial

Conduct regarding case pertaining to Hearing (and order)

and Order Entered By Court namely:

- Cannon 1 Rule 1.2 A judge shall act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety.
- 2. RULE 2.2. Impartiality and Fairness A judge shall uphold and apply the law, and shall perform all duties of judicial office fairly and impartially.
- 3. RULE 2.3. Bias, Prejudice, and Harassment (A) A judge shall perform the duties of judicial office, including administrative duties, without bias or prejudice.

4. RULE 2.5. Competence, Diligence, and Cooperation (A) A judge shall perform judicial and administrative duties competently, diligently, and promptly.

Both Judges violated the above rules by hastily and without reasonable consideration, entering orders which were <u>irrefutably proven incorrect beyond a reasonable doubt</u>. They ignored requests to extend the time of the hearing or to delay a decision with a more proper amount of deliberation, instead improperly rushing to the incorrect judgement and displaying complete lack of independence, un-bias, or impartiality.

Judge Ordered:

THE COURT FINDS the testimony and evidence presented that the children's pediatrician recommended the children obtain to be more credible than the testimony of that the children should not

THE COURT FINDS the following ruling is in the best interests of the minor children in this case.

IT IS ORDERED granting Mother the authority to provide the minor children.

. Mother shall provide Father with no less than least 24 hours' notice of the children's scheduled appointments. Father shall take no action to interfere with these appointments. Father shall not communicate with the medical provider who will be providing this before the appointments. Father may not speak negatively with the children regarding this prior to the children's receipt of all required.

Jude Ordered:

IT IS ORDERED denying the request to vacate the order awarding attorney's fees and costs. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED denying the request for

## reconsideration.

	All of expert witness's testimony and concerns about the							
	have been <u>irrefutably proven correct beyond a</u>							
	reasonable doubt. The testimony of the "children's pediatrician" has been irrefutably							
	proven incorrect beyond a reasonable doubt. The order by Judge							
	has been irrefutably proven incorrect beyond a reasonable doubt:							
1.	The has finally	admitted the	is worth	nless (and with NEGATIVE				
	) and that those who receive and do not receive it should be treate							
	the same.							
2	The drastically under-reported (by 10X or more)							
۷.								
	continues to rise in death toll and injuries now exceeding							
	,			reports as a DIRECT RESULT				
	of	exceeding	in the	through				
3	Death rates among	voung neonle hav	ve dramatically risen a	t a rate never hefore seen				
	<ul> <li>Death rates among young people have dramatically risen at a rate never before seen.</li> <li>A Recent study in found children between</li> </ul>							
,								
	the ages of are <u>MORE</u> likely to die within a month than those who did							
_	take the vaccine.		-l d £: d: !!					
5.	researcher	publi	shed a paper finding "					
	." In fact, the opposite was true: "							
	."							
6.	6. Unexplained mortality from		is on the	is on the rise everywhere in the				
	world.							
7.	In the	of		are 50% more likely				
	than the							
8.	The	stated "						
				."				
9	The govern	nment has admitte	ed that "					
٠.	80.011	II						
10.	0. Indeed, there is overwhelming evidence severely damages t							
		immune system and, in some cases, caus		, .				
11.	,		are all on the rise in	and				
	researches i			J				
		1						

t

.

It is indisputable that requests to extend the length of the hearing, take additional time for deliberation, and a request for reconsideration should all have been granted and were instead improperly denied.

- 5. RULE 1.3. Avoiding Abuse of the Prestige of Judicial Office A judge shall not abuse the prestige of judicial office to advance the personal or economic interests of the judge or others, or allow others to do so.
- 6. RULE 2.4. External Influences on Judicial Conduct (A) A judge shall not be swayed by partisan interests, public clamor, or fear of criticism
- 7. CANON 4 A JUDGE OR CANDIDATE FOR JUDICIAL OFFICE SHALL NOT ENGAGE IN POLITICAL OR CAMPAIGN ACTIVITY THAT IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE INDEPENDENCE, INTEGRITY, OR IMPARTIALITY OF THE JUDICIARY RULE 4.1. Political and Campaign Activities of Judges and Judicial Candidates in General.

By rushing to judgement which was <u>irrefutably proven incorrect beyond a reasonable</u> and Judge were willing and active doubt, Judge participants in advancing the economic interest of who have been irrefutably proven beyond a reasonable doubt to have falsified and hidden through fraud the . In addition, Judge were willing and active participants in advancing the political agenda not based in any science whatsoever of resulting in countless unnecessary deaths and injuries. They refused to properly consider significant evidence that is far superior, and is unnecessary and useless

- 8. RULE 2.8. Decorum, Demeanor, and Communication with Jurors (B) A judge shall be patient, dignified, and courteous to litigants, jurors, witnesses, lawyers, court staff, court officials, and others with whom the judge deals in an official capacity, and shall require similar conduct of lawyers, court staff, court officials, and others subject to the judge's direction and control.
- 9. RULE 2.11. Disqualification (A) A judge shall disqualify himself or herself in any proceeding in which the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned, including but not limited to the following circumstances: 18 (1) The judge has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party or a party's lawyer, or personal knowledge of facts that

are in dispute in the proceeding.

Judge violated Rule 2.8 by acting as opposing council with an impartial and aggressive line of questioning aimed at including threats of "over a baseless accusation of reading information during video testimony. This began when it was clear that not only was attorney uninformed and ill-prepared, but also unable to prove his case or produce any expert witness testimony; but simply a blanket statement from the children's biased pedestrian which was also irrefutably proven incorrect beyond a reasonable doubt.

Due to their violation of the above rules including Rule 2.11, both Judge and Judge should have immediately disqualified themselves since they were unable to rule impartially or consider any of the scientific or medical evidence due to a clear personal bias, prejudice, political mandate, or personal knowledge of facts in dispute.

Further, believes this active and willing participation of both Judge in politically driven mandates which were unscientific, advanced the economic interest of who have been irrefutably proven beyond a reasonable doubt to have falsified and hidden through fraud efficacy and safety data during , were biased, prejudiced, were demonstratably and irrefutably incorrect, and resulted in coercion which violates Civil and Federal Law (21 code of federal regulations section 50.23 and 50.24 and 18 US Code Section 2331 Subsection 802 Anytime a US Citizen is forced to do something (coerce a population) it would otherwise not do is defined as Domestic Terrorism) and which is a Felony carrying a term of 99 years in prison and up to \$100 Million Dollar fine per institution.

Therefore, requests the above two decisions be <u>vacated and reversed</u>, an order for <u>immediate repayment of all legal fees be made</u>, both Judge and Judge be <u>removed as judges and barred from serving as a judge in perpetuity</u>, and immediately <u>investigated for violations of Civil and Federal Law cited above</u> as well as violations of the

Sincerely,