

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 22-391

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

February 22, 2023

The Complainant alleged improper legal decisions and delayed rulings by a superior court judge hearing civil cases.

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).

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 22, 2023.

From:
To:
Cc:
Sent:
Attach:
Subject:

Attn:

Ms.

----- Original Message -----

From:
To:
Cc:
Sent:
Subject:

Complaint and sworn affidavit by

AZ Judicial Commission
1501 W. Washington #229
Phoenix, Az. 85007

Commission Case

Judge
Judge

Plaintiff:

V

Defendant:
Counsel:

Re: Complaint against Judge actions and
troublesome nonconforming procedures.

1. Failure to respond to detailed motions filed by the plaintiff to the judge Court between and and assumed to have been ignored by the courts silence without explanation or any written responses.

2. Failure by the court to permit the plaintiffs several written requests for what are called **evidentiary hearings** permitted by the ARS statutes regarding an irrelevant comingled foreign matter was reaching into of the legal jurisdiction to allow them to proceed in a convoluted and unprofessional manner which were already available by other means already by submitted documents already in he courts hands and was sought by the the plaintiff to remind the court that it was reaching into a foreign and irrelevant the case than the one on hand.

3. Refusal to permit the plaintiff his civil rights under the US Constitution comprised all or in part by the 14th amendment (Equal rights under the law and/or as defined in laymans terms, ('Justice delayed - justice denied') of the US Constitution as per the plaintiffs several

requests and legal right to do so by making such a requests several times in the past years only to have them ignored to no avail

- sorry to say.

4. The felonious allegations made by counsel that ended up just causing the court to 'bend the direction of the courts thoughts and its thoughts contrary to the already defined facts and on the wrong side of his spurious and or irrevelant invented evidence caused the dismissal of past legal decisions, and settlements made by and un-acceptable legal precedents contrary to the already established protocols.

5. The setting aside of priorly litigated (years earlier) facts already settled to each sides mutual satisfaction) legal decisions made **expost post facto** by the people of the state of Arizona department in favor of the plaintiff without any question or out without any arguable theories questioning their its legitimacy.

6. Illegally setting aside of decisions and compromises found acceptable to all parties sometime three years prior (?) and negotiated with the people by my then attorney (Office:) and as disclosed by his in file sworn affidavit and his offer to appear in court as my certified witness from the very inception of this case.

7. The truncated decision by Judge to dismiss the plaintiffs counter suit filed on the basis of these false allegations that have '**never**' been presented as **tangible evidence**' in an for that he misrepresented the truth with a kilo of unfounded and frivolous motions by counsel to dismiss my suit on the basis of unfounded or frivolous allegations that were all a just pipe dream as no provable or tangible evidence has ever been presented by anyone as being tangible contrary evidence in on hand this legal matter.

8. it Judge having continued this case into unnecessarily because he had bull headedly sat on all outstanding motions for more than years for no

justifiable legal reason! Then after forcibly having his way by his legal authority 'failing to keep his scheduled telephone trifecta along with counsel who were

ignored all my future phone messages to his office a week before the meeting was scheduled trying to confirm the time of the forcibly imposed telephonic meeting a week

before the telephonic meeting was scheduled which in the end was defaulted by judge who defaulted by **not submitting his required (confirmed by me) minute entry.**

Complaint against Judge .

1. After gleening the County legal legal records several weeks later on a hunch about confirming counsel had lied to the plaintiff about the real truth

to this matter, **having had the outstanding lien released** I received a favorable County courts blessings of a 2nd Pro Se approval to go

after counsel , Esq and his pipe dreams lies and discovering that my lien **had indeed been released by the people** based on

my episodes as counsel had lied to me about my file and finding that my dismissal of my lien was a fact of life. the plaintiff

I never heard from judge again and figured he didn't want to have to have anything to do with judge ongoing circus.

2. After receiving my plaintiffs file judge after a delay in excess of month the court failed to proceed as per the court approved Pro Sa approved motion and repeated calls to his secretary () advised the plaintiff that there were procedures in place and that she could nor serve as an intermediary between and the court and the plaintiff so I left things to the courts its

devices. I never heard from the judge so I just waited and waited to no avail reluctant to call his secretary again. This matter

was never unwound as it should have been....

[Complaint against the judicial Commission:

Having studied the commissions platform for an entire (months) pondering how to make best used of their services in my troublesome case with a judge that has shown little regard for Pro Se etiquette, the US Constitution 14th amendment (AKA as known Equal rights under the law), filed several times and yet unanswered minute entries to counsel , Esq. in the end despite all the violations by the presiding judge judge which the commission seemed to ignore **decided to ignore** the myriad of non-compliance violations of the commissions platform made by the court in its resoluteness.

Respectfully submitted,