

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 22-473

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

July 14, 2023

The complainant alleged a superior court judge improperly exercised jurisdiction in a criminal matter.

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 July 14, 2023.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2022 - 473

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.

TAKE NOTICE; Furnished herein "COPY"

BILL OF EXCEPTIONS, Attachment within filed

and

Violations Title 18 U.S. Code § 241, 18 USC § 242 & RICO ACT first utilized

The herein actor portrayal(s) as People bound by oath, to uphold Private Rights as SWORN Judicial Branch Officers, to nullify within Legislative sanctioned tribunal's to breach said oath(s) to perpetrate commercial administrative action.

TAKE FURTHER NOTICE: Case Number:

Suit filed within the

COUNTY

Case No.

V

Defendant

STATE OF ARIZONA

Plaintiff

[illegible]

BILL OF EXCEPTIONS

AFFIDAVIT

BILL OF EXCEPTIONS

TAKE NOTICE; "The law requires proof of jurisdiction to appear on the record of the administrative agency and all administrative proceedings. Hagans v Lavine, 415 U.S. 533". The herein Defendant's to readdress and declare conflict of interest within the herein proceeding, the presiding Judge/Administrators being held liable for conflict in actions within administrative proceeding, acting court's agents; and as Defendant's readdressing jurisdiction within the

as Defendant's filed suit. BILL OF EXCEPTIONS

readdressing the improprieties of People bound by oath, as herein acting court's agent's to confer jurisdiction, court's procedure failure to direct Plaintiff's agents to Answer. Notice of failure notated as Noticed within:§ 2200.68 (c) [84 FR 14558, Apr. 10, 2019, as amended at 87 FR 8949, Feb. 17, 2022] Take Further Notice; Violation(s) of Title 18 U.S. Code § 241 Conspiracy Against Rights and Title 18 USC § 242 Deprivation of rights under color of law and due to conflict of interest of suit being filed within the

under Admiralty and Maritime law of Nation in equity, to be established pursuant to actions and inactions of People bound by oath to be known as therein as Defendants.

Bill of Exceptions

Take Notice: Defendant refuse any herein court's agents appointment(s) of counsel, Public Defender, or Bar Attorney, the defendant maintains that to incur such an appointment(s), supports and creates herein court's ability of augmenting Defendant's status and standing 'In Personam/ pro per jurisdiction' a subrogation/ Order into "confer 'pro se commercial jurisdiction', of which Defendant filed multiple Case Challenge's, being placed upon the herein Case records, and without being addressed by Plaintiff's agents or the court's agent's to direct Plaintiff to Answer, of Defendant's In Personam Jurisdiction Challenge(s) of the herein legislative tribunal's commercial court, and the ability to rule over one of the people and the court's to 'create order' "one of the people" to be a 'Pro Se representative an d/b/a ens legis business entity', created by Government to invoke a business status and standing. Defendant's Challenges to the name, enabling the courts agents to confer and secure as 'One of the People' being held as surety/obligee of a government created fictitious entity, to do business as d/b/a within the commercial establishment herein legislative tribunal's authority and jurisdiction. Defendant's multiple Challenges readdressing as filed within this herein courts case(s) by defendant, of which Challenges to have been filed for such People bound by oaths of Treacherous actions, the herein court's agents negated the Plaintiffs to answer of posed Challenges, only then to confer court's own authority of unsubstantiated self invoked finding, to create within an "ORDERED" establishment of a pro se standing upon the Defendant one of the People's status. The herein court's agents d/b/a and d/b/a both acting agents of the herein court's to have confer jurisdiction, and to have denied the defendant's Challenges by alleviating the Plaintiff's agent by Answering. The herein court to have been given Notice of herein stated jurisdiction conferral(s) by court's agents to no avail. This court to readdress, is herein challenged, to demand the 'Plaintiff to prove In Personam Jurisdiction over the defendant

The verification of a clear concise contract establishing the Trust
Trust as lien holder in due course within County Public Recording Office.
filed record number contracting and addressing as such. A clear and concise
verifiable 'Public Notice' of Verification of 'Private Contract' verifiable within County
Superior Court cases number(s) and to have verified
Defendant's on the record, notice of Trust, Claim in lien, to be used as
Defendant's refute and as Public Noticed documented testimony, of Plaintiff's Agents unverified,
and unsubstantiated commercial lien charges. The Defendant's position, and to CLAIM of the
conspiring of the Court's Agents and the State of Arizona County Agent's of racketeer
influenced and corrupt organization, the complicit action as administrators and judge(s) within an
administration capacity, to confer commercial jurisdiction over One of the People the herein
Defendant , conspiring with the State of Arizona Agent's as Plaintiff's by
commingling pro se commercial Jurisdiction.

After Challenges to jurisdiction file upon the record, and verbally challenged within herein court hearing, the Plaintiff's to have failed to prove jurisdiction upon the record, the court is reminded, "a court can not confer jurisdiction, it must be proven where none exist and cannot make a void

proceeding valid. It is clear and well established law that a void order can be challenged in any court" OLD WAYNE MUT. L. ASSOC. v. McDONOUGH, 204 U.S. 8, 27 S. Ct. 236 (1907), "There is no discretion to ignore lack of jurisdiction." Joyce v. U.S. 474 2D 215, "Court must prove on record, all jurisdiction facts related to the jurisdiction asserted." Latana v. Hopper, 102 F. 2D 188; Chicago v. New York 37 F Supp.150, "The law provides that once State and Federal Jurisdiction has been challenged, it must be proven." Main v. Thiboutot, 100 S. Ct. 2502 (1980), "Jurisdiction can be challenged at any time." and "Jurisdiction, once challenged, cannot be assumed and must be decided." Basso v. Utah Power & Light Co. 495 F 2D 906, 910., "Once challenged, jurisdiction cannot be assumed, it must be proved to exist." Stuck v. Medical Examiners 94 Ca 2d 751. 211 P2d 389., "Defense of lack of jurisdiction over subject mater may be raised at any time, even on appeal." Hill Top Developers v. Holiday Pines Service Corp. 478 So. 2D. 368 (Fla 2nd DCA 1985), "The burden shifts to the court to prove jurisdiction." Rosemond v. Lambert, 469 F2d 416, "Once jurisdiction is challenged, the court cannot proceed when it clearly appears that court lacks jurisdiction, the court has no authority to reach merits, but rather, should dismiss the action." Melo v. US, 505 F2d 1026., The law requires proof of jurisdiction to appear on the record of the administrative agency and all administrative proceedings." Hagans v. Lavine, 415 U. S. 533., A judgement rendered by a court without personal jurisdiction over the defendant is void. It is a nullity. [A judgement shown to be void for lack of personal service on the defendant is a nullity.] Sramek v. Sramek, 17 Kan. App. 2D 573, 576-77, 840 P.2d 553 (1992), rev. Denied 252 Kas. 1093 (1993). As clearly stated this court lacks personal jurisdiction over the "In Personam standing of the defendant herein court's use of appointment of courts agent's as defendant's counsel to confer jurisdiction by said appointment, the herein defendant denies any and all appointment and demanded withdrawal of all court's appointments of any and all defense counsel attorney's. Facts of the herein cases being the plaintiff and court lacks ability to proven jurisdiction, and must dismiss, yet continue to confer jurisdiction where none exists by manipulation of the court's ability to confer and induce jurisdiction through court defendant by counsel appointments all under defendant's protests and noted by court's agents.

The "alleged victim failed to swear under penalty of perjury" claim made, without a verifiable Claim the Plaintiff has no interrogatories to be utilized as evidence and must be dismissed.

Plaintiff failure to Answer Defendant's Filing default these proceedings.

Plaintiff failure to place sworn under penalty of perjury filed documents upon case record, shall stands as nullity, thus 'here say evidence' being utilized by the herein court to proceed. Defendant

does NOT consent to contract, does not consent to being held as a surety, does not to these proceedings what so ever. Defendant herein establishing upon Case Record a Complaint of the agent's of
County Clerk of Court, Judge(s)

and Chief Judge

in conjunction with STATE OF

ARIZONA Prosecutions agents

as an organized commercial subdued within d/b/a ens legis in subrogation as an at law presumption for attachment, upon One of the People being 'Pro Se subdued' within a legislative created action, and being knowledgeable, complicit, of herein said action and herein demand being held accountable as People bound by oath to uphold the Private Rights of We the People, and herein One of the People. Each of the People bound by oath, herein as sworn claim placing Defendant in harms way through what is described within the RICO ACT utilized on , of which these legislative administrative agents, acting within dual legislative duty, in conflicting judicial oath capacities, as sworn obligee(s), to have deviated from sworn oath's, into legislative commercialization of We the People and the Defendant as One of the People violation of Title 18 § 241 Conspiracy Against Rights and 18 § 242 under color of law, either to confer jurisdiction or adverse legal ease consent.

1. Plaintiff's failure to Prove jurisdiction on record
2. Plaintiff's failure to Answer Challenges to Jurisdiction, In Personam, and Subject Matter
3. Plaintiff's failure to present upon the case record Verifiable Claim (Sworn under penalty of perjury) substantiate interrogatory to stand as verifiable evidence.
4. Court's agents failed to direct Plaintiff's to Answer Defendant's Case filed Challenges In Personam, Subrogation/Subrogee.,

If the herein court's agent choose to to proceed further, the Defendant to call for subpoenas, as Witnesses and as counter testimony of State's agents commercial here say charge assertions;

Estates, a Mobilehome park of which Privately secured
to remove " Mobilehomes" from; Estates, "
victim(s) Alleged Plaintiff's filed fraudulent schemes and artifices, theft and Mobilehome
purchaser witness to neglect to provide
guarantee of all titles, of Mobilehomes within Mobilehome Estates, as
of , whom contracted Mobilehome removal subcontractor/personnel, and as witnessed of
the sale of purchased within Plaintiff's case
/ Owner/Seller of to / trust
man home in Arizona

PROOF OF CONSIDERATION

Cert
Judge(s) as Defendant's within district court for united states southern
district of new york, in personam only Admiralty and Maritime under the law of Nations in
Equity "COPY" USPS Certified Number:

Chief Justice Clerk of Court and

PROOF OF SERVICE USPS

Judge , agent emailed
Judge agent emailed
* State's Attorney agent emailed
Chief Judge agent emailed
Clerk of Court agent emailed

NOTICE OF COMPLAINT

Admiralty and Maritime under the law of Nations in Equity "In Personam ONLY"

By _____
in propria persona a private
irish moor arizonian of americas People being without the
United States in Congress Assembled nor citizen of
District of Columbia UNITED STATES

I DECLARE by my hand under penalty of perjury under the constitutional laws of arizona and
the united states of america that the foregoing is true and correct. Dated this the th day of

Witness: _____, Witness: _____

Print Name: _____, Print Name: _____

**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.**