State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 23-022
Judge:	
Complainant:	

ORDER

July 21, 2023

The complainant alleged improper legal rulings by a superior court judge hearing a criminal 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 Joseph C. Kreamer did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on July 21, 2023.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

2023-022

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name:	Judge's Name:
words what you believe the names, dates, times, and pages may be attached alon	rm or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional gray with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side a copy of the complaint for your records.
1), violation of cono.	canon be prop 207 the voter voted and
Arr. Judge's are	not following the law
2.) Judge amendment Protec	in violation of Canon R.1.1, 2.2, 6th 14th tion Act number The Voter profection Act the ex 2) of the Act states Reducing or eliminating offerse level or penalty provided for in this act
any offerse or a	fferse level or peralty provided for in this act
a complaint this to the person	n write a complaint it must be taken as form was not needed please address this matter that did not take my writen complaint thank
-	·

Before The Presiding Disc	iplinary Judge	
(The Attorney Disciplinary To Committee; Chaif Bar Ca	Probable Course	
Committee; Chait Bar Ca	unsel)	
T T 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	1	
In The Matter of A Non-Member	To Judicial, Administrative	
of the State Bar of Arizona	Assistant:	
en de la companya de		
N		
Assistant this is a judicial Complaint, Canon Violation P.I.I, 2.2 The violation of Kriz. Const. art 4pt.		
	10.22	
151(6)(c), voter Protection Act, Tr	u doctrine (2012) Pending	
action canon.		
	·	
	3:	

Before The Presiding Disciplinary Judge (The Attorney Discipline Probable Cause Committee; Chief Bur Cause))
In The Matter of A Non-Member Motion 54 (b) of The State Box of Arizona
State of Africana Judge
Judicial violation Cauty Judge _ case No: Filed in Cart on the Pleading for Prop 207 votes Protection Act
1.) Judge violation is a serious cross of Interference with the administration of Justice violation of constraint Compliance with the law The doctrine of 2012 gave clear instru- Ction on how court must function for pending-Action canon when statutory law is altered.
2) Judg uidation of canon R.1.1, 2.2, 6th, 14th amendment of U.S. Canst, and Ariz. Const. art pt 4 of pt. 131 (6) (c), voter Protection Act number 2) Reducing or climinating any offense or offense level or penalty provided for in this act