

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 23-028

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

August 28, 2023

The complainant alleged delayed rulings by a superior court judge hearing a post-conviction relief proceeding

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 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 Denise K. Aguilar and Louis F. Dominguez did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on August 28, 2023.

To: the AZ Commission on Judicial  
Conduct

In my case ( )  
it has been a constant violation  
of law by Judges.

I am Pro 'Per, and whenever  
I submit motions they are  
constantly late with the court  
rulings.

Also on several of the Motions  
the ruling has nothing to do  
with the relief requested. Rulings  
have been given and applied to  
the wrong filings. Then the filings  
that the Motion actually spoke  
about in detail is never actually  
ruled on.

The current example is  
this. At the end of I  
file a Motion to Exceed the  
28 page limit for a Post  
Conviction Relief. (Filed )  
At the time there were already  
Motions Pending Rulings. I  
then filed the PCR on .

Keep in mind by the Mail box Rule these motions are actually filed when mailed days earlier.

On the court ruled on all of these motions. Judge presided. (See Minute entry provided at the back) The first motion was filed, so it had already been days since filed by the court. By law it was filed days prior, at least, when it was mailed. If you look through my case for PCR you'll see this is a common occurrence.

The Court denied the Page extension and I had to appeal which take a long time. It took so long to appeal that Judge was replaced on my PCR.

I filed a new Motion to Exceed the page limit and asked that the stricken motion be filed, on almost a year later. At that time there was already motions

pending.

① Motion to Extend time to file the PCR, Filed , and Never Ruled on.

② Motion for an informal Video Conference, filed also on . Ruled on = days later.

Because the Motion to Extend time to File the PCR still had not been ruled on, I filed a second PCR on . and change it so an extension of the Page limit was not needed. The time limit expired and if my Extension of the time limit were denied I would not have been allowed to file at all. (That's what happened to my Direct Appeal) I did not want that to happen to my PCR as well.

The court held my second PCR for weeks before placing it on the docket on . On I filed a Motion to get a ruling on this PCR

because over days had passed and there was no response from the state.

That's Motions. On there was finally a Ruling made. It only applied to of the motions. (See Minute Entry in the back) On this date this was the result.

- ① No mention of the Motion to Extend time to file at all.
- ② Video conference denied days later.
- ③ Motion to Exceed the page limit granted and PCR decided as filed.
- ④ 2nd PCR Not Mentioned at all.
- ⑤ Motion for Rulings on 2nd PCR denied.

The court also gave the State days to respond to the filed PCR. They never responded to the second one which by now should have been ruled on by law.

What I believe the court is trying to do is claim the second PCR that was filed days prior is now filed that is illegal and unethical. It was already late, and the court's monthly requirement that no motion be pending longer than days was already violated.

Also the motion to Exceed the page limit clearly stated the first PCR as the one to be filed. The second one did not violate the page limit, so did not need a motion to exceed it.

The court swears monthly that it is not taking longer than days to rule on Motions. It signs an affidavit each month so the Judge is not sanctioned and gets paid. Both Judges on this PCR violated that. Judge for years and now Judge both have been lying about doing their jobs.

They also are incompetent

**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.**