State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 23-081
Judge:	
Complainant:	

ORDER

August 1, 2023

The complainant alleged improper legal rulings by a city 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 Denise K. Aguilar did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on August 1, 2023.

<u> 202</u>3 - 081

Arizona Commission of Judicial Conduct 1501 West Washington Street, Ste 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

GRIEVANCE: " Judge COURT

case no.

May this communication serve as notice of grievance for the errant conduct of ", which, in such office as "judge" with the COURT for case no. (pending), does act without such granted scope of authority despite jurisdictional challenge and beyond both verbal and written notice with documentation on the public record presented to her attention in particular.

I hereby refer this "person" and public "officer" to the Arizona Commission of Judicial Conduct as grievance for cause. I see such conduct "beyond notice" as both "willful and intentional" which a grand jury might consider and classify as "criminal".

That further trespass and damage not occur, I respectfully ask this "person's" professional oversight commission to consider that I attempted to express to officers curbside that they were acting without jurisdiction; these officers would not hear me. I attempted to express to " (judge) that I stand without court jurisdiction at initial presentation on ; this public servant would not hear me. "

"was also presented written documentation of status on
(attached) including addressed "copy:" to " (or Presiding Judge)"
and afforded notice and opportunity to correct with specification: "Notice to principals is
notice to agents; notice to agents is notice to principals." (2 copies present) Seeming to
disregard the written evidence presented, " responded with Notice
of Pending Court Action dated with associated arrest warrant.

Directly addressed with "Returned Service" and a Motion to Dismiss (attached), " responded to Assistant City Prosecutor, " " pursuit of summary denial on with pre-adjudication warrant for arrest with bond. Based upon the initial fraud of arrest without jurisdiction and unlawful imprisonment, rendering all that follows as fraud, would seem to be an "official order" and conspiracy for assault and kidnapping.

"seems not to consider the initial error of patrol officers with "CITY OF "protective services overstepping their scope of authority in ignorance resulting in fictitious obligations without jurisdiction. Upon serious reflection, the matter may have been concluded upon the first consideration of "to observe upon review" to observe upon review

and due diligence. It appears " honors no publicly published document presented, and rather than correct course, chooses to pursue further error with apparent will and intent to a questionable end beyond such initial arrest in error.

With motion to dismiss was specified as returned service "No UCC Contract Trust and no Territorial Office", information with which an educated and experienced judicial officer might be expected to review, consider, and have such significant detail guide their actions to a different course. I add in the interest of further edification that which I have communicated to the "judges" responsible for allowing such trespass to continue, I am neither "member of the district" (territorial) nor "member of the city" (municipal)", but a man, and living soul on the land and soil, where no administrative, municipal, nor territorial court holds any jurisdiction, yet, egregious trespass continues.

Having begun with a fraudulent arrest without jurisdiction, all proceeding action is therefore void, "void ab initio", without any merit, the entire house seeming to casual observance to be a massive teetering constructive fraud. Adjudication in due course will determine the law and facts of such matters.

I affirm under penalty of perjury that the foregoing information and the allegations contained in the above testimony are true to the best of my knowledge.

for:		date:
by:		
	ts Reserved	
Arizona Sta	te :	
C	ounty:	
	day of	
	hysically appeared	whose identity
the man wh	ose name is subscribed	atisfactory evidence to be to this document, and who bove attached document.
Notary Public		



CITY ATTORNEY

Assistant City Prosecutor

IN THE

COURT

COUNTY, STATE OF ARIZONA

THE STATE OF A	RIZONA,) Complaint No.:
	Plaintiff,) Case No.:
vs.) RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION) TO DISMISS)
	Defendant.)

The State of Arizona, by and through undersigned counsel, moves the Court to summarily deny the defendant's motion to dismiss as it provides no factual or legal basis.

Ariz. R. Crim. Pro. Also, dismissal pretrial is not proper where the complaint is legally sufficient. Ariz. R. Crim. Pro. 16.4.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this day of

CITY ATTORNEY

Assistant City Prosecutor

1	Copy mailed/delivered this
2	day of to:
3	The Honorable
4	City Court
5	
6	
7	
8	By:
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	

0	
6	On.

State Of Arizona VS.		a	Arrest Warrant		For Court Use	
			Case #:			
			III	NGERPRINTED USE A E: AZCR3-1 IN THE OF	ZAFIS PRINT TYPE 04 FENSE FIELD.	
e nearest or earest or mo	MMANDED to arre most accessible st accessible ma		ndant before this ounty. If the arrest is	s made in another cou	navailable, you must t inty, you must take the	
ıle 3.1(d) P	re-Adjudication	(post Initial Appeara /are described as follo	nnce) A	CCH Code:		
Offens	e Date	St	tatute/Rule & Lite	eral Description		Offense Class
	the behalf of the	d without having an ir e accused in the amou	nt of			ss 1 Misdemeanor ss 2 Misdemeanor cured appearance
1960 156	i ne offense is, or					
l Unknown -	The oπense is, or		-	Honorable		
Unknown - Date	10 AND 25	DOB:	HGT:	Honorable WGT:	EYES:	HAIR:
Unknown - Date SEX:	RACE:	DOB:	1 May 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		EYES:	HAIR:
Oate SEX:	10 AND 25	DOB:	1 May 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		EYES:	HAIR:
Date SEX: address: court ORI:	10 AND 25		1 May 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	WGT;	EYES:	HAIR:
Unknown -	10 AND 25		HGT:	WGT;		

Court name

Badge#

and presented defendant before Judge

Date

Judge's name

Agency

Deputy Sheriff/Officer

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.