State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 23-158
Judge:	
Complainant:	

ORDER

July 14, 2023

The complainant alleged a superior court judge failed to make a record while conducting hearings in 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 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.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

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

2023-158

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name:	Judge's Name:
Instructions: Use words what you be names, dates, times, be attached along wi	his form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own lieve the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may the copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper of the complaint for your records.
In this	case, it is the Judge , who is in change of
the court reco	n, be, captain of the shipsin . Pursuant
	V. Stat. 33 12-221 and 12-231, the judge appoints both the
	(Stenographer) and the Bailist to prescribe their duties
	the office outh by the judge.
In this C	use Judge failed to a dhere to the Standards set
forth by the A	izone Code of Judicial Administration , Pt. 1: Chapt. b:
\$1-602. ON	10/38/15 during Claimants trul bothe both the Stenegrapher
(10/38/15 during Claimants trial bothe both the Stenegrapher hereingten) and the Bailist ("hereinaften)
Sterograph a	d FTR Malfunctioned almost Simultaneously, was to
the presecut	to dring in a Courtneam Projector and the dimming of the court-
room lights	to Show the junes non-disclosed, non-admissible exidence Laptup Viewings of " As a result, important ovents,
of claiment	: Laptup Viewings of " . As a result, important ovents,
evidence 41	il fortige of the will was not recorded by
and was los.	.(ROA)
Furthe	more, as a result of the Courts Ma Studetioning electronic
recorders /	recording devices and the Stenographers Realtime recel and
Stenigraph	Freezings when claiment filed his Motion FOR NEW
trial on	and when he filed an Direct Applear on
The evidence	e, testimony of Witness, and footoge of the

Prosecutos misconduct was not available to claimants use.

However, in the OPDS assigned on Expert Witness,

from . He is familiar with

the Court room recording Systems and qualifies as an expert

in facial recognition Software.

ON Claimants P.I., wrote him.

a letter informing claiment of "Official Report as to if the FIR had been edited. Stated that,"

" See, (Exhibit B)

THE FACTS:

(1.) That, the defendant, total occurred on Suring trial the prosecute called witness. (. 'seeprefte')

It the Stand to give testimony on behalf of her deceased husband. See,

(FTR at OR R.T., pg. 1, lines). The Prosecutor

asked. the following:

(herenofter)? Before answering,

rises from the witness chair send states Very Loudly that, "

This testimony does not appear in defendant's

transcripts. The transcripted answer is simply"."

(2) That, at the Same time Stenegraph Fraze and did not necond. Testimony stating; "is the same time the Court's FTR (operated by) also failed to record

statements, and as a matter of fact, the court's FTR failed to record pages - , lines and page , lines of R.T.

(3) ON Affendants P.I., interviewed who explained that,"

para. #30). "See, (EXHIBIT A,

(4.) That, further in (Exhibit A, para's \$1,8,13) states that, she never had to have her L'tenograph Machine repaired, certified or inspected.

(5) That, in (Exhibit A, pera to) goes on to explain that, she was as a Stenographer she was responsible for the purchase of the Stenograph machine and the Lojtware to run the machine.

(6) That, stated that,"

11111111

of the trial as the stenographen machine See (Exhibit A,

(8.) That, at , P.I. received a text message from advising him to examine pgs. and: See (EXHIBIT A, para 30)

(9.) That, the defendants missing testiment of the prosecutions playing of defendants "located on his Laptop Computer that was shown to the jurior's on the Courts Projector after the dimmings of the Countroom lights and the Prosecutions statement to the jurior's informing the jurior's that,"

of line through of page thru pg. , lines 1 .).

10. That, defendant first made his claims of the above events in his MOTIONE FOR NEW TRIAL filed about weeks after his trial, on . (RUA and and para 5, 11 and 13) while the court's misconduct and events were fresh on defendants mind.

(11.) That, it was not until appreximetely

Was notified by his h.I. of the Expects (

That the Court pulled a Switcherce, i.e., Lamera Comera Switch

of the electronic recording devices during trial. See (Exhibit B) (the term cumera

switch is ambiguous. It events mean that translation actual switch boated in the PTA system or

the Courts switched comera's during trial. This is left of the Holouts discretion of specking in Minimister.

To condicte me an entire the switch of the record the prosecutions minimister.

(D) That, previously, for the past years defendant had believed

that the FTA had been edited, deleted and as to why the Courtroom

events were not present in the Stenographers transcripts and for

on the Courts electronic recording device. Rolf.

(13.) That, when defendant filed his MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL, and his Appeal, and Rule 32 OH the Same Issue (Missing transcripts and FTR), no one, not the Counts, Prosecutes, defense Counsel, Rule 32 counsel or appeal counsel ever informed defendant of the Switcheroo' of the trials electronic recording devices on as to the Stere graphers
Stenegraph's REALTIME FEED FROZE, Simultaneously.

(14.) That, it is doubthal now that the state in Court will produce
their Switcheroo FTR recordings because this will show these a Conspiracy.

First, the were never disclosed to defendant. RDA:

Secondly, clefendant filed a Motion to Patternio THE Exidence. ADA:

Their dy, the STATE Responded To Motion in Liming to Receivede RUA
also see, RiA, whereas the state vowed in Court that they
would not bring-up the each ruled defendant's motion os mute.

Faulthy, an the state see, Retain (ROA: pg., para \$5)

FOURTHLY, church trial on while No remembed on the Stand,
the prosecutar took the Liberty while was repairing her Stangraph,
to clim the court recom hights, bring out the Court's Pargeoth and Show
the juris the home ond use a manual credit land embosser,
New to stal a PIN number and use a manual credit land embosser,
New to remove I disable 6th chips on iledo....." See, (Exhibit C, Det.

Sullivan Computer Crimes that forensics.)

Judicial Staff Trainer in charge of the Builits.

Itated that, "

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.