

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 23-293

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

January 12, 2024

The Complainant alleged improper legal rulings and bias 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 Barbara Brown did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on January 12, 2024.

From:**Sent:****To:** Commission on Judicial Conduct <CommissionJudicialCo@courts.az.gov>**Subject:**

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Consider the following complaint against
court judge as follows:

First, on a hearing on , while I was still
lawyer, tone and conduct
towards to me was completely out of line. The FTR of
him talking down to me like I was a child, grimacing,
shaking his head and making faces, and cutting me off
speaks fo Neither he nor Judge
disputed outright hostility against me
when filed his motion t
as a result of his comment "
?". The FTR is clear enough on this
point, and either this commission cares or it does
not.

Second, in a minute entry from ,
continued with his very weird and bizarre hostility
against me even though I am long off the case. He
lied a number of times on purpose in this minute
entry just to slander me. It is concerning, but not
surprising in light of and , that
judicial officers would go out of their way to insult
me for no legally jus I guess that is
what I get for being .

Anyway, he wrote: "

knows that is a lie because it was not plural proceedings but a single sentencing because he knows I never got a hearing on the merits. "

From his own minute entry he wrote I only chose to not attend a single, as in one, as in the exclusive natural number greater than zero but less than 2, one and exactly only one hearing: "

". But he used plural "proceedings" in the entry to imply I did not dispute or contest the allegations against me because he is a coward.

Third, he wrote today that filed a motion with "

ing there wer her than causing my .

But , the coward that he is, knows that is a lie and only case caused my on. Again, as he wrote in his very own minute entry, "

(3)

" meaning his implication this case is only in part responsible for my suspension, ie, "some of which", is a flat out lie with the intent of slandering my professional reputation.

Next, he wrote that "

I never got a hearing on the merits and never got the c ny such arguments before the " ". He also knows d rt rule 58, the did not rule against me. It was violation of decades of due process precedent. But then again, that is the nature of his cowardice.

has an agenda, plain as day to cover up prosecutorial and police misconduct. That is why

reply dated does not appear on
the online docket despite his telling
weeks ago it would and today's minute entry even
claiming the same. reply spells out
everything proving the fact both and I
have been denied due p o just like and
the AZ court, does not want the
public to know about public misconduct.