

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 07-019

---

Complainant: No. 1301600156A

Judge: No. 1301600156B

---

**ORDER**

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge.

The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Dated: June 25, 2007.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on June 25, 2007.

*This order may not be used as a basis for disqualification of a judge.*

January 16, 2007

JAN 22 2007

FROM:

CJC-07-019

**TO: THE COMMITTEE OF JUDICIAL REVIEW  
STATE of ARIZONA**

**Re: CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR OF AN ELECTED  
JUSTICE of the PEACE**

**NEEDED: An investigation of the facts**

**PROBLEM: I was awarded judgment through a dishonest legal process.**

It would have been better to have legally lost the lawsuit, thereby preserving the United States Constitution, State of Arizona Constitution, and the Arizona Revised Statutes of Civil Procedures, through an honest legal process.

Each court procedure challenges all American's commitment to the governing laws. A dishonest court is National and State terrorism from within our judicial system.

**NEEDED: An investigation of the facts**

The violations are 100% provable with 'hard' original court issued and / or filed documents, then mailed over state line to plaintiff. Copies of SOME documents are included for your consideration.

**Questions:**

Does the Justice of the Peace Oath of Office allow the judge to ignore Civil-Trial Revised Statutes of Civil Procedures, State and Federal Constitutional Trial Rights, then replace them all with his own ideas, to help his  business-associate, who becomes a defendant in his court?

Why did a Civil Trial, which the court had allowed **one hour** to hear, continue for two more months?

Why would a judge excuse a  associate-business- owner-litigant's failure to file the Court ordered 'NO LIMIT' Disclosure, Discovery, failure to file an objection to a filed Motion for Default Judgment and failure to appear at a court notified pre trial conference?

Judge said at first pre trial that proof of pre trial notice to the defendant was not in the court's file. The plaintiff furnished his copy with a checkmark for both plaintiff and defendant at the bottom of the form.

Why would pre trial notice to the Defendant not be in the court's record, when the form itself has confirmation of mailing to both litigants noted on the bottom of the notice?

Why would the judge ignore the fact that the defendant admitted to the court in a filed letter dated  that he did in fact, not pay the Plaintiff?

After verifying proof of all the above, proper service of complaint, proper court clerk's mailing of Pre Trial notice to the defendant, during the first pre trial, then confirming justification under the governing laws, Rule 37(b)(2)(C) [A.R.C.P], - Rule 26.1(b)(1) [A.R.C.P], - Rule 55(a) [A.R.C.P], - Rule 60(c) [A.R.C.P], why would a judge sign a 'letter format' Judgment in Default, when the judge knew that a statewide approved form was available for that purpose, unless he never intended the Judgment to be final?

Why would any judge sign a 'Judgment in Default' without verifying all the facts, unless he had already predetermined to 'Vacate' the Judgment, to benefit his friend, the defendant?

Why would a judge sign a 'letter format' Judgment in Default, with the wrong case number? Five is added to the false letter Judgment.

Why would a judge sign a Judgment in Default that was intended to be final, then present it to the Judgment Creditor, without the official **"SEAL"**?

Why would the court clerks, allow and assist the judge to transfer a false court **"OFFICIAL"** judgment to a litigant?

Does the court clerk's Oath of public service allow each to assist the judge to ignore Civil-Trial Revised Statutes of Civil Procedures, State and Federal Constitutional Trial Rights, then replace all of them with the judge's own ideas, to help his  business-associate, to delay a judgment, to allow the sale of real property, not incumbered by a judgment, then issue a document that can be challenged as **'not legal'** in another court?

Why would a judge refuse to sign a temporary restraining order to prevent the closing of an escrow until the final appeal process was over?

Why would the court clerks, allow and assist the defendant-friend, to not have all motions date / time stamped, proving that each is legal and part of the official court case records, not just once but **TWICE**? Both times benefitted the defendant-friend?

Why would the court clerks, allow the judge to neglect to impress the official "**SEAL**", before transferring the document to the litigants, **threetimes**?

Isn't it the purpose of the '**SEAL**' to prove that each document is legal and part of the official court case record?

Why would the court clerks allow official documents to be not fully completed with all required information, before transferring Judgment to the litigants, as in "no trial date on the final Judgment"?

This happened not just once, but **SIX** times combined. Each time benefiting the defendant-friend.

Why would the court clerks, with several years experience, allow and assist with court record '*errors*', to only favor their long time acquaintance and liked business owner?

Why would a judge sign the 'letter format' Order to 'Vacate Judgment in Default', (a no **SEAL** '*legal form*'), which was printed the same day the defendant-friend's Motion was allegedly presented to the Court, (lower left corner, has the date of printing), and contained a 'known-to-the-court-to-be-a-false-statement' about pre trial notice?

The judge and clerks had already confirmed pre trial notice was correctly mailed by the court clerk, at the  pre trial and it is also confirmed in the defendant's motion itself, that the notice was in fact in the possession of the defendant, since it was received shortly after it was mailed by the court clerk on  again, as confirmed on the bottom of the pre trial notice.

The defendant's notarized motion also confirms the defendant's failures to file with the Court, the court-ordered 'NO LIMIT' Disclosure, Discovery, which should have included the answered -Interrogatory questions submitted to the court and mailed to the defendant.

Why would a judge sign an Order to 'Vacate Judgment in Default' on   the day after the defendant's Motion was allegedly submitted to the court, (notarized  though not date / time stamped by court),

instead of allowing the Judgment Creditor his 14-day right to file a response to an allegedly filed motion?

The 'Vacate of Judgment Order' states that the defendant's claim is the reason for the Vacate of Judgment Order.

If Judge's reason was different from what is stated in the Vacate order, as claimed by the judge at the [ ] second pre trial, why would a judge not allow the plaintiff to know why the judge would consider a Vacate Order, by granting **TEN**-legal days to submit proof of original service of complaint, (if that was truly the judge's concern), instead of violating Plaintiff- Judgment Creditor's 14-day right to file a response to an allegedly filed motion?

After [ ] years as a Justice of the Peace in [ ] AZ, how could a judge not know that, at least in [ ] AZ, the sheriff always files 'Proof of Complaint Service' with the court? Isn't that part of the [ ] fee paid for service?

[ ] The defendant is less than [ ] from the court and sheriff office. Service of complaint was (2) two hours (13) thirteen minutes after lawsuit was filed, with sheriff's proof of service filed with the court the next day. This is confirmed in the sheriff proof of service copy mailed to the plaintiff. Sheriff's filing was also confirmed (13) thirteen days later by the court clerk and noted on the sheriff's form and the plaintiff's cover sheet of trial document history.

All court documents prove **there was not a valid legal cause** to Vacate the '*presented as legal*', Judgment in Default.

So why would a judge not re-instate a Judgment in Default as motioned by the Judgment Creditor-Plaintiff, after it was confirmed to be a second clerk 'filing error', that '*allegedly*' kept proof of service of complaint out of the case record?

Why would a trial be set in less than the 14-day legal time required to subpoena a witness, [ ] who had confirmed the plaintiff's claim in his deposition dated [ ] questions [ ] through [ ]

The court was notified that a subpoena was requested in the [ ] Motion to Set and court format disclosure. The witness deposition was refiled with the court on [ ] by the plaintiff.

Why would all court record '*errors and omissions*', only favor the defendant, the '*friend-of-the-court*'?

Why would a judge confiscate the plaintiff's evidence at [ ] trial, when copies of plaintiff's evidence were made part of plaintiff's first two

of three disclosures, then referred to in plaintiff's pleading, third court format disclosure and motion for default judgment?

Why would the plaintiff be denied the right to file objections and motions **six** times?

How can a judge no '**SEAL**' Order, require that a litigant must be accompanied by an attorney in a civil action, if not an intimidation tactic?

Why would the judge require two sheriff's to serve this no '**SEAL**' order across state lines?

Why would the court clerk refuse to release the official case record to the plaintiff-judgment creditor, without the judges permission?

There are more unexplained strange proceedings and "seven refused to be accepted and filed", plaintiff / judgment creditors motions. Some proof of claim is included. The remaining evidence is protected and will be made available when needed.

COURT RULINGS IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANT FRIEND, WHO DID NOT FOLLOW ONE COURT ORDER OR STATE AND FEDERAL RIGHT-TO-A-FAIR-NON-BIAS, CIVIL-TRIAL

**37 TIMES**

COURT RULINGS IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANT-FRIEND ALLOWING MOTIONS NOT TO BE FILED, BUT TREATED AS IF FILED

**2 TIMES**

COURT RULINGS IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANT-FRIEND ALLOWING A-KNOWN-TO THE COURT-TO-BE-A-FALSE STATEMENT TO BE TREATED BY THE COURT AS FACT

**2 TIMES**

COURT RULINGS IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANT-FRIEND, EVEN THOUGH DEFENDANT ADMITTED HE OWED AS CLAIMED

**2 TIMES**

COURT DENYING THE PLAINTIFF HIS RIGHT TO FILE MOTIONS OR OBJECTIONS

**7 TIMES**

COURT ISSUING FALSE OR FAKE 'MEANT TO BE ACCEPTED AS LEGAL OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS'

**6 TIMES**

CJC-07-019

COURT RULINGS IN FAVOR OF DEFENDANT FRIEND TO DELAY AND  
EXTEND THIS LAWSUIT FROM [REDACTED]  
**3 TIMES**

COURT VIOLATIONS OF U.S. AND/OR STATE OF ARIZONA LAWS AND  
OR RULES UNDER [A.R.C.P.] Rules, IN FAVOR OF FRIEND  
**57 TIMES TOTAL**

The verdict would have eventually been reversed in favor of the Defendant, if I  
had not been so persistent, by requesting a friend to overnight-mail the two  
objection motions to the court on [REDACTED] which was received on the the last day  
of right to object to the defendant's one motion with two possible intents.

This type of legal process will continue in [REDACTED] AZ even though this Judge is  
[REDACTED] The new Justice of the Peace is [REDACTED]

**Please help to restore Justice in [REDACTED] Arizona Justice  
Court.**

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

CC: The Honorable Janet Napolitano  
Governor, State of Arizona  
Attorney General Terry Goddard.  
State of Arizona  
State of Arizona Bar Association  
F.B.I.  
State of Arizona and National Media