

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 10-278

Complainant: No. 0117400307A

Judge: No. 0117400307B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a superior court judge should have disqualified himself because he allowed the attorneys to conspire against him. The commission reviewed the matter and found insufficient evidence of judicial misconduct to support further investigation. The primary issue appears to involve defense counsel rather than the judge. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: December 28, 2010.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Keith Stott

Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on December 28, 2010.

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

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**2010-278****COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE**

Your Name:

Judge's Name:

Date: 10/19/2010

Instructions: Describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes misconduct. Please provide all of the important names, dates, times, and places related to your complaint. You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to explain your complaint, and you may attach additional pages. Do not write on the back of any page. You may attach copies of any documents you believe will help us understand your complaint.

PRIOR TO MY TRIAL I WAS INFORMED BY GERALD M. BRADLEY THAT THE JUDGE ASSIGNED TO ADJUDICATE MY CASE HAS A PROPENSITY FOR VIOLATING THE RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE, AS WELL AS BEING HEAVY HANDED AT SENTENCING.

THIS COMPLAINT IS IN REGARDS TO TWO SPECIFIC ISSUES. THE FIRST ISSUE DEALS WITH A COMPLAINT THAT I MADE TO THE STATE BAR ASSOCIATION AGAINST MY ATTORNEY GERALD BRADLEY. ON OCTOBER 7, 2010, SENIOR BAR COUNSEL ROBERTA L. TEPPER RESPONDED TO MY COMPLAINT. FILE NO: 10-1908. IN HER RESPONSE SHE FAILED TO FOLLOW THE STATE BARS POLICY OR PROCEDURE IN REGARDS TO INVESTIGATING ALLEGATIONS OF SEVERE MISCONDUCT PERTAINING TO AN ATTORNEY. INSTEAD SHE CHOSE TO ALLOW THE JUDGE TO MAKE THE DECISION ON WHETHER ANY IMPROPRIETY BY GERALD BRADLEY WAS COMMITTED OR NOT.

I FIND IT APPALLING THAT SENIOR BAR COUNSEL ROBERTA L. TEPPER WHO IS RE-PRESENTING AN ALLEGED INDEPENDENT FAIR AND COMPETENT ADJUDICATION ORGANIZATION, WOULD REFUSE TO ABIDE BY THE RULES SET FORTH BY SAID ORGANIZATION AND THROW THIS UNEDUCATED AND UNREPRESENTED COMPLAINANT TO THE SAME JUDGE THAT ALLOWED MY ATTORNEY GERALD BRADLEY TO ACQUIRE TO COLLUSION AT TRIAL. JUDGE SHOULD BE DISQUALIFIED FROM MAKING ANY DETERMINATION AS TO ANY IMPROPRIETIES CONCERNING GERALD BRADLEY: CONTINUED:

(Attach additional sheets as needed.)

ADDITIONAL
SHEETS ATTACHED

2010-278

PURSUANT TO RULES OF SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA,
VII JUDICIAL ETHICS, RULE 81 ARIZONA CODE OF JUDICIAL
CONDUCT RULE 2.11. DISQUALIFICATION

A. A JUDGE SHALL DISQUALIFY HIMSELF IN ANY PROCEEDING
IN WHICH THE JUDGE'S IMPARTIALITY MIGHT REASONABLY
BE QUESTIONED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO INSTANCES
WHERE:

THE JUDGE HAS A PERSONAL BIAS OR PREJUDICE CON-
CERNING A PARTY OR A PARTY'S LAWYER, OR PERSONAL
KNOWLEDGE OF DISPUTED EVIDENTIARY FACTS CONCERNING
THE PROCEEDING.

JUDGE CAN NOT MAKE AN UNBIAS DETERMINATION
BECAUSE HE CORROBORATED OR ALLOWED THE COLLUSION
BETWEEN MY ATTORNEY GERALD BRADLEY AND THE STATE
PROSECUTING ATTORNEY BRETT HARAMES. ANY DETER-
MINATION HE WOULD MAKE WOULD BE PREJUDICIALLY
IN FAVOR OF GERALD BRADLEY. IT IS QUITE OBVIOUS,
AND CRYSTOL CLEAR APPARENT THAT SENIOR BAR
COUNSEL ROBERTA TEPPER GAVE GERALD BRADLEY A
TACTICAL ADVANTAGE BY VIOLATING THE RULES OF
PROCEDURE OF THE STATE BAR BY NOT PERFORMING
ANY TYPE OF INVESTIGATION INTO MY ALLEGATION OF
COLLUSION. MY ASSERTIONS ARE NOT MINISCULE IN
STATURE. I CHARGED GERALD BRADLEY WITH FRAUD,
DECEPTION, ALLOWING PERJURY BY THE POLICE OFFICERS
WHO TESTIFIED FALSLEY, AND I CAN AND WILL PROVE IT.
CURSED IS HE WHO PERVERTS JUSTICE