

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-057

Complainant: No. 1436910714A

Judge: No. 1436910714B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that one superior court judge violated his free speech rights and another superior court judge misstated the law as to what constitutes possession of drugs.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judges engaged in conduct that violated the provisions of Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution or the Code of Judicial Conduct and, if so, to take appropriate disciplinary action. The purpose and authority of the commission is limited to this mission.

After reviewing the information provided by the complainant and various electronic court records, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judges did not violate the Code in this case. The commission does not have jurisdiction to investigate the legal sufficiency of the judges' rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: April 19, 2012.

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George Riemer
George A. Riemer
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on April 19, 2012.

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

2012-057

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your Name:

Judge's Name:

Date: 2/24/12

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.

ARIZONA STATE CONSTITUTION ART 6 SEC 21 AND THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION ON HOW JUDGE BY HIM SUBSCRIBING UNDER OATH TO UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT (RULE 81) UNDER RULE 1.1 COMPLIANCE WITH THE LAW WHERE IT STATES UNDER CANON 1 A JUDGE SHALL UPHOLD AND PROMOTE THE INDEPENDENCE, INTEGRITY, AND IMPARTIALITY OF THE JUDICIARY, AND SHALL AVOID IMPROPRIETY AND THE APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY. JUDGE IS SUPPOSED TO SUPPORT ME AS TO WHATEVER IT IS I WANT WITHIN REASON, AND TO LAUNCH FREEDOM-INCLUDING FREEDOM OF SPEECH UNDER THE ADHERENCE TO A CODE OF VALUE, AND NOT USING HIS POWERS INVESTED IN HIM AGAINST ME THE DEFENDANT AS AN EXCUSE TO NOT TREAT ME FAIRLY OR COMPASSIONATELY, BECAUSE HE'S ON A HIGHER ECHELON THAN EVERYONE ELSE. NO MATTER WHAT-I'M STILL ENTITLED TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH TO SAY WHAT I NEED TO SAY IN AN ORDERLY FASHION ACCORDING TO MY FIRST AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION. IN WHICH I WHEN IN JUDGE COURT CHOOSES TO ADDRESS THE COURT IN THE TYPE OF MANNER THAT IS NOT DISRUPTIVE, WOULD APPRECIATE IT IF YOU DON'T FLAMBOYANTLY BECOME DISRESPECTFUL AGITATED ON RECORD THE WAY YOU WERE ON OUR COURTDAY ON FEBRUARY 22ND 2012, WHEN YOU VIOLATED MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS BY ME ADDRESSING THE COURT, YOU THEN ACKNOWLEDGING ME GETTING READY TO TALK, THEN YOU CUTTING ME OFF YELLING DON'T THINK YOU ARE GOING TO COME IN MY COURTROOM, AND TALK WHENEVER YOU WANT TO TALK, BUT ON THE RECORD YOU ALREADY GAVE PERMISSION

(Attach additional sheets as needed.)

TO SPEAK THEN SWITCHED UP ON ME (TITLE 42 § 1986) ALL I WAS BASICALLY TRYING TO DO WAS FINISH WHERE I LEFT OFF AT. WHEN HE GAVE ME THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK ON THE 15TH OF FEBRUARY, BUT CUT ME OFF WHEN I STARTED TALKING ABOUT THE CONSTITUTION NOT ALLOWING ME TO EXERCISE MY RIGHT TO THE FIRST AMENDMENT.

JUSTICE TILLY IS BLIND TO THE LIGHT. BECAUSE THE MORE I TRY TO SURFACE THE FACTS ABOUT MY INNOCENCE, THE MORE THE JUDGES TRY TO DENY WHAT I'M SHOWING THEM IN PLAIN SIGHT. IS A JUDGE AND A MASON WHO HAS THE ILLUMINATING CRYPTIC POWERS TO BRAIN-STORM THE ILLUSIONS OF A IMAGINARY REPORT. FOR EXAMPLE THE EXISTENCE OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS IS DETERMINED BY GENERAL NATURE OF THE CHARGE (WHICH IS THE THEFT) CONTAINED IN THE COMPLAINT. (IN WHICH I WAS NOT CHARGED FOR).

MY 14TH AMENDMENT WAS VIOLATED HOW IT STATES IN PART NO STATE SHALL DEPRIVE ANY PERSON OF LIBERTY IN WHICH AT THAT PARTICULAR TIME I HAD A LIBERTY INTEREST IN SPEAKING ABOUT MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT, WHICH HAD BEEN VIOLATED WITHIN THE STATE OF ARIZONA, MARICOPA COUNTY JURISDICTION OF EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW.