

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-134

Complainant: No. 1254510442A

Judge: No. 1254510442B

ORDER

The complainant alleged that a pro tem court of appeals judge made erroneous rulings and should be disqualified from further involvement in his case. He further alleged a superior court commissioner engaged in improper ex part communications.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the pro tem judge and commissioner 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 the electronic court records, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that neither the pro tem judge nor the commissioner violated the Code in this case. The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of court rulings. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: July 16, 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 July 16, 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

2012-134

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your Name:

Judge's Name:

Date: _____

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.

Wherein, Pro Tempore Judge reviews of appellant's Motion For Disclosure, pursuant to Rules of Criminal Pro. Rules 15.1 through 15.6 et. al. (j) (b) (1) and (g), down to the last few pages, the sworn affidavit "There was no Pro Per disclosure" has been denied, doesn't really apply. There is no ruling required. There was only the denial by trial Court to rule for Pro Per disclosure of questions by the defendant, initially refused "to state whether there was documents within his possession, custody, or control responsive to the defendant's September 12, 2011 Subpoena duces tecum." There are only the dashed pencil strokes of the defendant produced a document, which had previously been received at Inmate Legal Services (ILS), a dozen or so documents missing, and beyond a porous independent real estate system of open brokerage firms like 42 Floors by Jason Freedman and David Woodworth, Rivera Tract Chairperson, Probate Court Commissioner seems cautiously approving and notes the City of Phoenix real estate attorney certainly wouldn't hesitate to provide listing data on the properties their Matrix Financial Services Corp. owns. Mr. Freedman and Woodworth seems satisfied to help Honorable Pro Tempore judge, which aims to make a leasing of the new Court Tower office space and avoiding tax evasion, by and through leasing out to States ex parte

Honorable is so profused he will literally jump into a sworn affidavit and denie it. Appellant Counsel may have never grasped the incremental of the case before began denying appellants sworn statements.

One-third of tax decision and law enforcement officers is under § 2680(c) [amended 2007]. And the Fourth Circuit Court held that the phrase "should be limited to those officers acting in tax and customs enforcement capacity."

Since the Honorable is a Pro Tempore judge and not able to performing such a function, he is not a law enforcement officer for purposes of § 2680(c).

Therefore shall be recused of

noting that while the quality of the Circuits favored the State of Arizona's position, the quality of decisions favored Appellants position. See: *Andrews V. United States*, 441 F.3d 220 (4th Cir. 2006); *Public Health and Welfare* 42 § 3 1983, Note 3823. Freedom of speech, employment, clearly established right: Did States ex parte have tax abatement or will beneficiary. See § 3370.

At time that attorney for Tucson, Arizona Indigent Defense System (TIDS) was discharged, after engaging in protected speech objecting to the TIDS procedure for approval of expert accounting audit, law that public employer could not retaliate against an employee for exercising his right of free speech was "clearly established," having qualified immunity

defense, in City of Phoenix real estate attorney § 1983 free speech claim; on Point "State V. Dixon, 226 Ariz. 545, 553, ¶ 39, 498, 250 P.3d 1174, 1182 (2011)" case law prohibiting such free speech retaliation existed for years before City of Phoenix real estate attorney discharged." McFall V. Bednar, C.A.10 (Okla.) 2005, 2005 WL 896483, amended and superseded 407 F.3d 1081 Civil Right Key 1376 (10); Doe V. United States, 487 U.S. 201, 212, 108 S.Ct. 2341, 101 L.Ed.2d 184 (1988). Also see e.g., United States V. Hubbell 530 U.S. 27, N.1, 120 S.Ct. at 2048-49 (2000), there is a dazzling chain conspiracy to cover up appellants 12 years sentencing and State's ex parte Probate Court abatement of Uniform Disposition Unclaimed Property of Vera Coronado; neither are there any records of Alice M. Coronado-Hernandez being Durable ^{Special} Power of Attorney of Vera Coronado estate, it was just a front.

Without State providing a valid: ecf. azs Superior Court gov/cgi-bin DktRpt? of (PACER) and Vera Coronado true whereabouts there working on a dry case leading appellant to a Federal Petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2254

Also see. Inc. Magazine May 2012 "No," "No," "No," "No," "Yes" Pages 74-82 By David H. Freedman (no relation) to Jason Freedman. Without these accusations, bordered by Inc editor David Freedman on the brokers participating in conversation with smaller real estate brokerage firms (Converse in page 80), there is facts which would incriminate City of Phoenix real estate attorney or "Doe". Hubbell, id., at 2043

[FN 6-8]; neither are trial court orders for Pro-per disclosure of State's ex parte internal dealings within the Maricopa County Probate Court. With the Arizona Court of Appeals judge not complianced to § 2680(c), the reh litigation of the appellant has no foundation. Andrews, *supra*.

These are cf. decisions to refusal of and the Commission of Judicial Conduct has just been put on point. The Inc. editorial, the comments, and actions of the people are irreparable herein. However, the state's ex parte warranty deeds documents did arrive in a simple, sealed envelope. It came in a broken edged that exposed the Warranty deed and deed of full release and reconveyance, which passed the barrier of the Maricopa County Sheriff's office and delivered to Defendant by a detention officer. A similar kind of exchanged shaped as it moved into the hands of Honorable pursuant to 16 A.R.S. Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 34(b). See: *City of Phoenix v. Peterson*, 11 Ari.App. 136, 462 P.2d 829 (App. Div. I, 1969) (Pretrial procedure 378. In action against police officers and City for . . . Plaintiff was not entitled to prior examination of other 'City of Phoenix real estate attorney' pursuant to § 33-708 C who were present during the incident in question, the statements of such real estate attorney which were not part of the official departmental report and/or defendant's indictment"). Hubbell, *id.*, at 32-34, 120 S.Ct. at 2043 (2000).

Nevertheless, the City of Phoenix real estate attorney dealing with state's ex parte in Maricopa County Probate Court violated the Independent Counsel Reauthorization Act of 1994, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 591-599.

Note Bene Please take note that a petition for recusal of Appeal Court judge Honorable _____ has been advanced to the Court and Appellant Counsel and any necessary action is at discretion of this Commission of Judicial Conduct that such requires.

By: _____

Enclosure.

ILSF-022-Judicial Complaint