

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 12-272

Complainant: No. 1436910885A

Judge: No. 1436910885B

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge told him during a hearing he should not be subject to Rule 11 proceedings, but he still is.

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the judge 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 order entered in regard to the hearing, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the judge did not violate the Code in this case. Accordingly, the complaint is dismissed in its entirety, pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: November 2, 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 November 2, 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

8012-272

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Your Name:

Judge's Name

Date: 10-3-12

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.

I'M WRITING UP ON A COMPLAINT BECAUSE SHE SPECIFICALLY TOLD ME ON RECORD ON THE 14th OF SEPTEMBER OF 2012 THAT SHE FELT I SHOULDN'T BE ON RULE 11 BECAUSE ALL THE MOTIONS AND THINGS I WROTE DIDNT GRANT ME TO BE ON RULE 11. I HONESTLY FEEL THAT BY BEING ON RULE 11 HAS CAUSED ME TO SIT IN A FACILITY UNNECESSARILY BY VIOLATING MY DUE PROCESS TO A SPEEDY TRIAL. THIS COURT IS A SHAM IT IS A KANGAROO COURT WHICH WAS ESTABLISHED ALL THE WAY BACK IN 1849 AS A SELF-APPOINTED TRIBUNAL MOUK COURT. IN WHICH THE PRINCIPLES OF LAW AND JUSTICE ARE DISREGARDED OR PERVERTED THESE COURT PROCEEDINGS ARE BASED ON THE IRREGULAR PROCEDURES TO RENDER A FAIR PROCEEDING IMPOSSIBLE. COUNTERFEIT IMITATION PRETEND FALSE NOT GENUINE KANGAROO - WHICH REFER TO THE ILLOGICAL LEAPS BETWEEN FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OR THE DEFENDANTS UNFATHOMABLE QUICK BOUNCE TO COURTROOM TO COURTROOM. SHE KNOWS AS WELL AS EVERYONE ELSE LINKED ON THIS CASE THAT I NEVER DESEVED TO BE STALLED ON RULE 11 IN THE FIRST PLACE.