

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 17-174

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

The complainant alleged a superior court judge imposed an improper sanction against him.

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.

The commission does not have jurisdiction to review the legal sufficiency of the judge's rulings. In addition, 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(a).

Dated: August 23, 2017

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

---

George A. Riemer  
Executive Director

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on August 23, 2017.

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

**CONFIDENTIAL**

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

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

**2017-174**

**COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Judge's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions:** Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

Probably never before heard of in modern American courts, sanctioned for asking  
for an attorney be appointed for him. Motions for clearance have by present in the and  
the been eligible for appointed counsel.

For over the has unlawfully violated second amendment rights. Yet  
another delay by who is now also forcing who is indigent to actually prepay the  
to file a request to restore his civil rights and get removed from It is egregious because  
is the cause of indigence in that being on has caused him to be unable to  
work and extreme economic harm. What kind of a Judge delays a civil rights restoration this long and  
is untenable.

removals are able to be filed every at least pursuant to Rule 11.5. Rule 31.11 does not  
apply in criminal cases without a conviction. This sort of behavior causes distrust in the judicial system  
the audacity of forcing a citizen to pay to get civil rights which are inalienable.