

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 17-177

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge improperly denied his requests for a change of counsel in a criminal proceeding.

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 30, 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 30, 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

2017-177

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.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: IT ALL STARTED WHEN I WAS ASSIGNED
DEFENCE ATTORNEY I DEMONSTRATED
LACK OF INTEREST IN MY CASE, BY LACK OF VISITATION, COMMUNI-
CATION AND NOT INFORMING ME ON WHAT WAS GOING ON, FOR
MORE THAN THATS WHEN I REQUESTED A CHANGE OF
COUNSEL. BETWEEN I PUT A COMPLAINT AGAINST
WITH THE AFTER THAT EVERYTHING
CONTINUED THE SAME, NOTHING HAD IMPROVED AS FAR AS PROFFESIO-
NALISM AND VIOLATING MY RIGHTS. ON THE OF I
RECIEVED CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE ST I
WHISH STATED THEY COULD NOT CHANGE MY
ATTORNEY, ONLY THE JUDGE COULD. ON I RECEIVED A
LETTER STATING THAT WAS
ON I SUBMITTED A
WHICH THE JUDGE DENIED. AGAIN ON I EN-
TERED ANOTHER, WHICH WAS

2017-177

AGAIN DENIED BY THE JUDGE. THE [REDACTED] I EN-
TERED ANOTHER [REDACTED] " ALONG WITH IT
I PUT IN THE CASE # [REDACTED] WHICH IS THE CASE IN WHICH
[REDACTED] WAS BEING INVESTIGATED FOR PROFESSIONAL
MISCONDUCT. EVEN AFTER MY ATTEMPTS TO CHANGE COUNSEL
DUE TO CONFLICT OF INTEREST BETWEEN [REDACTED]
AND MYSELF I WAS DENIED A THIRD TIME. THE [REDACTED] DAY OF
[REDACTED] I RECEIVED A LETTER FROM [REDACTED]
STATING MY COMPLAINTS AGAINST [REDACTED] HAD BEEN
RESOLVED AND THE [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] IN WHICH HE WAS VIOLATING
SEVERAL RULES [REDACTED]
FURTHER MORE THE LETTER STATED THAT [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] ON HIM AND HE WAS [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] TOOK ADVANTAGE OF THE FACTS THAT ALL
MY MOTIONS WERE DENIED, AND I LACK KNOWLEDGE OF LAWS,
RIGHTS, AND CAME AND THREATENED ME TO NOT HELP ME IN MY
CASE AND WITH TRIAL, BECAUSE THE PROBLEMS AND TROUBLES
I HAD CAUSED HIM [REDACTED]
ON THE [REDACTED] I ENTERED ANOTHER [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] ALON WITH THE [REDACTED] THAT
STATED [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] AND THE JUDGE [REDACTED] HAD
DENIED MY MOTION AGAIN AFTER REVIEWING ALL THE
EVIDENCE SHOWING CONFLICT OF INTEREST. HE DENIED

[REDACTED]

AFTER ASKING ME IF I WISHED TO CHANGE COUNSEL,
I FELT SCARED AND ALONE, THINKING IN THE PREVIOUS
THREADS [REDACTED] HAD MADE ME.

[REDACTED] AND THE JUDGE CONSPIRED AGAINST ME AND
TOOK ADVANTAGE OF ME KNOWING I DID NOT KNOW THE
LAW AND MY RIGHTS.

MY COMPLAINT IS THE PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT THAT
VIOLATED MY DUE PROCESS AGAINST HONORABLE [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] THE JUDGE HAVING IN HIS POWER SUFFICIENT
EVIDENCE TO REASSIGN ME COUNSEL DUE TO THE "[REDACTED]"
[REDACTED] DID NOT DO IT.

FOR THIS REASON I STILL HAVE [REDACTED] AS MY COUNSEL.
SO BEING IN THIS SITUATION I SAW NO OTHER OUTLET THAN TO
SIGN A PLEA. I WAS NOT COMFORTABLE SIGNING, I FELT
I WAS LEFT NO OTHER CHOICE. ANYBODY IN MY SITUATION
WOULD NOT FEEL CONFIDENT GOING TO TRIAL WITH AN ATTORNEY
WHO DOESN'T HAVE THEIR BEST IN MIND, AND AFTER BEING TOLD
IN PERSON THAT [REDACTED]

THANKYOU FOR YOU TIME AND COUPERATION.

(ALONG WITH MY COMPLAINTS IS ATTACHED MY [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] THAT I ENTERED INTO THE COURTS WISH
HONORABLE [REDACTED] REVIEW AND DENIED.

THE [REDACTED] I WILL BE SENTENCED, I NEED BE
SEND ANY CORRESPONDENCE TO [REDACTED]