

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 17-300

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a municipal court judge violated his constitutional rights, failed to report attorney misconduct, and made improper rulings in a criminal case.

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).

Commission members Art Hinshaw and Anna Mary Glaab did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Dated: December 20, 2017

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Margaret H. Downie

Margaret H. Downie

Executive Director

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on December 20, 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

2017-300

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.

On the probable cause on ARS 28-1381 A2. Document. On the office ARS 28-1381 A1 and A2 in the 1 in violation of Ariz. R. Crim. P 8.2 a, and ER 3.8(a) and 8.2(a). accepted this into record and transfer to the Trial Court. ruled no. See attached court refiled. by way of under

On a Pro-Per Writ to remove Defense counsel for Wanton Misconduct denying the VI Amend. Right to assistance of counsel to address the office on the XIV Amend. sec. 1 'Privileges', 'Due Process', and 'Equal Protection of the laws', which has been denied with the fundamental procedural violations and lawful no probable cause ruling of a Superior Court. The denied the Petitioners XIV Amend. sec. 1 'Privileges', 'Due Process' and 'Equal Protection of the laws' on court record video monitoring; By violating Art. VI sec. 26 bound by oath to uphold the Ariz. United States Constitution in conjunction with the Ariz. Rules of Judicial Conduct Rule 1.1, 2.2, 2.3(C), 2.5(A), 2.15(B)(D).

On when the answer by saying on court record that he Doctor on Petitioners Superior Court Case. is not a part of counsel on, violating confidentiality that should have never known to begin with, denying the Petitioner's IV Amend. Right to privacy, and violating State Laws. And did nothing about it violating Art. VI sec. 26 denying the XIV Amend. sec. 1 'Privileges', 'Due Process', and 'Equal Protection of the laws', of the Ariz. United States Constitution, and violating Rules of Judicial Conduct 1.1, 2.2, and 2.5(A).

On the officers statements. In the Pro-Per writ and that he was not ready to rule on it just vet. which involves multiple officers in unlawful conduct surrounding Petitioner was on and the officers kept details from the Narrative of From evidence. See attached Pro-Per writ, and in officers own statements. and missing for details