

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 17-324

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge conspired with the prosecutor to wrongfully convict 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: February 14, 2018

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Margaret H. Downie

Margaret H. Downie

Executive Director

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 14, 2018.

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

ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT 2017-324

LETTER TO THE ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT ON [redacted] AFTER VIEWING THE 4 DOCUMENTS IN BACK OF THIS COMPLAINT

"ACKNOWLEDGED IN HIS RULING THAT PLAINTIFF'S CONVICTION WAS WRONGFUL AND INVALID BUT THE ONLY THING JUDGE REALLY DID WAS VERIFY THE FACT THAT PLAINTIFF SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN PROSECUTED IN THE FIRST PLACE ALTHOUGH WITH PROSECUTOR

"NO PROBABLE CAUSE ARIZ U.S CONSTITUTIONS "NO REMEDY WAS BEEN PROVIDED"

BUT THIS COMPLAINT IS CONCERNING

WHO "CONSPIRED" ALONG WITH [redacted] PROSECUTOR UNDER COVER POLICE

AND UNDER COVER POLICE

TO MALICIOUSLY PROSECUTE AND FALSELY IMPRISON PLAINTIFF FOR PERSONAL REASONS "EXCLUSIONARY RULE VIOLATION WONG SUN V UNITED STATES 371 U.S 471 (1963)"

THE 4 DOCUMENTS IN BACK OF THIS COMPLAINT PROVE THAT BEFORE TRIAL ON [redacted] THAT IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE FOR

THE [redacted] OR ANY OTHER PUBLIC OFFICIAL ACTING UNDER COLOR AND AUTHORITY OF STATE LAW TO "SHOW CAUSE" WHY PLAINTIFF WAS NOT RELEASED ON

BEFORE TRIAL THERE SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN A TRIAL IN THE FIRST PLACE CONVICTION WAS IN VIOLATION OF CLEARLY ESTABLISHED LAW BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

2. KNEW FROM THE VERY BEGINNING THAT ONCE HE AND PROSECUTION "ACKNOWLEDGED" THAT ALLEGED STATEMENTS THAT RESULTED IN DRUG ARREST WERE OBTAINED IN VIOLATION OF PLAINTIFF 4TH 5TH 6TH RIGHTS TO FACE HIS ACCUSER

THAT ALLEGED DRUG CHARGES THAT RESULTED FROM THOSE ALLEGED STATEMENTS WERE SUPPOSE TO BE DISMISSED

"JUDGE ALLOWED STATE TO CREATE A FALSE PROBABLE CAUSE, BECAUSE UNKNOWN FEMALE WAS NOT IN TRIAL" SEE DOCUMENT NUMBER 4 MOTION TO DISMISS DRUG CHARGES ALLEGED: DRUG EVIDENCE WAS CLEARLY ILLEGAL, THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT JUDGE WAS SUPPOSE TO GRANT THIS MOTION BUT HE DENIED MOTION OUT OF BAD FAITH INTENT TO DECEIVE DISHONESTY OF BELIEF AND PURPOSE

"UNDER RULE 8 (B) 6 EFFECT OF FAILER TO DENY AN ALLEGATION IS THE SAME AS ADMITTING "GUILT" AS TO THAT ALLEGATION

HAS ALREADY ADMITTED GUILT AS TO THE ALLEGATION IN THE COMPLAINT FILED 12 8, 2011 BY WAY OF DEFAULT "CONSPIRING" WITH OTHER 3 DEFENDANTS TO MALICIOUSLY PROSECUTE AND FALSELY IMPRISON PLAINTIFF 4TH 14TH FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS DEPRIVATION

KNEW THAT WHEN HE DENIED DOCUMENT NO 4 IN BACK OF THIS COMPLAINT THAT HIS DENIAL WAS IN CLEAR VIOLATION OF CLEARLY ESTABLISHED LAW BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT BUT NO "REMEDY HAS BEEN ~~PROVIDED~~ PROVIDED"

SEE 3 PAGES IN BACK OF MOTION TO DISMISS ALLEGED DRUG CHARGES IT WILL EXPLAIN HOW

"CONSPIRED" TO MALICIOUSLY PROSECUTE AND FALSELY IMPRISON PLAINTIFF WHEN HE ALLOWED PROSECUTOR TO CREATE A FALSE PROBABLE CAUSE TO PROSECUTE PLAINTIFF
CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA

)
)
 Petitioner,)
)
 v.)
)
)
)
 Respondent.)
)
 _____)

ORDER

has filed a Motion to Show Cause Unlawful Indictment and related pleadings alleging attorney misconduct and judicial misconduct relating to his criminal case. A complaint of attorney misconduct is made by contacting the State Bar of Arizona, 4201 N. 24th St., Suite 100, Phoenix, AZ 85016-6266. A complaint of judicial misconduct is made by contacting the Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct, 1501 W. Washington St., Suite 229, Phoenix, Arizona 85007. Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion to Show Cause Unlawful Indictment and related pleadings are dismissed without prejudice to contacting the appropriate agencies.

_____/s/_____

TO: .

PAGE
ONE.

SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA
RULE 81 ETHICS VIOLATIONS
AND JUDICIAL CONDUCT

MOTION TO SHOW CAUSE
UNLAWFUL INDICTMENT

PRESENT CASE NO. 01-100000000-00000
~~WITH ADD. 14TH AMENDMENT DEPRIVATION
PROSECUTED WITHOUT PROBABLE CAUSE~~

IN THE POLICE REPORT FOR THIS CASE, IT STARTS OUT BY SAYING
THAT AND I WERE WORKING IN THE AREA OF
WHEN AN UNKNOWN BLACK
FEMALE APPROACHED US AND ASK US IF WE WANTED HER TO GET
US SOMETHING WE TOLD HER WE WANTED 40 DOLLARS WORTH
OF CRACK COCAINE.
SHE ASK US IF WE WERE POLICE OFFICERS AND AFTER SHE WAS SATISFIED
THAT WE WERE NOT POLICE OFFICERS SHE WENT ON TO TELL THEM THAT
SELLS DRUGS FROM THE JUST DOWN THE
STREET AND THAT SHE BUYS DRUGS FROM HIM ALL THE TIME, OFFICERS ALLEGED
THAT UNKNOWN BLACK FEMALE TOLD THEM THAT SHE WOULD WALK
DOWN TO THE 2 BLOCKS AWAY ON
AND SEE IF WAS ALLEGEDLY OUT SELLING DRUGS
"THE TRIAL CONVICTION SENTENCE"
SEE POLICE REPORT FOR AND FALSE APPEAL WAS
THIS CASE DATED FRUIT OF THE POISONOUS
TREE "
SEE FOLLOWING PAGE ALLEGED ABOVE
INCUMMATING STATEMENTS RESULTING IN DRUG ARREST WERE SUPPRESSED
CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

PAGE
TWO

BEFORE TRIAL

AND

PROSECUTOR "GRANTED PLAINTIFF'S MOTION"
"TO SUPPRESS" ALLEGED INCUMINATING STATEMENTS IN THE POLICE REPORT
ON PAGE ONE OF THIS DOCUMENT BY UNKNOWN BLACK FEMALE TO UNDER
COVER POLICE THAT RESULTED IN DRUG ARREST OF PLAINTIFF
"STATING" THAT NOTHING THE UNKNOWN BLACK FEMALE
ALLEGEDLY TOLD UNDER COVER POLICE IN THE POLICE REPORT ABOUT
COULD BE USED AGAINST HIM BECAUSE IT WOULD
BE "HEARSAY" "NO PROBABLE CAUSE TO PROSECUTE" RULE 3.8 ETHICS VIOLATION
SEE MINUTE ENTRY JUDGE RULING DATED SUPPRESSION OF STATEMENTS
AFTER THE ABOVE RULING BY PROSECUTOR AND JUDGE ALLEGED DRUG CHARGES
SHOULD HAVE BEEN DISMISSED AND PLAINTIFF SHOULD HAVE BEEN RELEASED
BUT.

ALLOWED PROSECUTOR TO PROCEED TO TRIAL WITH ALLEGED
DRUG EVIDENCE RESULTING DIRECTLY THEREFROM, SUPPRESSED STATEMENTS
OF UNKNOWN BLACK FEMALE IN THE POLICE REPORT TO PROSECUTE
PLAINTIFF RESULTING IN A MALICIOUS PROSECUTION FALSE
IN PRISONMENT ARIZONA & U.S. CONSTITUTIONS
4TH 5TH 6TH 8TH 14TH AMENDMENT DEPRIVATION CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS
ACCORDING TO RULE ER 3.8 THE PROSECUTOR "SHALL" REFRAIN FROM
PROSECUTING A CHARGE THAT THE PROSECUTOR KNOWS IS NOT SUPPORTED
BY PROBABLE CAUSE "SEE FOLLOWING PAGES AFTER ALLEGED
INCUMINATING STATEMENTS OF UNKNOWN FEMALE WERE SUPPRESSED.
BECAUSE SHE WAS "UNKNOWN" PROSECUTOR KNEW WITHOUT A DOUBT
THAT THERE WAS NO PROBABLE CAUSE TO PROSECUTE AND THAT
ALLEGED DRUG CHARGES SHOULD HAVE BEEN DISMISSED BEFORE TRIAL
ON "TRIAL WAS FRUIT OF THE POISONOUS TREE"
THERE NEVER SHOULD HAVE BEEN A TRIAL IN THE FIRST PLACE

CONTINUED NEXT PAGE

**THE COMMISSION'S POLICY IS
TO POST ONLY THE FIRST FIVE
PAGES OF ANY DISMISSED
COMPLAINT ON ITS WEBSITE.**

**FOR ACCESS TO THE
REMAINDER OF THE
COMPLAINT IN THIS MATTER,
PLEASE MAKE YOUR REQUEST
IN WRITING TO THE
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL
CONDUCT AND REFERENCE
THE COMMISSION CASE
NUMBER IN YOUR REQUEST.**