

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 20-266

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

December 16, 2020

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge improperly denied his request for new counsel.

The role of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine whether a judicial officer has engaged in conduct that violates the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct or Article 6.1 of the Arizona Constitution. There must be clear and convincing evidence of such a violation in order for the Commission to take disciplinary action against a judicial officer.

The Commission does not have jurisdiction to overturn, amend, or remand a judicial officer's legal rulings. The Commission reviewed all relevant available information and concluded there was not clear and convincing evidence of ethical misconduct in this matter. The complaint is therefore dismissed pursuant to Commission Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Commission member Colleen E. Concannon did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on December 16, 2020.

Comp
2020-266

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

I WOULD LIKE TO HEREBY LODGE A FORMAL
COMPLAINT AGAINST THE HONORABLE
; JUDGE, SUPERIOR COURT,
OF COUNTY,

THE COMPLAINT I WISH TO FILE IS
FOR UN-FAIR AND PARTIAL DISMISSAL OF MY
MOTION TO REMOVE AND REPLACE INEFFECTIVE
COUNSEL IN THE PERSON OF

VIA MY TORRES HEARING ON
PERTAINING TO CAUSE NUMBERS

I REQUESTED THE REMOVAL AND REPLACEMENT
OF COUNSEL PRIMARILY DUE TO THE REASON THAT
HAS OUTRIGHT REFUSED TO PROVIDE ME WITH
REQUESTED DISCLOSURE SEPARATE TIMES OVER A
TIME FRAME. IN ADDITION TO AN ONGOING

2020-266

TO AN ONGOING CONFLICT OF INTEREST, INADEQUATE COMMUNICATION AND GENERAL UNWILLINGNESS TO ASSIST ME IN MY DEFENSE.

TO WIT, JUDGE STATED HE SAW NO REASON TO GRANT MY MOTION. GOING SO FAR AS TO ASK COUNSEL WHERE THINGS STOOD AS FAR AS TO PROVIDING ME WITH THE REQUESTED DISCLOSURE. TO WHICH COUNSEL REPLIED THAT THE REQUESTED DISCLOSURE HAD BEEN PROVIDED A WEEK PRIOR TO THE TORRES HEARING, MORE OR LESS AN ADMISSION THAT HAD WITHHELD THE TIMES REQUESTED DISCLOSURE!

SHOULD THIS BODY WISH TO REVIEW THE VIDEO OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF JUDGE STATED AT THE START OF THE PROCEEDINGS THAT THE RECORDED FOOTAGE WOULD BE BROADCAST ON THE INTERNET VIA

I FEEL MY RIGHT TO FAIR AND ADEQUATE DEFENSE IS BEING DENIED TO ME AT THE PRESENT TIME!

A RETURNED RECEIPT OF THIS COMPLAINT WOULD BE APPRECIATED.

SINCERELY,