State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 15-154

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a superior court judge made improper rulings in his 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.

Dated: July 9, 2015

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ George A. Riemer

George A. Riemer
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed
to the complainant and the judge
on July 9, 2015.

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

I understand the commission cannot reverse court orders or assign a new judge to a case.

I declare, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing information and the facts I have provided upon which my allegations of judicial misconduct are based are true and correct.

Signature:

Date:

INSTRUCTIONS

Use the following space or plain paper of the same size to explain your complaint. Explain why you believe what the judge did constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list the names, dates, times, and places relevant to your allegations. Additional pages may be used and relevant copies of documents may be sent with your complaint (please do not send original documents). Use one side of each page only and write legibly or type your complaint. Please keep a copy of your complaint for your records.

See attachment:

I reserve the right to amend and/or add issues as I discover evidence of said issue(s).

Between the   and the

1.   Judge   unlawfully   denied EVERY   defense motion

See: ALL defense motions and orders after   to   into

involuntarily accepting   and involuntarily

was forced to file a 42 USC § 1983 suit before the   just to

prevent Judge   form depriving   of his right to represent himself.

then recused himself. *See:*

After the unlawful   declaration of mistrial against

objections and without manifest necessity, the trial Court scheduled a

in violation of the   preclusion - - since the State failed to do the

requisite acts to remove jeopardy from the

Before the   and unlawful trial, Judge   denied

OVER   DEFENSE motions in a row; and made it abundantly clear he

would ALWAYS   deny   defense motions and unlawfully continue

trial until   waived his right to represent himself.

Judge   was well aware of the aforementioned   and the

events of the   and obviously knew   would likely be successful if

allowed to   again.

2. Judge   unlawfully allowed prosecutor   to prosecute the case even though her   was apparent and obvious. Judge

knew   had sued   and accordingly she was vindictively prosecuting

Judge   also knew the Court had previously directed   to withdraw from the case and she ignored the Court's directive. *See:*

3. Judge   unlawfully prevented payment from   to defense expert Dr.   because Dr.   had discovered irrefutable evidence clearing   and Judge   did not want the evidence to be tested so as to prevent the evidence from entered into the Court.

4. Judge   refused to sanction the State in any way after   proved the State intentionally destroyed he last piece of exculpatory evidence remaining in police custody - - after the police and prosecutor were already caught having destroyed over   of   evidence.

After years of attempting to examine the   discovered in the

pocket,   finally issued an order allowing the defense to examine and/or test the   and   subsequently informed   that the State, specifically   would destroy the   so   could not prove it contained illicit drugs.

On the date   Private Investigator was scheduled to meet with

Detective   to examine the   Detective   informed

he could not find the   - just as

informed   Detective   would do. *See: relevant motions and*