

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 17-304

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

The complainant alleged a court commissioner issued an improper ruling

The responsibility of the Commission on Judicial Conduct is to impartially determine if the commissioner 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 commissioner's rulings. In addition, the commission found no evidence of ethical misconduct and concluded that the commissioner 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: January 10, 2018

FOR THE COMMISSION

/s/ Margaret H. Downie

Margaret H. Downie

Executive Director

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on January 10, 2018.

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

The main contestants in this diabolical scheme were recruited by the
acting as the umbrella agency for the defunct

. Recent contact has been made with the state of Arizona, as sources available
have implied that have been investigated by the State of Arizona. There is
absolutely no doubt that the authorities are at the crux of this "Put Up Job" and
have demonstrated that no boundaries would limit them in their job of absconders
regarding our ignoring any risk of involving themselves individually in perjury
emitting testimonies, under oath, in courts of law.

Using the service of written charges of suspected drug offenses and neglect of our
accepted the conjured speculation of employees
and ultimately formed a coalition resulting in the removal of our from home
and custody. The original trial in concluded with no witness
participation from the accusatory lot of belonging directly to only undeniable and
indisputable proof established with conclusive evidence submitted to the
ascertaining that no drug involvement and or neglect of the children was discovered on
the parents behalf and a mandate written that no further action would be taken by "The
Department". In the ensuing months after the children were court ordered to return to
the libelous faction of an ensemble of nvestigators,
caseworkers, and in-home officers were enlisted to intervene in the way of
life in the house as well as doing so on a daily basis.

The decision by [redacted] was then made to extrapolate from the ways and means that were not successful in their initial attempt in [redacted] to relentlessly utilize a completely different and more deceitful tactic in forming a proposition to [redacted] the aspect of endangering and neglecting the children. When the [redacted] trial concluded, the fathers 6th amendment rights were grievously breached when the [redacted] refused to allow any witnesses of the defendants list of nine possibles, including [redacted] and people in general with knowledge of the [redacted] that could testify to the fact that imperiling, endangering and neglecting the children were an impossibility as the [redacted] overview prevailed. Probation and parenting classes for [redacted] for child neglect were imposed as the case was brought back to the animus of [redacted] authorities and the family was forced to enter into a dismal demise. [redacted] of Rule 32 legalese resulted in an evidentiary hearing where only supporting evidence, intended to corroborate the testimonies of major witnesses, all of which interacted with the [redacted] was heard and denied as to not being credible evidence. In short, this would include [redacted] testimony as to no appearance of any of the charges including drug use. [redacted] testimony that a false police report was made by the [redacted] against the defendant in an attempt to substantiate defamation of character, including several other discrepancies which were noticed in a ruling by a [redacted] Thirdly, 80 pages of medical records from the children's birth to their removal again by feckless thugs of

based on perjured testimony by 2 miscreants that in the end was the basis for severance.

In the intervening time, to the present day, complaints against the residing

have been filed in the and the

On the . These grievances

include abuse of discretion, questionable conduct of moral judgement, absolute indifference to the refutation in denial of 6th amendment rights as afforded the defendant according to the Constitution of the United States of America and at the utmost importance to this case the final instrument suborned by explained as follows:

Arizona Revised Statute ARS 13-2701 (Chapter 27)

PERJURY

1. Material (States witnesses)
2. Statement (States witnesses)
3. Sworn Statements (State witnesses)

ARS 13-2702

1. Validity (Witnesses for the State testified with knowingly false statements)

ARS 13-2705

1. Perjury by inconsistent statements

ARS 13-2707

1. Proof of Witnesses for the States testimony containing guilt of perjury.

The final court chapter was construed in such a way that the main performers for in allegiance with appointed attorney general et. al., deliberately made profitable use of numerous months of hearings fraught with fraudulent accusations meant to implore the judge into believing what ntended to be supplanted into the permanent record and were successful in their ability to coerce the person who held in the balance.

A personal forensic study of proceedings from Day 1 of the dialogue that had all the earmarks of misconception, finally transcended into Severance action, can be arbitrarily proven how subversively and relentlessly duped a non-plussed judge into a pitiful state of perdition.

In closing, from the onset," The Dept", wanted or They recognized the gain to them in one way only, the marketable aspect of and were not to be denied in their amoral quest.

Respectfully,

