

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 19-146

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

August 21, 2019

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge improperly denied his request to continue a criminal trial, improperly denied his motion to dismiss, and violated her oath of office.

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 Rules 16(a) and 23(a).

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on August 21, 2019.

FILED #  
NEW FILING Comp  
2019-146

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29

COMMISSION ON

JUDICIAL - CONDUCT

STATE OF ARIZONA

1501 WEST WASHINGTON ST

SUITE 229\*

PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007

NAME:

CASE:

JUDGES NAME:

HONORABLE

COUNTY  
COURTS

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

CASE NUMBER:

STATE OF ARIZONA V.

ATTORNEY OF RECORD:

MR.

PRO-PERSONA

NAMES OF WITNESSES:

MR.

PRO-PER

MR.

ADVISORY COUNSEL

TRANSCRIPTIONIST

HONORABLE

- "JUDGE"

MR.

COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

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 MIS-CONDUCT ARE BASED ARE TRUE AND  
CORRECT, TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF,  
AND, AS TO THESE, I BELIEVE THEM TO BE TRUE.

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

SEE MCCOY v. HOUSNANT 584 US, 200 L. ED. 2D (2018)

POINT I. HONORABLE.

OF THE

COUNTY

COURTS ON

"THE PRO-PEL DEFENDANT"

FROM RECEIVING FULL, FAIR, IMPARTIAL HEARINGS,  
OR THE FULL, FAIR IMPARTIAL ADMINISTRATION OF  
JUSTICE, BY A

OF A CONTINUANCE BY

DEFENSE COUNSEL, TO BE ABLE TO PREPARE

WITNESS INTERVIEWS;

REVIEW OF SUCH

FILE, OBTAIN CRITICAL PHYSICAL MATERIAL

EVIDENCE FROM THE

TO CONDUCT

FURTHER INDEPENDENT TESTING FOR FINGERPRINTS OR

P.M.A., FOR DEVELOPMENT OF EXCERPTS EVIDENCE, BY

DEFENSE COUNSEL (PRO-PEL DEFENDANT); OBTAIN THE

OF

OF THE

STOP AT

REVIEW, AND OBTAIN

AGAINST STATE WITNESSES;

CONDUCT A

IN PREPARATION

FOR TRIAL, AS THE EVIDENCE WILL BE REVIEWED IN THE

PRETRIAL TRANSCRIPTS, THEN HONORABLE.

"A"

NOT A

BY

"THAT THIS PRO-PEL DEFENDANT"

IN ESSENCE

TO TAKING PLACE, TO HEAR THE

SECOND TRIAL, AFTER A FIRST

TRIAL PLACE

ALL COMBINED IN THE

WOULD LEAD A REASONABLE PERSON

TO BELIEVE HE THE PRO-PEL DEFENDANT COULD

2 COULD OR WOULD BE "  
3 FROM RECEIVING FULL, FAIR, IMPARTIAL HEARINGS, OR  
4 THE FULL, FAIR, IMPARTIAL ADMINISTRATION OF  
5 JUSTICE, AND AS A \_\_\_\_\_ CAUSED A  
6 "STRUCTURAL DEFECT" IN THE \_\_\_\_\_ NOT ONLY  
7 IN THE "

9 "CAUSING - A" \_\_\_\_\_ TO THIS ✓  
10 "PRO-PER DEFENDANT'S CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED  
11 AND \_\_\_\_\_ PROTECTED \_\_\_\_\_"  
12 RIGHT TO "SELF-REPRESENTATION"; DUE-PROCESS OF LAW;  
13 EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER THE LAW,  
14 HONORABLE \_\_\_\_\_ WAS UNDER CODE OF LAWS.  
15 (A COMPLETE DENIAL OF RIGHTS UNDER CODE OF LAWS...)  
16

17 POINT 2, BECAUSE OF, POINT 1, AND THE HONORABLE  
18 \_\_\_\_\_ CONTROL OF THE  
19 "PRO-PER DEFENDANT'S" CONSTITUTIONALLY  
20 PROTECTED AUTONOMY RIGHT TO  
21 PREPARE FOR TRIAL, BY THE REPEAL OF  
22 THE \_\_\_\_\_ WHICH IS IN THE "PRO-PER"  
23 DEFENDANTS' \_\_\_\_\_ TO DO SO, AND  
24 IN ALIGNMENT WITH HIS CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED  
25 RIGHT TO DUE-PROCESS OF LAW, NOT ONLY DID  
26 NOT REPEAL BUT \_\_\_\_\_ HIS CONSTITUTIONALLY  
27 PROTECTED BOTH \_\_\_\_\_ RIGHT TO  
28 SELF-REPRESENTATION, AND EQUAL PROTECTION  
29

**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.**