

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 24-410

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

December 27, 2024

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge made improper rulings in criminal cases.

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 members Denise K. Aguilar and Colleen E. Concannon did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on December 27, 2024.

Sent Certified mail #

From: **Advocacy on behalf of** a private man

Comp

To: **Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct**
1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

2024-410

Re: Complaint Regarding Judicial Misconduct – Violations of Rule 2.5, Rule 3.3, and Rule 8.4 in the Alleged Matter of alleged cases
, and

This complaint is submitted by **Advocacy on behalf of** a private man, against Judge for violations of her duties under **Rule 2.5** (Competence and Diligence), **Rule 3.3** (Candor Toward the Tribunal), and **Rule 8.4** (Misconduct). Judge incompetence, negligence, and willful criminality have created **disabilities** that prevent her from fulfilling her judicial responsibilities, compromising the integrity of the judicial process and undermining unalienable rights.

Competence and Diligence (Rule 2.5):

Judges are required to perform their duties with competence and diligence, ensuring that legal matters are handled thoroughly and in a timely manner. Judge persistent disregard for the Judicial Notices filed in these alleged cases, along with her disability to address key jurisdictional challenges, exhibits a **significant lack of competence**. Specifically, her inability to properly review and respond to the jurisdictional issues raised violates **Rule 12(b)(1)**, which governs challenges to the court's jurisdiction.

1. **Question:** By allowing the alleged matter to proceed without addressing jurisdictional concerns, has Judge not exhibited a lack of competence and diligence, as required by Rule 2.5?

Candor Toward the Tribunal (Rule 3.3):

Rule 3.3 imposes a duty of candor on all officers of the court, requiring that no false statements be made and that any inaccuracies be corrected immediately. Judge failure to correct the record after specific legal challenges were raised regarding the court's jurisdiction and incapacity, not being "on legal time" or "on state business" at the time of the alleged offense constitutes a violation of this rule. Her refusal to correct the falsities on the record and her continuation of the proceedings without proper legal review resulted in the matter being adjudicated under **false premises**.

2. **Question:** Has Judge not violated Rule 3.3 by failing to correct the record and continuing the proceedings without addressing jurisdictional issues, exhibiting judicial misconduct or fraud upon the court?

Misconduct (Rule 8.4):

Rule 8.4 defines professional misconduct as conduct that is **prejudicial to the administration of justice** or involves dishonesty, fraud, or misrepresentation. Judge actions meet this standard by disregarding jurisdictional challenges and proceeding without addressing critical legal issues. This conduct has severely undermined the integrity of the court and is inconsistent with the ethical responsibilities expected of a judicial officer.

3. **Question:** Does Judge refusal to properly address critical jurisdictional challenges and her failure to adhere to the standards required under Rule 8.4 not constitute professional misconduct?

It is imperative to question whether Judge has adhered to her constitutional oath. Judges are required to swear an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States and their respective state, including the protection of rights guaranteed therein. If Judge actions do not align with the oath she took, it raises serious legitimate concerns about her ability to faithfully execute her judicial duties

4. **Question:** Has Judge adhered to the constitutional oath she swore to uphold in light of her actions in this matter?
- **Judge actions exhibit incompetence, negligence, and willful criminality, violating the principles of competence and diligence (Rule 2.5), candor toward the tribunal (Rule 3.3), and the ethical standards outlined in Rule 8.4.** Her failure to address significant filings in the alleged cases and disregard for specific questions of jurisdiction, and decision to allow the alleged matters to proceed under false premises constitute not only judicial misconduct but also **intentional acts that undermine the rule of law**. Such deliberate disregard for the legal process can be construed as **obstruction of justice**, potentially rising to the level of criminal conduct. By knowingly perpetuating legal proceedings on a faulty basis, **Judge actions may violate state and federal laws**, including potential breaches of **18 U.S.C. § 242**, which prohibits the deprivation of constitutionally protected rights under color of law. This willful criminality severely undermines the integrity of the judicial process and warrants **further investigation into its criminal implications**.
 - **Question:** Does this continued willful criminality not render Judge unfit to serve in her role as a judicial officer?

We respectfully request that this complaint be reviewed, and that specific responses be provided for each rule violation raised. Appropriate action should be taken against Judge to ensure accountability for these ethical and procedural violations.

Respectfully Submitted,

Advocacy on behalf of

Sent Certified mail #

Interested Parties:

Clerk of the Court

Judge

Court of Arizona, County

Prosecutor

County Attorney's Office

Presiding Judge

Court of Arizona, County

Attorney General of Arizona

Governor

Office of the Governor

United States

Arizona State

Arizona State