

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-143

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

August 5, 2025

The Complainant alleged a municipal court judge entered a plea on his behalf and improperly ordered Rule 11 proceedings in a criminal case.

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 allegations of the complaint in this matter solely raised disagreements with legal rulings. The Commission does not have jurisdiction to overturn, amend, or remand a judicial officer's legal rulings. "A good faith error of fact or law does not violate this rule. However, a pattern of legal error or an intentional disregard of the law may constitute misconduct." *See* comment 3 to Rule 2.2 of the Code of Judicial conduct. Any violation of the Code of Judicial Conduct must be proven by clear and convincing evidence.

A mistake in a ruling does not automatically mean that the judicial officer has engaged in judicial misconduct. Judicial officers are required to exercise their discretion in making their decisions. Even if a judicial officer's decision is legally or factually incorrect, the ruling is generally considered to be "legal error" and not "ethical misconduct" that the Commission can address. When a complaint to the Commission solely relates to the correctness of a judicial officer's legal decisions, the Complainant is seeking the Commission to function in the capacity of an appellate court. Correcting legal errors is the role of the appellate courts, not the Commission.

The Commission is a regulatory body with limited jurisdiction. The Commission is not a court, and as such, it does not have any authority to overturn a judicial officer's rulings, intervene in a case, assign a new judge to hear a case, or award any monetary or other relief. The Commission process cannot be a substitute for seeking appellate review.

The Commission reviewed all information submitted by the Complainant 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).

A Duty Panel comprised of Commission members Regina L. Nassen, Scott H. O'Connor, and Christopher P. Staring considered this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on August 5, 2025.

affidavit

case no:

The undersigned Affiant, **of the family doe**, hereinafter "Affiant", does solemnly swear, declare and state as follows:

1. Affiant is competent to state the matters set forth herein.
2. Affiant has knowledge of the facts stated herein.
3. All the facts herein are true, correct and complete, admissible as evidence and if called upon as a witness, Affiant will testify to their veracity.

Plain statement of Facts

4. I swear and affirm that the man named _____ who is known to act as a judge for the _____ Municipal Court along with his/her predecessor's to the above case/actions now further identified as co-conspirators has and does cause i, a harm and injury by way of its practice of law from the bench as additionall I make claim that _____ and it's co-conspirators does the act of practicing law from the Bench by way of the entering of a plea of not guilty on behalf of _____ only a party may enter a plea or advised council to a proceeding including but not limited to an arraignment, further it appear _____ practice law from the Bench by his filing of a motion for rule 11 competency examination and all other motion /orders have prove to show cause as to aid, assist, and contribute in an effort to act for the benefit of the prosecution, i make claim that the action of practicing law from the bench is/comes with wanton disregard as the co-conspirators/wrongdoers are learned individuals of the law who have been observed to have performed such acts by i, during previous court actions and proceedings all in violation to the Arizona Constitution article 6 section 28 as to Justice and judges dual office holding shall not be eligible for any other public office during their term of office a judge may only render a judgment, additionally I make claim that there be a direct conflict of Interest as the plaintiff to the above case is" STATE of Arizona" to which also it appear _____ and all co-conspirators are known to be registered agents and employees to the State of Arizona, which has and does furtur establish there be a disadvantaged place upon i, as in being that it further appear that there be reasonable belief of communicating improperly with one side to a proceeding by way of its practice of law from the bench and it has and does caused delay to above case/action and further there appear to be unconstitutional order relied upon under it's statue 13-4507, and 13-4510 and in further violation as to provide i right to preliminary hearing and in violation of rule 12.5, 12.6 rules of criminal procedure, herein i give formal written warrant authorizing the Arizona Commission on judicial conduct the power to perform various acts,duties and obligations as to uphold and honor their oath to The United States of America Constitution and the State of Arizona Constitution.

