

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 25-190

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

July 29, 2025

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge made improper rulings and covered up criminal activity by another judge.

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 Michael J. Brown, Regina L. Nassen, and Christopher P. Staring did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on July 29, 2025.

Comp

**Attachments:** [attachmentcover\(1\).pdf](#)  
[document\(3\).pdf](#)

---

**From:**

**Sent:**

**To:** Commission on Judicial Conduct <CommissionJudicialCo@courts.az.gov>;

**Subject:** Judge                      complaint

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

Now that I have filed the opening brief, I can move forward with the next Judicial complaint which is .

This Judge ruled that an untimely motion to quash was acceptable in her Court for a discovery subpoena. Refusing to enforce a subpoena of hundred of thousands of documents which would have included evidence of a | and business relationship and judicial bribery. She then also allowed the plaintiffs to plead at a lower standard than required which created Judicial overreach in a breach of constitutional free speech.

She covered up Judge                      criminal activity by abuse of process. Rather than enforcing the subpoena. This amounts to conspiracy by court officials, the attorneys are the next complaint.

On remand the plaintiffs claimed they didn't know how to read a court calander and admitted to destruction of the documents.

The other issue was plain error by Judge                      which is constitutional breach.

Attached pdf

This is a Judge aiding and abetting from the bench. Instead of enforcing rule of law.

Judge                      needs to be removed.

, Pro Per

Powered by

ATTACHMENT COVER PAGE	<p style="text-align: center;">(ENDORSED) <b>ELECTRONICALLY FILED</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">on</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>CLERK OF THE COURT</i> <i>Clerk</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>By Deputy Clerk:</i></p>
<p>STREET ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: BRANCH NAME: WEBSITE:</p>	
ATTACHMENT NAME: <b>BRIEF - Opening: Opening Brief of Appellant</b>	
CASE NAME:	CASE NUMBER:
<p>Please log on to <a href="#">[REDACTED]</a> regularly for updates</p>	

Please staple this to your original attachment

OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Case No.

Appeal from Ct., #  
Predecessor case: Case No.

Plaintiff/ Appellee

Vs.

Defendant/ Appellant

OPENING BRIEF OF APPELLANT

## STATEMENT OF FACTS

The parties have prior litigation history in, \_\_\_\_\_, attorneys from that case have never withdrawn from the matter to this day. This matter originates from \_\_\_\_\_ operating an online website named \_\_\_\_\_ and publishing statements on the website backed by evidence from the AZ Court record in \_\_\_\_\_ which were linked to a pdf file on the site. (I#34-38) Plaintiffs/Appellee's omitted both the linked evidenced from the website, and joinder of relevant parties when filing suit (I#1) and claimed all statements were defamatory. It is clear from the filings alone, The Motion to declare \_\_\_\_\_ a vexatious litigant mid case was an abuse of process to prevent access to the public record to submit evidence of public corruption by the \_\_\_\_\_, in the bribery of a AZ State \_\_\_\_\_ Court Judge, in the manufacturing of \_\_\_\_\_ which the Judge financially benefited from. Defendant/Appellant answered with the defense of truth (I#34-38) Defendant filed Motion to Add Necessary Parties or dismiss lawsuit (I#61-63) Defendant subpoenaed Non Party \_\_\_\_\_ to produce all evidence of financial transactions between \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ (I#67) Plaintiffs/Appellee's Filed Motion for designation of vexatious litigant (I#68) The Court grants the mid case vexatious litigant order (I#78) Defendant files a notice of special appeal (I#80) Non Party \_\_\_\_\_ Files an untimely Motion to Quash Subpoena (I#71) The Court grants the Motion

**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.**