

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-208

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

August 15, 2025

The Complainant alleged a city court judge misnamed the defendant in a civil traffic 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 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 member Regina L. Nassen did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on August 15, 2025.

Comp

Date:

25-208

To:

Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct
1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Subject: Submission of Judicial Complaint Against Magistrate

Dear Members of the Commission,

Please find enclosed a formal judicial complaint titled "**Judicial Complaint for Misrepresentation, Identity Theft, and Fiduciary Criminality by [redacted] Acting as Magistrate.**" This complaint arises from actions taken under the jurisdiction of the [redacted] Municipal Court, which have resulted in ongoing injury and raise serious concerns regarding judicial conduct and ethical standards.

The complaint includes the following exhibits:

- **Exhibit A:** *ORDER RE: FILINGS* dated [redacted]
- **Exhibit B:** *NOTICE OF CLAIM OF DAMAGES FOR UNWARRANTED SUMMONS – FRAUDULENT PRESUMPTIONS, LACK OF CAPACITY, JURISDICTION, AND UNLAWFUL TRESPASS* dated [redacted]

I respectfully request that the Commission review this complaint and take appropriate action in accordance with its mandate to uphold the integrity of the judiciary.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name:

Judge's Name:

Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

see attachments:

From: _____, private man
_____] without the US

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

**Judicial Complaint for Misrepresentation, Identity Theft, and Fiduciary Criminality by
_____ acting as Magistrate**

Unauthorized Case Number: _____ 5

Dear Commissioners,

This complaint is submitted by a private man based on firsthand knowledge and observation of ethical violations, administrative falsifications, continued injury, and unlawful takings without just compensation arising from actions taken under the jurisdiction of the _____ Municipal Court. _____ the named Respondent, acting under color of authority, has participated in and permitted a series of actions that breach the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct, undermine due process, and unlawfully impose obligations upon a man not proven to be subject to statutory authority.

For clarity, the name _____ as used in this complaint is equivalent in meaning and private standing to _____ of the House of _____, as used in prior filings. The private man retains the same unalienable rights, private status, and intent in all expressions of his name. Any variation is a matter of form, not substance. From this point forward in this complaint, the term private man shall be used in place of the full name.

Factual Background: This unwarranted matter arose from an interference stop by _____ Police Department employee _____; who trespassed against the private man while he was peacefully minding his private affairs. No verified harm, injury, or commercial activity was present. Despite the absence of lawful nexus or factual evidence establishing statutory capacity, and despite receiving notice from the private man, _____ proceeded to issue citations under state codes and attempted to compel performance under fraudulent presumptions.

At all times relevant, and from the outset of the agents' intrusions, the private man provided clear and repeated notice of his private capacity and lack of consent to be designated as a defendant, resident, United States citizen, taxpayer, person, or any other statutory party presumed to be exercising privileges granted by the state. These notices were disregarded. Instead, city agents advanced administrative conversions of status, imposed harmful burdens, and escalated threats of coercion without any lawful foundation. This pattern of systemic criminality culminated in the _____ Municipal Court's willful mischaracterization and obstruction of lawful filings, and its continued maintenance of a false and injurious record.

I. False Role Assignment and Misrepresentation of Status: Prior to issuing the ORDER RE: FILINGS, the court had received written communication from the private man in the form of a properly formatted and

a public agency at the time of the accusation. The Notice of Claim included factual statements, lawful citations, and a demand for remedy.

Despite receiving multiple notices affirming the private man's lawful name and private capacity, the court proceeded to mischaracterize his standing and issued an ORDER RE: FILINGS on stating: " .." This was a willful misrepresentation of the private man's declared and affirmed calling. The phrase " " is a false assertion, unsupported by evidence, sworn testimony, or competent witness. The styling used by the private man is a lawful clarification of identity, not an alias, and was offered in good faith to distinguish private standing from a fictional designation. This conduct reflects judicial disability through incompetence and a lack of jurisdictional understanding, rising to the level of deliberate deceit committed under color of law.

By continuing to label the private man as "Defendant," the court fabricated a statutory role without proof of jurisdiction, capacity, obligation, or consent. This false legal identity constitutes a misclassification resulting in direct harm and administrative injury. Such conduct violates **Rule 1.2** of the Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct, which requires judges to promote public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and also violates **Rule 2.2**, which mandates fair and impartial application of the law.

II. Acknowledgment Without Acceptance of Valid Filing: In the same ORDER, the court wrote: " .."

The document filed by the private man was titled: NOTICE OF CLAIM OF DAMAGES FOR UNWARRANTED SUMMONS – FRAUDULENT PRESUMPTIONS, LACK OF CAPACITY, JURISDICTION, AND UNLAWFUL TRESPASS

The title was bold, capitalized, and clearly visible. The court's claim that the document was " " is materially false. The filing—lawful evidence submitted into the record—was acknowledged by the agent, its length and presence noted, yet its contents were deliberately ignored under false pretense. This constitutes a constructive rejection of lawful evidence, reflecting bias, bad faith, and administrative obstruction. Such failure to perform essential judicial duties may amount to gross negligence or willful disregard. This violates **Rule 2.5(A)**, which requires judges to act diligently and competently, and **Rule 2.2**, which mandates fair and impartial application of the law.

III. Simulated Prosecutorial Involvement in a Fabricated Public Matter: The void ORDER further states (Exhibit A): " .."

However, upon direct inquiry, the clerk of the Municipal Court confirmed that no prosecutor is assigned to civil traffic matters. Thus, the court's reference to a prosecuting attorney is not supported by the court's own records or structure. This is a material fabrication intended to justify the court's refusal to act and creates a false impression of criminal procedure where none exists.

This misrepresentation raises serious concerns about ethical fitness and good faith.

IV. Escalating Harm from Unrebutted Presumptions: At all times relevant, the private man was not shown to be a qualified party under any statutory obligation, nor did he volunteer to perform under

state codes or operate within federal regulatory time standards. He was not in the State of Arizona for purposes of jurisdiction, and he affirmed his private capacity—both verbally and in writing. Yet agents operating under the court continued to demand compliance: fees, proof of insurance, registration, and submission to administrative process.

These coercive demands, issued without verified authority or rebuttal on the record, escalated the threat of harm. What began as trespass has now become life-threatening—exposing the private man to bondage, custodial coercion, and indentured servitude under false pretenses. This continued coercion, cloaked in administrative procedure, reflects a pattern of willful criminality and transforms a fabricated civil misunderstanding into a deliberate and ongoing injury.

allowed such harm to persist and deepen, despite her duty to act with impartiality, diligence, and respect for rights that exist beyond statutory assumption.

See A.R.S. § 1-201 – Adoption of Common Law; Exceptions.

V. Lack of Verified Complaint from Real Party in Interest: At no time has the record reflected a verified complaint signed under penalty of perjury by a competent witness with firsthand knowledge of any harm, injury, or lawful obligation involving the private man. The so-called Plaintiff, "State of Arizona," is a legal fiction and has not produced a witness capable of attesting to a direct claim or damage.

The absence of a verified complaint renders any action taken by the court presumptive and without lawful foundation. Due process demands that any party bringing a claim must verify the facts under oath. In this matter, no such verification exists. The State cannot function as both the accuser and the arbiter without violating the essential principles of fairness, impartiality, and jurisdictional integrity.

VI. Exhibit A: ORDER RE: FILINGS (Attached)

The document referenced above has been marked as Exhibit A and contains the following material misrepresentations:

- False attribution of the private man's name as "assumed"
- False claim that the five-page document was untitled
- Fabricated reference to a prosecuting attorney
- Knowing acknowledgment and subsequent misrepresentation of a valid notice, constituting administrative deceit and obstruction of the record
- Incomplete and misleading language regarding service or mailing

These are not clerical oversights; they reflect a deliberate pattern of judicial misconduct, administrative deception, and abandonment of ethical duty.

VII. Misuse of Name and False Jurisdictional Claim by Municipal Court: The Municipal Court, a subordinate municipal venue, has no lawful authority to issue orders under the name "State of Arizona" without a verified complaint, delegation of authority, or competent witness. Presenting "State of Arizona" as a claimant in this situation, without factual evidence or lawful standing, reflects a misuse of name and a false claim of jurisdiction. This amounts to a misrepresentation of authority and the unlawful conversion of a private man's affairs into presumed public obligations under color of law.

**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.**