

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 25-223

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

August 15, 2025

The Complainant alleged a superior court commissioner acted as the attorney by entering a not guilty plea at the arraignment in a criminal case. The Commission's investigation revealed the Complainant misidentified the judge who acted on his 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 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.

I Swear or affirm that the man named  
 who is known to act as a judge for the  
 County, Court along with his predecessors  
 to the above case/action now further identified as coconspirator's  
 has and does cause i, a harm and injury by way of its practice  
 of law from the bench as additionally i make claim that  
 and its coconspirator's does the act of  
 practicing law from the bench by way of entering of a  
 plea of not guilty on behalf of ; as to such  
 does said act without right and acts  
 not of any judicial capacity, but rather in the capacity  
 of a corporate officer as i claim the man who entered said  
 not guilty plea has with wanton disregard appear to cause  
 an effect which subject said defendant to be held in the  
 status to that of a corporation or corporate entity, and  
 for which at no time do i, a man claim to be a corporation  
 or under the status of a corporation; only a party may  
 enter plea or advised counsel to a proceeding, including but  
 not limited to an arraignment, further it appear  
 practice law from the bench is/comes with  
 wanton disregard as the coconspirators/wrongdoer(s) are  
 learned individuals of the law who have been observed to have  
 performed such acts by i. Court record <sup>as evidenced on the</sup> at arraignment <sup>and via camera</sup>  
 on at 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

2022  
of office, a judge may only render judgement; additionally i make claim that there be a direct conflict of interest as the plaintiff to the above case is "THE STATE OF ARIZONA", to which it also appears

and all coconspirator's on said date are known to be registered agents and employees to the state of Arizona, which has and does further establish there to be a disadvantage placed 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; 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 Constitution and to the Arizona State Constitution.

i swear or affirm under penalties of the common law and the United States constitution all herein be true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

i say here now and will verify in open court all herein be true.

Produced by:

(Complainant, and real party in interest.)