

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-350

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

October 14, 2025

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge improperly appointed counsel when he wished to be self-represented. Complainant also alleges the superior court judge was biased and had improper ex parte communications.

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 Colleen E. Concannon, Joseph C. Kreamer, and Regina L. Nassen did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on October 14, 2025.

COMPLAINT TO THE ARIZONA COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

IN THE MATTER OF HARRIS

COURT JUDGE

COUNTY

COURT OF ARIZONA

Case: _____

Date of Incident: Starting (approx.) _____)

I, _____ hereby submits this sworn complaint against Hon. _____ for judicial misconduct arising from secretly proceeding against me by depriving me of my right to self-representation by secretly appointing counsel in my PCR AFTER I filed my "Pro Se Supplemental PCR Brief", and ordering that the State "shall respond" — but discovered that the State's charges were baseless and fraudulent. See attached "Objection..." and its Exhibits.

I have proven a prima facie case of actual innocence and Judge _____ is violating the Code of Judicial Conduct to secretly deprive me of my right to self-representation as the means to strike my Brief because the State has no argument against my claims and allegations.

The prisoner's Legal Mail Log, a government document evidences that the unlawful appointment of counsel was done without informing me, as detailed in the attached "Objection..."

I only inadvertently discovered Judge
ultra vires acts due to newly appointed counsel sending
me a copy of his "NOTICE of APPEARANCE," which I
received on _____ - (approx) weeks after
Judge _____ commenced secret proceedings wherein
he decided that I was no longer a pro se litigant.

I respectfully request the Commission to fully investigate
this matter and issue a ruling that I am pro se to
ensure the integrity of future proceedings and that my
rights are no longer denied by Judge _____

VERIFICATION

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of
the State of Arizona that the foregoing is true and
correct to the best of my knowledge.

DATE: _____

By: _____

#

ARIZONA

COURT

COUNTY

STATE OF ARIZONA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Defendant.

Case No.

OBJECTION TO THE COURT'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL
AND UNWARRANTED APPOINTMENT OF
COUNSEL AND DENIAL OF SUBSTANTIVE
RIGHT TO SELF-REPRESENTATION

DEFENDANT, a pro se litigant pursuant to the Sixth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and Article II § 24 of the Arizona Constitution, re-invokes his Constitutionally protected substantive right to self-representation and Objects to this court's unconstitutional and unwarranted appointment of counsel and denial of right to self-representation.

Defendant's previously appointed counsel,

filed her "Notice of Non-Filing" on, or

about,

Defendant then filed his Supplemental PCR Brief that was deemed too long by 4 pages by this court, and then timely filed his current Brief on

— with other filings by Defendant and the State subsequent to that Brief.

Thus, the appointment by force of counsel at this

Rule 32 proceedings. See: Coleman v. Thompson, 501 U.S. 722, 752 (1991). See also: State v. Escarero-Muraz, 232 A12.586, 307 R.3d (2013).

Effectually, this court forced Defendant to proceed pro se, and now that his Brief is filed and has established a prima facie case of actual innocence and false charges, this court is attempting to force Defendant to accept counsel involuntarily, and deprive Defendant of his Constitutional rights, to favor the State and prejudice Defendant, by nullifying the Pro Se Brief.

In fact, in its Order of " (one of three Orders denying Defendant's motions) this court stated, inter alia:

"

"

"

" "

"

" "

The "Pro Se Supplemental Brief" id. was filed on (Rule 1.7 (D)(4)) See: Exhibit 1, Prisoner's Log Mail log, thus requiring the States Response, id., on 10/1 before,

**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.**