

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-414

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

October 3, 2025

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge failed to follow the law in a criminal matter.

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 Denise K. Aguilar and Roger D. Barton did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on October 3, 2025.

Supplemental Statement to Judicial Conduct Review Board

Comp

Complainant:

Judge(s):

Case:

Date:

I. Introduction

I submit this supplemental statement in support of my ongoing judicial conduct complaint. All facts below are stated truthfully to the best of my recollection and are backed by documentary or electronic evidence in my possession. These incidents reflect actions and omissions directly involving the presiding judge in my criminal matter, demonstrating a pattern of procedural and ethical failures that impaired my constitutional rights.

II. Summary of Judicially Relevant Incidents

1. Threat of Plea Revocation and Warrant as Leverage

- o **Date:** telephonic sentencing
- o Judge warned that failure to appear in person at the next hearing would result in plea-deal revocation and a nationwide arrest warrant.
- o That threat was later inconsistently applied and suggests improper leverage.

2. Blocking Access to Court for Self-Representation or Counsel Change

- o I filed a motion to discharge my public defender and proceed pro se under *Faretta*.
- o Court rejected the application solely because I was "represented," yet required any such request to be in person—effectively denying my right to self-representation.

3. Issuance of Warrant Containing Factual Misstatement

- o The bench warrant stated I “.”
- o I have same-day email correspondence disproving that assertion, calling into question the judge’s duty to ensure factual accuracy in court orders.

4. Refusal to Consider Time-Sensitive Humanitarian Request

- o When my mother suffered a medical emergency in , I contacted the judge’s chambers seeking leave to travel and tend to her as her only living relative.
- o The request was summarily denied with no hearing or judicial review of the extraordinary circumstances.

5. Denial of Motion to Quash Warrant Despite Exceptional Circumstances

- o My attorney filed a motion to quash the warrant based on my mother’s critical illness and my compliance with telephonic hearings.
- o The court denied relief without addressing why these humanitarian factors did not justify quashing the warrant.

6. Rejection of a Properly Formatted Constitutional Motion

- o On , I filed a “Notice of Special Appearance and Motion for Relief...” fully compliant with Ariz. R. Crim. P. 1.6(a) & (b).
- o The court refused to act, citing “” and “,” despite emailing the denial to my valid address. No opportunity to cure defects was offered, and my *Faretta* hearing request went unaddressed.

7. Abrupt Termination of Remote Proceeding in

- During a remote extradition hearing in custody, the judge was interrupted mid-proceeding, abruptly ordered the live feed disconnected, and left the record incomplete.
 - Jail staff later claimed a “technical mishap,” but my firsthand observation contradicts that explanation. The hearing was rescheduled, extending my detention without proper judicial review.
-

III. Extradition Background & Governor’s Warrant Process

- **Custody Start Date:** in on an Arizona fugitive warrant.
 - I **refused to sign an extradition waiver**, triggering the Uniform Criminal Extradition Act’s Governor’s Warrant process.
 - Arizona was **obligated** to transmit certified charging documents and proof of fugitive status to its governor for formal requisition to governor.
 - Despite my continued custody, Arizona **never initiated** this mandatory Governor’s Warrant process.
-

IV. Relevant Legal Requirements

- **Uniform Criminal Extradition Act (UCEA)** §§ 3 & 7 require:
 1. Certified charging instrument (complaint, indictment, information).
 2. Copy of the arrest warrant.
 3. Evidence that the accused was **physically present** in the demanding state when the alleged offense or court obligation arose, then departed.
 - **Hyatt v. People ex rel. Corkran**, 188 U.S. 691 (1903): Extradition is constitutionally barred when the accused was never physically present in the demanding state at the relevant time.
-

V. Defects in the Arizona Warrant

- The Arizona warrant was issued for **failure to appear** on
 - I was **never physically present in Arizona** on that date; I resided in
 - The constitutional “fugitive from justice” requirement was therefore unsatisfied, rendering the warrant **legally defective**.
 - Any Governor’s Warrant submission risked denial by governor or successful habeas corpus challenge.
-

VI. Observed Conduct by Arizona Authorities

- Arizona’s **failure to transmit** the formal Governor’s Warrant packet extended my custody without judicial oversight.
 - This omission continued for **13 days** despite my refusal to waive extradition.
 - The most reasonable inference is that Arizona officials were **aware** of the warrant’s constitutional defect and deliberately avoided formal requisition to prevent judicial challenge.
 - This conduct denied me the opportunity to contest the warrant’s validity, constituting **procedural abuse** and a deprivation of habeas corpus rights.
-

VII. Pattern of Concern

These incidents collectively demonstrate:

- Persistent **avoidance** of constitutional determinations (self-representation, plea withdrawal, warrant quash).
- Reliance on **factually inaccurate orders** to justify arrest warrants.
- **Procedural obstruction** via denial of filing access and dismissal on spurious grounds.
- **Irregularities in courtroom record-keeping** and refusal to hold *Faretta* hearings.

Bad faith use of extradition procedures to prolong detention without lawful basis.

VIII. Requested Board Action

I respectfully request the Board to:

1. Investigate whether Arizona judicial or prosecutorial officers acted in **bad faith** by failing to initiate the Governor's Warrant process.
 2. Determine whether such actions violated:
 - o Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct, Canons 1, 2, & 3
 - o Obligations under *Faretta v. California* and due-process precedent
 - o Duty to maintain accurate court records and truthful judicial findings
 3. Recommend appropriate corrective or disciplinary measures.
-

IX. Supporting Documentation to Follow

- Copies of all relevant motions, warrants, and court orders
 - Email correspondence with my attorney contradicting warrant language
 - E-file confirmation emails and service certificates
 - Timeline of events with date-stamp evidence
 - Extradition custody records from _____ detention facility
-

spectfully,