

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 25-430

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

December 23, 2025

The Complainant alleged an appellate court judge improperly denied a special action.

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 Michael J. Brown did not participate in the consideration of this matter.


Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on December 23, 2025.



**CONFIDENTIAL**

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

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**



gave shocking testimony claiming anyone who doesn't accept the time served plea deal, who wants to exercise their constitutional rights to a trial, that is a sign of mental illness and must be force medicated. He also claimed that anyone who thinks has been disciplined in court for pedophilia normalization activism aruging in multiple jurisdictions it's religious persecution for to be prosecuted for sex with his year old "wife", but under cross-examination admitted not going to the article (among others) he was given about the case he himself was likely party to. is in County Detention Facility now when he should be in a federal facility, likely doing prison snitch services to lesser his year sentence.

Not only did judge deny the motion she falsely attributed another party's case to her decision that doesn't even relate to in the interim denial of jurisdiction decision (**Exhibit 1**). Under the Rules of the Arizona Supreme Court Rule 2.5(A) (Competence, Diligence, and Cooperation), which states, "A judge shall perform judicial and administrative duties competently, diligently, and promptly.". The fact she and the panel didn't even look up the associated cases to address this error, and see that


was a court appointed Rule 11 expert and there are breaches of the rules of Arizona Rules of Criminal procedure underway shows a clear lack of competency. As County court is in non-compliance with Ariz. Crim. Proc Rule 1.5(c) where only foreign based members & associates of the cult such as who lost his account for child rape threats/fantasies against my partipate in the link in the last hearing, yet all requests for access and just the court audio are blocked by the court of the clerk of the court and are never responded to. This is in breach of Rule 2.3. Bias, Prejudice, and Harassment, discrimination against those who are not on board with the Police protected child abuse cult. In [State vs Henderson No. 1 CA-CR 10-0659](#) this case it was found that suggesting a judge is a Freemason isn't grounds to Rule 11 anyone, and is only guilty of asking in an open court in if is a freemason hence these rule 11 proceedings begin, so all these proceedings are mute and there is a vested interest to protect the by stopping this case to go to trial. I am surprised that he was unable to answer the question, and the only motive for him not to do so is that he perjured himself on his affidavit to for his promotion to follow case from Justice court from County court after he had allowed him to be detained more than hours without charges being filed (my next complaint).

With my access to court records blocked and the case sealed on without a grand jury

**CONFIDENTIAL**

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

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**



motion to seal the best I have is **Exhibit 2**. A screen capture from the website that suggests [redacted] was a court appointed assessor in [redacted] by defense counsel. [redacted] withdrew her findings against [redacted] due to an undisclosed conflict of interest, yet the mail to the jail from the Arizona [redacted] has been stolen in the federal crime of mail theft by [redacted] County Sheriff jail staff and I have made a valid report to the USPIS about that as demonstrated by correspondence I have sent the CJC on a another matter. In the last hours I have observed that two registered sex Offenders linked to my dealings with the CJC [redacted] and [redacted] have been removed from the Arizona Sex offender registry this week who are linked to judicial corruption matters in [redacted] County and in the that [redacted] Date of Birth was changed on [redacted] system to [redacted] to obscure his case from search results. **Exhibit 3** clearly shows the case that the court of appeals division 1 linked to [redacted] as a party to a case which he is not involved in, in their published decision. I doubt they even obtained the secreted rule 11 court motions from the case, and I suspect the judge didn't even look up the docket before rendering a decision of no jurisdiction to a valid complaint. [redacted] will not waive his rights under Ariz Crim Proc 11.3(4) to have less than two court appointed psychologists find him not competent to stand trial under Ariz Crim Proc 11.5, and the appointment of hostile defense counsel may enable this travesty of justice. Torrents of exculpatory evidence given to defense counsels in [redacted] case has been destroyed over the last approximately [redacted] years he has been held in custody. The cases of [redacted], [redacted], also show that Rule 11 has been weaponized against police corruption informants. Psych Nurse [redacted] can be seen on this [redacted] video supporting the use of force medication. The [redacted] case shows that 1 month in the [redacted] is usually sufficient to coerce those to take the plea deal instead of going to trial. [redacted] The report of [redacted] has not been handed to [redacted] or the court [redacted] days after it was completed. This is a clear breach of the Arizona rules of criminal procedure that was ignored without satisfactory effort by the Arizona [redacted] in a special action request. He will naturally request a review of this decision, but this incompetence is so obvious that an audit of the judges activity on the court's computer system as far as case access should be undertaken to assess if [redacted] and her colleagues on the panel did their duties competently.

Kind Regards, [redacted]. Sent via email as pending a new complaint number.

**Exhibit 1:** A screenshot of [redacted] as it appears at the time of preparing this document.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

**Special Action**

<b>Case Information</b> Case Filed: Case Closed:	<b>Dept/Composition</b> <b>Department</b> Hon. Hon. Hon.
--	--

<b>Side 1.</b>	<b>Petitioner</b>
(Litigant Group)	
•	PRO SE
<b>Side 2. STATE OF ARIZONA, Respondent</b>	
(Litigant Group) STATE OF ARIZONA	
• State of Arizona	<b>Attorney for: Respondent</b>
	Esq. (AZ Bar No. )

**CASE STATUS**

Decision Rendered

PREDECESSOR CASE(S)	Cause/Charge/Class	Judgment/Sentence	Judge. Role <Comments>	Trial	Dispo
			Authoring Judge of Order		
			Authoring Judge of Order		

**OPEN DUE DATE**

Petition for Review to due Due By:

*Re: ORDERED: Special Action Petition (Petitioner Pro Per) = JURISDICTION DECLINED. FURTHER ORDERED: Special Action Petition (Petitioner Pro Per) (Oral Hearing Requested) = DENIED as moot. Hon -Author*

**CASE DECISION**

**ORDER**

ORDERED: Special Action Petition (Petitioner Pro Per) = JURISDICTION DECLINED.

Filed: \_\_\_\_\_ Mandate: \_\_\_\_\_

Decision Disposition
<i>Jurisdiction Declined</i>

.....Author

**6 PROCEEDING ENTRIES**

1. FILED: Special Action Petition (Petitioner Pro Per)
2. FILED: Certificate of Mailing re: Special Action Petition
3. FILED: Courtesy Copy of County Court Minute Entry filed reappointing Legal Defender (re: indigence)
4. FILED: Special Action Clerk Notice (Assigned to Dept Judges)
5. FILED: Memorandum: Judge for Judge Chief Judge
6. ORDERED: Special Action Petition (Petitioner Pro Per) = JURISDICTION DECLINED. FURTHER ORDERED: Special Action Petition (Petitioner Pro Per) (Oral Hearing Requested) = DENIED as moot. Hon Author

Exhibit 2: What appears to be an appointment of \_\_\_\_\_ by \_\_\_\_\_ County Court taken from \_\_\_\_\_ retrieved

**CONFIDENTIAL**

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

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**



**Case Information**

Case Number: [search for case minutes](#)  
Title: STATE OF ARIZONA PLAINTIFF VS Category: CRIMINAL  
Court: \_\_\_\_\_ [County](#) Filing Date:  
Judge: Disposition Date:

DEFENDANT - D1

Citation	Count	Description	Disp. Date	Disposition
	1	MURDER 2ND DEG-EXT INDIFFRENC		
	2	KIDNAP-DEATH/INJ/SEX/AID FEL		
	3	AGGRAVATED ASSAULT		
	4	THREAT-INTIM WINJ-DMGE PROP		
	5	AGGRAVATED ASSAULT-VICTIM BOUND/RESTRAINED		

STATE OF ARIZONA PLAINTIFF - P1 Date of Birth

**Case Activity**

Date	Description	Party
	ORDER: Continuing	D1
	MOTION: Continue	D1
	NOTICE: Appearance	D1
	ORDER: WITHDRAW COUNSEL	D1
	ORDER: APPEAR TELEPHONICALLY	D1
	MOTION: WITHDRAW COUNSEL	D1
	MOTION: APPEAR REMOTELY / TELEPHONICALLY	D1
	ORDER: APPROVING THE STIPULATION	D1
	STIPULATION: STIPULATION	D1
	STIPULATION: STIPULATION	P1
	REQUEST: Request	D1
	MOTION: Continue	D1
	NOTICE: De'enses	D1
	SERVICE: Certificate	D1
	SERVICE: Certificate	P1
	Minute Entry Rule 11 Status	D1
	REPLY: TO RESPONSE	D1
	RESPONSE RESPONSE	D1
	RESPONSE RESPONSE	P1
	<b>RULE 11: MOTION FOR MENTAL HEALTH EXPERT</b>	D1
	MOTION: Motion	D1
	ORDER: SETTING	D1
	Minute Entry Rule 11	D1

**Exhibit 3:** A case clearly not attributed to court were filed under this case number in

but documents filed in County case due to lawyer incompetency only

**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.**