

State of Arizona  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

---

Disposition of Complaint 25-462

---

Judge:

Complainant:

---

**ORDER**

December 23, 2025

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge failed to follow the law in an extradition 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).

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

**STATEMENT OF FACTS**  
**COMPLAINT AGAINST JUDGE**

I, \_\_\_\_\_, a living sentient woman, Public Minister, and child of the Most High Almighty Creator, am of sound mind and having attained the age of majority, do state and affirm the following facts:

1. On \_\_\_\_\_ County \_\_\_\_\_ Court Clerk, the District Attorney's Office and Judge \_\_\_\_\_ received my Political Choice of Law and Rebuttals to Jurisdiction via USPS certified mail. (See Exhibit 1)

2. On \_\_\_\_\_, via Special Appearance at EDC Court in \_\_\_\_\_ with Judge \_\_\_\_\_ I put my Political Choice of Law on the record and requested the case be dismissed with prejudice as statutes and codes do not apply under the primary contact—the 1787 Constitution & 1791 Bill of Rights, there is no injured party whatsoever, mens rea cannot be proven, and jurisdiction has not been proven by the asserter, but Judge \_\_\_\_\_ continued acted as if he did not comprehend and scheduled a 2<sup>nd</sup> EDC hearing for \_\_\_\_\_

3. On \_\_\_\_\_ via special appearance at the 2nd EDC Hearing with Judge \_\_\_\_\_ I put my Political Choice of Law on the record again, cited the relevant Supreme Court cases and Public Law 88-243 and asked for the case to be dismissed for Lack of Jurisdiction but Judge \_\_\_\_\_ stated that EDC court was not the right venue to submit a Motion to Dismiss, putting a true conflict of laws on the record, and proceeding without jurisdiction in assigning an arraignment hearing with Judge \_\_\_\_\_ in \_\_\_\_\_ for \_\_\_\_\_

4. In the Minute Entry for the \_\_\_\_\_ Hearing, Court Clerk \_\_\_\_\_ and Court Reporter FTR Gold wrote “

making apparent the “court’s” intention to continue the proceedings outside a True Court of Record and outside the jurisdiction of the original organic Constitution potentially to an administrative process, to continue creating a True Conflict of Laws, to continue violating my Constitutional rights, and to continue causing a living being with documented ADA disabilities concrete harm against her will. (See Exhibit 2)

5. On \_\_\_\_\_ I submitted an ADA Request for a Continuance to Deputy Clerk \_\_\_\_\_ as my ADA disabilities necessitate ample time for comprehension and preparation for the \_\_\_\_\_ court date and was denied this reasonable request by Judge \_\_\_\_\_ without any legal basis or explanation. (See Exhibit 3)

6. On \_\_\_\_\_ at the Arraignment Hearing, Judge \_\_\_\_\_ did not allow me to state my Special Appearance, Rebuttals to Jurisdiction, the Conflict of Laws taking place, or any facts regarding the unconstitutional and invalid warrant from the State of \_\_\_\_\_ ( complaint No: \_\_\_\_\_ ) used by City of \_\_\_\_\_ Police Officers to arrest and detain me in this case number \_\_\_\_\_

7. At the Arraignment Hearing I clearly stated to Judge \_\_\_\_\_ that I could not make any plea under my Choice of Law and Judge \_\_\_\_\_ replied that he is “protecting” my “Constitutional Rights” by entering a “Not Guilty” plea on my behalf and set additional court dates, one with less than 3 days notice—for \_\_\_\_\_ with Judge \_\_\_\_\_ who has a history of intentionally causing me harm in Fugitive of Justice Case \_\_\_\_\_ As living woman and child of the Almighty, I believe this act by Judge \_\_\_\_\_ to be a form of intimidation, harassment, and discrimination against a natural person/living woman with disabilities. He also set a date for trial \_\_\_\_\_

in \_\_\_\_\_, (Court transcripts for the \_\_\_\_\_ Arraignment Hearing can be sent once received from County Court Records.)

8. By not allowing me to be heard, Judge \_\_\_\_\_ is in violation of Article 2 §§ 4 and 24 of the Arizona Constitution and the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, including due process.

9. By entering a plea on my behalf without my knowing, intelligent, willful and voluntary consent, Judge \_\_\_\_\_ violated Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure 14.4, 17.2, and 17.3.

10. Until proven to the contrary, I believe by denying my ADA Request for a Continuance and instead adding multiple, excessive and unnecessary hearings without jurisdiction being proven by the assenter, Judge \_\_\_\_\_ is intimidating and discriminating against a natural person with disabilities in violation of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

11. In said Arraignment Hearing on \_\_\_\_\_, Judge \_\_\_\_\_ violated his Oath of Office and Arizona Code of Judicial Conduct including Canon 1.1 (Compliance with the Law) Canon 1.2 (Promoting Confidence in the Judiciary) Canon 2.2 (Impartiality and Fairness) and Canon 2.5(A) (Competence, Diligence, and Cooperation),

12. On \_\_\_\_\_, I submitted an email to Deputy Clerk \_\_\_\_\_ who is designated to receive ADA Requests, describing the nature of the unlawful and unethical acts by Judges in this matter as well as a Request for all the records and transcripts of hearings for \_\_\_\_\_ and a request that the \_\_\_\_\_ court date be vacated or at the very least moved to a later date. However, she did not reply and the "off the record" hearing is still scheduled, with less than 3 days notice, for \_\_\_\_\_ (See Exhibit 4)

13. Petitioner continues to endure concrete harm and threats of arrest by numerous Judges of \_\_\_\_\_ County Court who are knowingly and intelligently proceeding without the assenter proving jurisdiction and using an unconstitutional warrant to cause Petitioner repeated emotional, mental, physical, and financial distress.

14. As of \_\_\_\_\_ an a APA Request Letter for the Minute Entries regarding the unconstitutional warrant has been sent to all pertinent parties via USPS certified mail. (See Exhibit 5)

I declare under penalty of perjury the foregoing is true and correct.

Petitioner and Authorized Representative  
For:  
All Rights Reserved. Without prejudice

By: \_\_\_\_\_

**COMPLAINT AGAINST JUDGE**

**EXHIBIT 1**

**Rebuttals to Jurisdiction with Proof of Mailing**

Special Deposit

Special Deposit

By: Respondent: Sui Juris:  
For Alleged Defendant:  
General Delivery  
Arizona

from House



Attention: COUNTY COURT IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF  
d/b/a Clerk of the Court; Officers and Assigns;

JUSTICE COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF  
d/b/a Judge. Officers and Assigns;

COUNTY ATTORNEYS OFFICE  
d/b/a Deputy County Attorney  
d/b/a District Attorney

In Reference: Cause (Case) Number:

## Notice Challenge and Rebuttal to the Twelve (12) Presumptions of Legal Courts

Definition of presumption:

<http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/presumption>

1. An idea that is taken to be true on the basis of probability:

A presumption is a presumption which must be agreed upon by the parties to be true.

**Then and Equally**

If one party challenges the presumption to be true on the basis of probability, then all that is required to remove the presumption is a formal challenge to that presumption.

The presumption, then, has no standing or merit in **Fact**.

Notice: Challenge and Rebuttal to the Twelve (12) Presumptions of Legal Courts  
Page 1 of 5

Special Deposit

Special Deposit



A probability:

[http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/american\\_english/probability](http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/american_english/probability)

1. The extent to which something is probable; the likelihood of something happening or being the case. By definition, then, this is not substantive as it is only a probability of what may be and therefore has no substance in material Fact.

A State Court does not operate according to any true rule of law but by presumptions (color) of the law. Therefore, if presumptions presented by the private Bar Guild are not rebutted, they become fact and are therefore said to stand true. There are twelve (12) key presumptions asserted by the private Bar Guilds which, if unchallenged, stand true, being Public Record, Public Service, Public Oath, Immunity, Summons, Custody, Court of Guardians, Court of Trustees, Government as Executor/Beneficiary, Agent and Agency, Incompetence, and Guilt:

(i) **The Presumption of Public Record** is that any matter brought before a state Court is a matter for the public record when, in fact, it is presumed by the members of the private Bar Guild that the matter is a private Bar Guild business matter. Unless openly rebuked and rejected by stating clearly the matter is to be on the Public Record, the matter remains a private Bar Guild matter, completely under private Bar Guild rules;

I, \_\_\_\_\_, **the undersigned, formally challenge the Presumption of Public Record, which is, by definition, a presumption and has no standing or merit in presentable or material fact.**

(ii) **The Presumption of Public Service** is that all the members of the Private Bar Guild who have all sworn a solemn secret absolute oath to their Guild then act as public agents of the Government, or "public officials" by making **additional** oaths of public office that openly and deliberately **contradict** their private "superior" oaths to their own Guild. Unless openly rebuked and rejected, the claim stands that these private Bar Guild members are legitimate public servants and, therefore, trustees under public oath;

I, \_\_\_\_\_, **the undersigned, formally challenge the Presumption of Public Service as it is, by definition, a presumption and has no standing or merit in presentable or material fact.**

(iii) **The Presumption of Public Oath** is that all members of the Private Bar Guild acting in the capacity of "public officials" who have sworn a solemn public oath remain bound by that oath and, therefore, bound to serve honestly, impartially, and fairly as dictated by their oath. Unless openly challenged and demanded, the presumption stands that the Private Bar Guild members have functioned under their public oath in contradiction to their Guild oath. If challenged, such individuals **MUST** recuse themselves as having a conflict of interest and cannot possibly stand under a public oath;

I, \_\_\_\_\_, **the undersigned, formally challenge the Presumption of Public Oath as it is, by definition, a presumption and has no standing or merit in presentable or material fact.**

**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.**