

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-555

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

February 11, 2026

The Complainant alleged a justice of the peace pro tem improperly denied a motion to continue.

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 and Regina L. Nassen did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on February 11, 2026.

, Authorized Representative of:

COUNTY JUSTICE COURTS, ARIZONA

Case Number: -

Personal Representative
For the Estate of

vs.

IMPROPER & FICTICIOUS COMPLAINT PARTY, CORRUPT
PERSUADER & HOLDER OF THE KEY(S),

DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE &
JUDGE FOR CONSPIICAY AGAINST RIGHTS
BY SPECIAL APPEARANCE NOT BY GENERAL

AND

BY JOINDER OF PERSONS PURSUANT TO A.R.S. R. 19

JURISDICTION HAVE NOT BEEN PROVEN
COURT HAS NO AUTHORITY TO RULE

(1)(A), (A)(B): , IN HER OFFICIAL &
PRIVATE CAPACITY, ON BEHALF AND INCLUDED HER
LAW FIRM OF LAW OFFICERS, PLLC, STATE BAR #
HOLDER OF THE KEY(S), CORRUPT & FALSE PERSUADER & INFLUENCER,
JOINED AS CO-FICTITIOUS COMPLAINING PARTY

**OBJECTION TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT BEING ISSUES & RENDERED BY A
TRYANISTIC OFFICER OF THE COURT & CLERKS UNLAWFUL & UNCONSTITUTIONAL
ILLEGAL FORCED COMPELLATION & APPEARANCE BY SPECIAL APPEARANCE ONLY
TO CHALLENGE THE LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER & IN REM JURISDICTION OF COURT
& DISQUALIFY SELF-IMPLEMENTING AUTOMATICALLY UNDER TITLE 28 U.S.C. 455 &
455A & B AND DIRECT VIOLATION OF ARIZONA'S STATE CONSTITUTION AND THE
JUDICIAL CODE OF CONDUCT FOR ATTEMPTING TO USE THIS COURTS AS A MECHAN-
ISM FOR INTIMIDATION, THREAT, DURESS UNLAWFUL COERCION AND OPPRESSION
IN WHICH THE LAW PROHIBITS AND DEMAND FOR RECALL HIS/THEIR APPOINTMENT
FOR JUDGSHIP FOR ACT UNBECOMING AND OFFICER OF THE COURT, WARING WITH
THE CONSTITUTION AND MISCONDUCT WHILE IN OFFICE STRIPPING THIS COURT
OF JURISDICTION AND RENDERING ALL PROCEEDINGS BEFORE IT/TAINTED BY
FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND IT NULL AND VOID:**

AND NOW COMES, : _____, Coerced Respondent by way and through her legal authorized representative third party having sufficient interest in the outcome of these proceedings that Justice Be Done. Entering said proceedings in Propria Persona(s) Sui Juris without any attorney, in their own persons, By 'Special Appearance only' TO DISQUALIFY THESE TYRANT JUDGE _____ AND JUDGE _____ AND THEIR OFFICE OF THE CLERK _____, CLERK _____ AND _____ WHO THINKS ITS OKAY TO HANG UP THE PHONE ON NON-REPRESENTED PARTIES THAT ACTS PERTINENT PROCEDURAL QUESTION. ILLEGAL PREVENTION OF RELAYING BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT THE LEGAL PROCEDURES UNLAWFULLY FAILING TO AFFORD UNTO UNREPRESENTED THE PROPER ATTENTION AND RESPECT AS REQUIRED IN THE JUDICIAL CODE OF **CANON 3(A) Adjudicative Responsibilities subsection (3)** A judge should be patient, dignified, respectful, and courteous to litigants, jurors, witnesses, lawyers, and others with whom the judge deals in an official capacity. A judge should require similar conduct by those subject to the judge's control, including lawyers to the extent consistent with their role in the adversary process.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 455 and 455 (A)(1) and (B)(1) and Arizona Supreme Court Rule 81, Rules of the Supreme Court, **the Preamble sect(s), 1, and 2, CANONS 1, 2(A),(B), 3(A)(1-3),(B), (4)(A),(D), ET. SEQ...**, of the Judicial Code of Canons, Both Co-Respondent(s): _____ and _____, Beneficiaries/Propria Persona Sui Juris(es) moves for in writing our DEMAND FOR DISQUALIFICATION and REMOVAL OF BULLY RAMBO JUDGE _____ AND JUDGE _____ AND THE OFFICE OF THE CLERKS AND ITS SUPERVISOR _____, CIVIL CLERK _____ AND CIVIL CLERK _____ WITH AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION OF THIS OFFICIAL MISCONDUCT WHILE IN OFFICE NOT OF GOOD BEHAVIOR. In accords with Canon vs. Commission on Judicial Qualifications, (1975); 14, 3d 678, 694; states that "**Acts in Excess of Judicial Authority constitutes Misconduct, particularly where a judge DELIBERATELY disregards the requirements of FAIRNESS AND DUE PROCESS; which MAKES IT IMPROPER TO SIT.** See also, Gonzales vs. Commission

Judicial Performance, (1983); 33, Cal.3d 359, 371, 374. Said Co-Respondent(s) avers as follows:

Both Judge _____ and _____ and the Court Administrator(s) fail to supervise and allow as a regular course of Business of the Offices for the Clerk to take _____ arrogant, hostile and disrespectful Negative behavior towards unlicensed litigants that come before the courts because they feel that there is No real consequences for them of their unbecoming behavior and once reported even before then start implementing secret sabotaging efforts against Disfavored Litigants that thwarts the unrepresented litigants' attempt to effectively educate, familiarize and represent themselves properly before the courts. The same Nasty and Negative Attitudes the Clerks displays so does these (2) Judges and Officers of the Court do as well. Tarnishing and Diminishing the '**Quality and Administration of Justice 'bringing the Courts Into ill-repute'. Breaching & Betraying the Public Trust.** Because of the Clerks and Judge's improper Invidious systematic discriminatory behavior and disdain for unrepresented litigants the Clerks begin a silent/sneaky campaign to start altering the record report of the case for the benefit and unlawful advantage of the represented party. The Clerks stoop so low as to even start Fabricating the Factual records of the cause by Changing the narrative of the case within the Case record docket reports in which they Know that most unrepresented litigants do not check so they get away with it. Misrepresenting case law and procedures with the intent to mislead the unrepresented Litigant that negatively directly affects the Outcome of the proceedings.

Order of _____, is **an ILLEGAL & Overt ACT** unlawfully carried out Outside of Time of Court. Violating Fundamental Fairness

A judgment (i.e. adjudication) without a Hearing the party or giving him an (reasonable) Opportunity to be HEARD (not after the fact) IS NOT A JUDICIAL DETERMINATION OF HIS/(HER) RIGHTS. Sabariago vs. Maverick, 124 US 261, 31 L. Ed 430, 8 S. Ct. 461, **and IS NOT ENTITLED TO RESPECT IN ANY OTHER TRIBUNAL.** Due to its Constitutional Voidness.

A judgment may not be RENDERED in violation of Constitutional protections. The validity of a judgment may be affected by a FAILURE to give the constitutionally required due process

NOTICE (which we were never given timely in order to contest and protect/object) and an Opportunity to be HEARD. Earle vs. McVeigh, 91 U.S. 503, 23 L.Ed 398, See Also, Restate-ments, Judgments ‘ 4(b). Prather vs. Loyd, 86 Idaho 45, 482 P. 2d 910. Not a concept unknown to our Federal and State Systems.

Once the Notice of Appeal had been filed in this case upon the record of the Court’s these Judges’ have been ***DIVESTED of Jurisdiction*** therefore the Order of

is a Complete and Total Nullity and VOID upon its face with No legal effect or Force of law.

it is well-settled in law that the “legal effect of perfecting an appeal is to divest the trial court of further authority to Act without leave of the appellate court and to vest jurisdiction in the Appellate Court. Spann vs. Abraham, 36 S.W. 3d 452, 461 (Tenn. Ct. App. 1999). For that reason, “[a]ny ruling made after the trial court has LOST JURIS-DICTION IS VOID AND IS NULLITY.” Prendergrast vs. State, No. M2013-0289-CCA-R3-ECN, 2015 Tenn. Crim. App. LEXIS 1047, at *16 (Tenn. Crim. App. Dec. 29, 2015).

This Court does not rule in this case by Right but by Usurpation.

In undertaking such action, the IMPERSONATING JUDGE acted outside the SCOPE OF HIS RESPECTIVE AUTHORITY & OFFICE, if it is erroneously proclaimed that any of His illegal act was within side the scope of his authority and office, then he is acting and has acted in an unlawful, retaliatory, arbitrary & capricious manner, Grossly Abusing The LAWFUL POWERS OF HIS RESPECTIVE OFFICE, THE RULE OF LAW, LANDLORD TENANT ACT, IN EXCESS OF THE LIMITED JURISDICTION OF THE COURT, & LEGSLATIVE INTENT.

ABUSING THE COURT’S DISCRETION INTRANSIGENTLY

JUDGES AND CLERKS BOTH LACKS THE LEGAL KNOWLEDGE OR TEMPERMENT TO HANDLE THIS CASE. THEY WILLFULLY & INTENTIONALLY DEFIES THEIR OWN LAWS & PROCEDURES OF THE COURT THAT THEY DEAR OTHER ESPECIALLY ALLEGED PRO SES’ TO CROSS.

IN NO SHAPE OR FASHION DO THEY MAKE ANY ATTEMPT IN APPROVING THE LEGAL PROFESSION MAKING SITUATION WITHIN THE COURTHOUSE A HOSTILE, HORRIFYING, & A HORRIFIC SITUATION AND EXPERIENCE RENDERING DEALING WITH THEIR OFFICE AND

HAVING A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL TRIAL UNTENABLE
FORGOING THE RULE OF LAW HAVING NO LEGITIMATE JURISDICTION. ACTING IN ABSENCE
OF ALL JURISDICTION TO RULE IN ANY MATTER BEFORE IT.
COURTS MUST NOT “PRODUCE A RESULT DEMONSTRABLY AT ODDS WITH THE INTENT OF [A
STATUTE, OR AN ACT] DRAFTERS,” See *United States vs Ron Pair Enter, Inc.*, 489 U.S. 235, 242,
(1989).
NO PROPER CONSIDERATION OF THE COURT
REFUSES TO CEASE AND DESIST FROM CONDUCT THAT FAILS TO PROMOTE PUBLIC TRUST.
IMPROPER LEGAL TACTIC THAT IS KNOWN TO BE AN ABUSE OF LAWFUL PROCESS.
BY WAY AND THROUGH THE UNLAWFUL EXERTION OF UNNECESSARY, UNFAIR & UNDUE
PRESSURE BY JUDGES AND CLERKS OF THIS COURT IN SECRET COLLUSION CONFIDENCE IN
THE INTEGRITY AND IMPARTIALITY OF THE JUDICIARY
UNDERMINING THE JUDICIAL PROCESS
CONSTITUTIONAL MISCONDUCT
FAILED TO INTERPRET THE CONSTITUTION WITH FIDELITY

CITY JUSTICE COURT’S TRIAL WAS NOT FREE FROM REVERSIBLE ERRORS Pursuant
to Court Administration Act. Chapt. 74 of the Government Code (set. 74.053) If an Objection as
this is timely the assigned judge’s DISQUALIFICATION IS AUTOMATIC. When an assigned judge
over rules a timely objection to his assignment, all the judge’s subsequent Orders are VOID AND
THE OBJECTING PARTY IS ENTITLED TO MANDAMUS RELIEF.

Said City Justice Court of Limited Jurisdiction cannot be **expanded** by so-called
judicial decree/void orders.

Is not based on Sound discretion of the court and is Retaliatory in Nature caring with it
POTENTIAL FOR HARM and being a

PUBLIC SHAM & BLOT ON THE COURT & OFFICE OF THE JUDICIARY & ITS INTEGRITY
ACTING OUTSIDE OF LEGAL & LAWFUL BOUNDARIES SET BY LAW & THE CONSTITUTIONS
VIOLATING LEGAL AND ETHICAL STANDARDS

**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.**