

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 25-639

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

March 3, 2026

The Complainant alleged a justice of the peace failed to follow the law in a criminal case.

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

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on March 3, 2026.

Comp

2025-639

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 RE: JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT COMPLAINT +
10 SYSTEMIC DUE PROCESS FAILURES,
11 SPEEDY TRIAL VIOLATIONS, AND JUDICIAL
12 IMPROPRIETY IN THE COURTS
13 (COUNTY)

16 TO THE HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION:
17 I RESPECTFULLY SUBMIT THIS FORMAL COMPLAINT
18 AGAINST
19

20 OFFICERS OF THE
21 JUSTICE COURT AND COUNTY
22 COURT FOR CONDUCT CONSTITUTING
23 JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT, ABUSE OF DISCRETION,
24 AND SYSTEMIC DENIAL OF CONSTITUTIONAL
25 RIGHTS. THESE ACTIONS COLLECTIVELY
26

1 demonstrate disregard for due process,
2 the right to a fair trial, and judicial
3 neutrality required under the Arizona
4 Code of Judicial Conduct and the
5 United States Constitution.
6

7 8 I. Chronological Background

9 1) Speedy trial rights invoked on ()
10 on this date, I explicitly invoked
11 my rule 8 (Arizona Rules of Criminal
12 Procedure) right to speedy trial. Despite
13 this, the Presiding Judge
14 failed to set trial dates
15 within the statutory timeframe or
16 take action to enforce my constitutional
17 right under Article 2, Section 24
18 of the Arizona Constitution and the
19 Sixth Amendment. The court permitted
20 proceedings to continue without objection
21 or enforcement, effectively nullifying
22 my invocation and condoning defense
23 counsels inaction.
24
25
26

1 2) Findings of No Probable Cause &
2 Court dismissals (

3 and)

4 The Justice Court made
5 Judicial findings of No Probable
6 Cause and dismissed one of my
7 cases on its own motion ()

8 Despite this finding, the court failed
9 to apply the same reasoning to
10 the companion case with identical
11 underlying facts. This selective
12 dismissal created inconsistent judicial
13 outcomes and left me exposed to
14 continued prosecution on charges
15 unsupported by probable cause.
16
17
18
19

20 3) Failure to dismiss despite exculpatory
21 evidence

22 After forensic testing revealed that
23 the alleged narcotics were counterfeit
24 substances, the court neglected its
25 duty to dismiss the case ~~sum~~ ~~sparte~~

1 under rule 16.4(b) and A.R.S. § 13-3907,
2 which require dismissal where no
3 legitimate evidence supports pro-
4 secution. Additionally, the alleged
5 conduct occurred on my private
6 property, yet the court failed to consider
7 this jurisdictional and constitutional
8 fact when allowing proceedings to
9 continue.
10
11

12 4. Improper judicial acceptance of
13 unsupported charges. The court permitted
14 the state to proceed with a possession
15 of dangerous drugs charge for which
16 jail records + police reports will show
17 I was never arrested, booked nor indicted,
18 violating the basic requirements of
19 rule 2.2(b) and rule 13.1. This charge
20 was ultimately dismissed but only
21 on the court's later motion after
22 months of improper prosecution and
23 deprivation of liberty and property.
24
25
26

1 S) UNJUSTIFIED Rule 11 Proceedings)

2 The Court granted defense Counsel's Rule
3 11 motion for mental health evaluation
4 without a factual or medical basis.

5 This action violated rule 11.2(a) (Requiring
6 a good faith showing of reasonable
7 grounds) and resulted in UNNECESSARY
8 delay. The Court's order effectively
9 punished me for asserting my right
10 to self-representation and for
11 challenging procedural irregularities
12 conduct that constitutes judicial
13 retaliation and bias.

14 G) UNLAWFUL ARREST without Probable Cause
15
16
17
18 ()

19 Following prior judicial dismissals
20 for lack of probable cause, the Court
21 authorized or failed to prevent an
22 unlawful arrest without supporting
23 affidavits or judicial determination
24 as required under A.R.S. § 13-3911
25 and *Gerstein v. Pugh*, 420 U.S. 103
26

**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.**