State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 2026-031

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

June 5, 2026

The Complainant alleged a former municipal court judge made improper rulings, improperly disclosed information to a third party, and left the bench to take another role to cover up the misconduct.

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

Copies of this order were distributed to all
appropriate persons on June 5, 2026.

Comp

26-031

FORMAL COMPLAINT OF JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT: BREACH OF MINISTERIAL DUTY AND EXTRINSIC FRAUD

TO: Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct

RE: Judge , Municipal Court (Current 12th

CASE NO:

DATE OF DISCOVERY: (Discovery of Ministerial Breach through unmasking of Fraudulent Concealment)

I. JURISDICTION AND TIMELINESS: THE -YEAR STATUTORY WINDOW & THE DISCOVERY RULE

This complaint is filed within the -year window for judicial misconduct investigations in the State of Arizona. Furthermore, the Petitioner asserts **Equitable Tolling** based on the **Discovery Rule** and the doctrine of **Fraudulent Concealment**.

- **Distinction Between "Harm" and "Cause":** A cause of action does not accrue merely because a party knows they are being treated unfairly. It accrues when the Petitioner discovers the specific factual basis for the legal violation. Between and , the Petitioner suspected general "Due Process" violations, a broad principle subject to judicial discretion. For nearly years, I dedicated my life and resources to the pursuit of vindication, forced to navigate a complex legal landscape through trial and error as a *pro per* litigant. During this time, I remained unaware of the specific nature of the violation, not due to a lack of diligence, but because the foundational Ministerial Breach was obscured by the Court's own misrepresentations.

- It was not until , that a complete forensic review of the Digital Docket and Trial Transcript unmasked a Ministerial Breach, a specific, non-discretionary failure that was actively suppressed.

- **Tolling Due to Fraudulent Concealment:** The law does not allow a defendant to benefit from a statute of limitations if they used their position to hide the nature of their violation. By representing on the record that the Court ruling was "unrelated" or "not in evidence," the Court committed Extrinsic Fraud. This fraud specifically prevented the Petitioner from knowing that a Ministerial Duty had been triggered days prior by the Courts ruling; therefore, the clock for a "Ministerial Breach" could not legally start until that concealment was finally stripped away, and we were no longer homeless and fighting to survive. However, the level of systematic sabotage, local and interstate harassment/surveillance we have endured over the past years has been debilitating and relentless. Even to this day.

- **The "Pro Per" Standard:** Federal and State courts recognize that a pro per litigant's discovery of a claim is tolled when state actors use their superior knowledge of the system to hide the specific legal mechanism used to harm them. The Petitioner's "Notice of a Fact" (the existence of the paper) is not the same as "Notice of a Claim" (discovery of the Ministerial Tort).

- **Void Judgment Is Timeless:** Challenges to judgments that are void ab initio due to a jurisdictional bar are generally not constrained by statutes of limitations. A court acting without jurisdiction lacks the legal authority to issue a valid judgment.

II. THE VIOLATION: BREACH OF MINISTERIAL DUTY & JURISDICTIONAL BAR

The Municipal Court was in physical and digital possession of the Court Mandate ( ) for days prior to the trial of .

- **The Ministerial Trigger:** Under the Arizona Mandate Rule, once the Court reversed the judgment, the Municipal Court had a non-discretionary, mandatory duty to apply that reversal. This is a Mandatory Duty which leaves zero room for judicial discretion. A judge has no authority to decide if a Court mandate is "relevant."

- **Jurisdictional Breach (Collateral Estoppel):** The Court's ruling on the merits, that the Petitioner did not commit disorderly conduct, created a jurisdictional bar. The Municipal Court was collaterally estopped from re-litigating the issue. Proceeding as if the reversal didn't exist is a Jurisdictional Breach.

- **Documented Receipt (Actual Notice):** Internal Docket entries **(See Exhibit A all highlighted sections and commentary in red)** prove User IDs and processed the mandate on . This established actual notice within the court system.

III. EXTRINSIC FRAUD: CONCEALING THE NATURE OF THE DUTY

The Court committed Extrinsic Fraud (Fraud upon the Court) by misrepresenting the nature of the mandate to a pro per defendant to secure a conviction that was legally barred.

- **The Evidence Collision:** The Internal Record shows the reversal was processed by multiple staff members, yet the Courtroom Record shows the judge and prosecutor claiming the reversal was "not in evidence" or "off the record." You cannot have an "administrative oversight" that lasts for days while actively corresponding with the defendant; this is a deliberate act to keep a legal truth out of the proceedings, **See Exhibit A all highlighted sections and commentary in red**.

- **The Misrepresentation:** By labeling a mandatory jurisdictional mandate as "irrelevant," the Court hid the Ministerial Breach.

This misled the Petitioner into fighting a "Due Process" battle for nearly years while the actual injury, an Administrative Tort, was being suppressed. Not only that, I pleaded with court personally via motions to vacate seeking an end to the case as a matter of recourse. However, knowing the mandate was processed, the Court chose to sustain the fraud.

- **Denial of Counsel as the "Enabling Act":** The Court intentionally denied the Petitioner counsel to ensure the Fraudulent Concealment of the Court Mandate would go unchallenged. Without representation, the Petitioner was placed at a substantial disadvantage, unable to identify the complex jurisdictional doctrines being bypassed by a prosecutor and judge working in concert to conceal the true status of the case.
- **Institutional Layering and Judicial Succession:** Due to the systemic nature of this fraud, one may question the rotation and retirement of judicial officers, potentially serving to insulate the original Ministerial Breach from scrutiny.
    - **Judge** : Presided over the initial trial and suppressed the Mandate, subsequently transferring to the , the very office responsible for mandate transmission.
    - **Judge** : Assumed control of the case matters and sustained the "Administrative Anchor" until his retirement in .
    - **Judge** : The current Presiding Judge (as of) who now presides over a void judgment. The retirement or transfer of these individuals does not absolve the Office of the Court of its liability. This "Succession of Silence" appears designed to confuse, yet the digital audit trail (/) remains an immutable record of the institution's knowledge.
- **Urgency and Potential Spoliation:** The urgency of this investigation is heightened by the fact that Judge now serves as the ( ). In this role, he possesses the administrative authority to oversee the destruction of judicial records as they reach the -year statutory mark in . This placement creates a high risk of Spoliation of Evidence regarding the Ministerial Breach. Petitioner requests an immediate preservation order for all internal logs, metadata, and User ID activity (specifically and) related to Case No: and .

Documentation of Unauthorized Ex Parte Transmission and Administrative Collusion

The systemic nature of the **Extrinsic Fraud** and administrative interference is definitively documented by a specific event occurring between . While the Petitioner was at the hospital supporting his wife and newborn daughter, he contacted the Municipal Court to inquire about the status of a pending motion.

During this call, a clerk inadvertently revealed a severe ethical and jurisdictional breach: she informed the Petitioner that the judge had already ruled on the motion and the court transmitted the ruling directly to a private, third-party email address: . A simple google search will reveal who she is.

This transmission occurred **before** the Petitioner, the *pro per* defendant, was ever served or notified of the ruling, and on the same day the motion was decided. This represents a documented, unauthorized **Ex Parte** communication between the Arizona Judiciary and the Petitioner's private, adversarial former employer. When the Petitioner immediately questioned the Court supervisor, she admitted the transmission occurred but attempted to minimize the violation by stating the clerk was "new" and had provided the "wrong email."

However, this "error" unmasked a massive ethical violation: the mere presence of a **private corporate email address** for a Court official within the Court's internal notification system proves a pre-existing, coordinated connection designed to prioritize the interests of a private corporation over the constitutional rights of the Defendant. This coordination ensured the "Administrative Anchor" remained active to benefit the employer's position in separate federal litigation, while the Petitioner was physically and emotionally occupied with the birth of his child. This failure to serve the defendant while simultaneously informing his adversary constitutes gross judicial misconduct and a total abandonment of the Court's ministerial obligations.

IV. THE HUMAN TOLL: VIOLATION BY OMISSION

To disregard the profound impact of this violation on a family of is to ignore the fundamental purpose of the law itself. Accompanying this claim are indisputable exhibits and forensic documentation detailing the catastrophic consequences this wrongful conviction has imposed on my life, consequences that remain active and escalating today, consequences such has loss of renting a home, loss of employment opportunities and more. The Ministerial Breach of was not a mere clerical oversight; it was the primary catalyst for the systematic destruction of a household. Given the weight of the evidence provided, this administrative failure can no longer be overlooked. Beyond the threshold of gross judicial misconduct, the failure to address a documented jurisdictional bar at this level of proof constitutes a total abandonment of judicial integrity, **See Exhibit B all highlighted sections and commentary in red**.

- **Economic Displacement:** The "Administrative Anchor" created by this fraudulent record led to the loss of housing and blacklisting from essential employment.
- **Ongoing Irreparable Harm (The Continuing Tort):** Because the 'Administrative Anchor' remains active and the record has not been corrected, the resulting legal and economic displacement constitutes a continuing tort. This status has forced the family into an environment that has directly impacted the health and safety of the household. Including homelessness on several occasions. Specifically, the Petitioner's wife, , is currently experiencing a severe medical crisis, including a documented ( ) and critical ( ).

The Court's refusal to perform its ministerial duty is the proximate cause of the family's inability to secure safe, stable housing and employment, thereby sustaining this life-threatening biological strain. The residual impact of this conviction has acted as a barrier to professional stability. For nearly years, I have been relegated to transient roles; employers frequently hire me based on my character and personality, yet they maintain no long-term intention of transitioning me into a permanent position. This has prevented me from establishing the steady payroll and career security necessary to support my family. The details within this complaint are neither lies or a ruse to gain favor or attention. These are the undisputed facts.

V. CONCLUSION: THE INTEGRITY OF THE JUDICIARY

The Petitioner always knew the facts, but the Court hid the Law. The Judicial Board is designed to protect the "Integrity of the Judiciary." When a lower court is caught on record suppressing a Court mandate that was already in their digital file, the integrity of the entire Arizona court system is at stake. They cannot excuse this without admitting that Court orders are "optional" in . The retirement of Judge or Judge does not render this moot; a void judgment is a legal nullity that must be vacated to stop the ongoing physical harm. The Petitioner requests an immediate investigation into this systemic administrative fraud and the resulting irreparable physical harm to his family.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

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.