

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 2026-088

Judge:

Complainant:

ORDER

June 5, 2026

The Complainant alleged a municipal court judge, now retired, improperly handled an arraignment and imposed an unconstitutional fee.

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 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.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**2026-088****COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE**

Name:

Judge's Name: Honorable Judge

Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

On complainant (defendant) was arraigned by Judge at the Municipal Court. As this was complainant's first time being brought before a judge the general counsel present was one () whom discussed a plea offer made by the state with complainant despite having only reviewed the police report and state favorable materials and despite any facts or evidence favorable to complainant relevant to the charged criminal offenses. Complainant vehemently rejected this offer as he maintained his innocence as he has the entire time. was then ordered by the court to be appointed to represent complainant in this matter and met in person on at least 1 occasion at his office with complainant. Complainant had been being treated for significant mental health issues during this time and had recently started taking a prescribed medication by his psychiatrist approximately 2 weeks prior which his psychiatrist had also disclosed in complainant's psychiatric record in that the medication may have contributed to the volatility of the criminal incident in question. Soon thereafter complainant realized that Judge had issued an illegal order in violation of the Constitution of Arizona. Despite bringing this to attention, failed to promptly raise the issue to the court. This put complainant in jeopardy due to complainant not being afforded his Sixth Amendment right to effective counsel under the United States Constitution, while also having violated complainant's right to due process under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution, and finally complainant's constitutional rights under Arizona state law per Article II Section 24 & Rule 6.1 under the Rules of Criminal Procedure.

It is believed that this argument failed to be raised due to an underfunded indigent defense system which puts an incredible strain on the already limited court appointed attorneys considering the herding effect of indigent defendants being as that nearly 80% of criminal defendants in this country are considered by the court to be "indigent." The results are catastrophic in regard to the administration of justice and the upholding of our Constitutional Republic. Particularly for the indigent community which to say the least, is in this context "the majority" of criminal prosecutions.

In addition, complainant experienced continued prejudice not only from the state, the judges, prosecution but also his own attorneys due to their failure to advocate and act zealously in his defense. This despite complainant suffering from his own mental health issues while he zealously navigated through his own recognized mental health issues. Complainant believes he was not afforded to plead his preferred defense due to the cost which would have been borne on to the state. As it is quite apparent the indigent defense system is beyond significantly underfunded. As such complainant believes he was prejudiced from the outset of this criminal matter by Judge due to her judicial error which also constitutes a fundamental error for the reasons stated herein. At the arraignment Judge ordered the complainant to pay a \$25 indigent fee assessment to the court by in direct violation

CONFIDENTIAL

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

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE**

Name: Judge's Name: Honorable Judge

Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own words what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional pages may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.

of Article II Section 24 under the Arizona Constitution wherein it states in part, albeit at the end of Article II Section 24 "and in no instance shall any accused person before final judgment be compelled to advance money or fees to secure the rights herein guaranteed." It is believed that this is a systemic "policy wide issue" in order to ensure the continuity of an unfair judicial process which brings both contempt and ridicule to the judicial system and is exactly why Arizona Court Chief Justice ordered a study of the indigent defense system on in hopes of restoring faith in the judicial system. It is believed that this is happening to most of if not all indigent defendants under the guise of state statutory law. For instance, it is believed that in this particular case and more than likely other cases within the Municipal Court, & possibly under other state municipal courts, that this \$25 indigent fee assessment was and is ordered per A.R.S. §9-499.09. It is believed that it is also potentially occurring under A.R.S. §11-584 in state Courts. And while the issue isn't with the particular statutes themselves, it is with the way that they are being applied both preemptively and unconstitutionally prior to conviction in direct violation of the state of Arizona Constitution under Article II Section 24 which then leads to prejudicial misconduct by the judiciaries.

By Judge ordering the payment of this \$25 indigent fee assessment prior to conviction the court effectively prejudiced complainant from the outset of this case. The issue is not whether complainant could have paid the \$25 indigent fee assessment but rather that this set the tone with the court as that the complainant, defendant in this matter, was uncooperative by failing to pay the unconstitutional fee prior to conviction and thus was likely "guilty." Complainant believes that is why he was not afforded the right to plead his preferred defense which would have likely led to an acquittal. As complainant already stated, he was not afforded the financial resources to be able to defend against this matter as the cost would have been very high to the state. So in addition to the defendant and potentially other criminal indigent defendants being exploited for the \$25 indigent fee assessment prior to conviction, complainant was also not afforded the right to effective counsel for likely the same reasons being that the system is so underfunded that it becomes a "pay to play" kind of system which is inherently contrary to both our state and federal constitutions.

There is a separate complaint which complainant filed against Judge and that has been assigned Case No. by this same Commission on Judicial Conduct. Complainant will also be filing a supplemental report regarding other observed behaviors by Judge. Particularly when complainant advocated for his right to plead his preferred defense, albeit costly to the state, in a separate judiciary hearing. In addition, it was observed that Judge was potentially working on other work while complainant was giving his testimony on the stand at trial. Complainant personally witnessed Judge completing work on what appeared to be "other matters" and Judge did not give

complainant her fully undivided attention while giving his testimony which also constitutes a Sixth Amendment violation of trial by an impartial jury being as this was a bench trial.

Finally, a complainant was filed against for failing to raise the unconstitutional \$25 indigent fee assessment issue. Unfortunately, that complaint was dismissed after the apparently dismissed the complaint as meritless. This entire case from the onset screams egregious collusion between multiple state agencies which surmounts to what this complainant can only describe as fraud on the court, by the court, the state, court appointed attorneys, the prosecutors' office, the victims' services division which is also a division of the prosecutor's office, etc. All to support the continuity of the illegal unconstitutional scheme which complainant has discovered through an overly analytical analysis composed through purely logical interpretation.

Complainant was a data breach analyst for about 2 years. In that time complainant analyzed thousands of grueling data sets manually page by page. Complainant has no data science experience. His process is manual, tiresome, and all encompassing. As such this commission should find these allegations credible and should launch a full fledged investigation in to the allegations stated herein for the protection of the public, the State, and most importantly the integrity of the court consistent with Arizona Court Justice administrative order on .

Wherefore complainant prays for affirmative relief in that this commission exposes this unjust "pay to play" rigged judiciary system. Complainant can stomach his convictions. What he cannot however stomach is a corrupt judicial branch along with the underprivileged being underserved because of their misfortunes.

Unus pro omnibus, omnes pro uno

State of Arizona vs. 	Case Number 	Appointment of Counsel Order
--	---	------------------------------

ORDER

A petition for appointment of counsel having been filed,

☐ IT IS ORDERED that counsel not be appointed.

☒ IT IS ORDERED that the following counsel be appointed to represent the defendant who is indigent.

Assigned To Courtroom:

☒ IT IS FURTHER ORDERED appointment of counsel is for all proceedings in this case up to and including the filing of a Notice of Appeal.

☐ The Court finds that the Defendant does not have financial resources to offset the cost of legal services.

☐ The Court finds that the Defendant may be able to offset the cost of legal services. The Court will determine the amount of payment, if any, at the end of the proceedings.

☒ IT IS ORDERED that Defendant pay a \$25 Attorney Indigent Assessment Fee to the court by:

☐ The Court finds the Defendant has financial resources which may offset the cost of legal services.

IT IS ORDERED that the Defendant pay: to the Court by

The Court will review this order at the end of the proceedings to determine if additional payment will be required.

Date: Judicial Officer:

Defendant Address: _____

Phone / Cell #: _____

Email Address: _____

IMPORTANT:

Defendant is RESPONSIBLE to contact assigned Public Defender before the next court date if no contact information is provided to the court.