State of Arizona

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 24-002
Judge:	
Complainant:	

ORDER

May 24, 2024

The Complainant alleged a superior court judge had a conflict of interest in hearing his cases in 2011.

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 Barbara Brown and Delia R. Neal did not participate in the consideration of this matter.

Copies of this order were distributed to all appropriate persons on May 24, 2024.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

CONFIDENTIAL

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

2024-002

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Name:	Judge's Name:
words what you believe the judge did names, dates, times, and places that	paper of the same size to file a complaint. Describe in your own that constitutes judicial misconduct. Be specific and list all of the st will help the commission understand your concerns. Additional is (not originals) of relevant court documents. Please complete one side is complaint for your records.
bood Pause - Jurisdiction : On	Man presided over the dependency proceeding
11 11 11 11	Retitioners minar children. This dependency hearing gave Tudge
	endants criminal case which was also pending at that time. The who was the main witness and accuser in the criminal case. Before
-1. 1. 1. 6.17	a determination on custody and control of the petitioner's children he
1 / 11 1	nine the evidence from the defendants criminal case Rule 2.11 (1)(6)(1)
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	in any proceeding in which the judges impartiality might reasonably be
questioned, including when the judg	
There is an impermissible risk of act	
prosecutor in a critical decision recording	
judge over the matter in the dependency to authorize the removal of the Petition	
1 - 1 - 1	jurisdiction to preside over the defendants case/trial, sentencing or
his hule 31 proceeding. A commentary	to hule L.II states that : L.) A judges obligation not to hear at decide
	QUIRED applies regardless of whether a motion to disqualify is filed.
	used that he had providually been assigned as the yudicial office presidings are the same allegations as those endemic to the sindictarent. "Exhibit B"
	Rule upon this notice to disquality nimself from the defendants criminal
proceeding due to his involvement in the	dependency case Petitioner hereby challenges his trial proceedings.
conviction, sentencino, appeal, and PEB pr	occedings as invalid due to the appearance of improperiety and bias.
from Judge where he clearly	violated Rule 2.11 (A)(G)(d) Good Pause Appearance of impropriety and bias
Resulting in A Structural Error which I	requires Reversal, Delendant submitted amotion through councel for him to
withdraw because the detendant had prop	f that was not prepared for trial. The delendant decided to execute
his right to waive counsel and proceed	pro-se. The main reason for the motion was that was appointed fore trial, Exhibit 6 "he was not doing his job, and he was not
as Inial attorney "less than a month be	fore trial, Exhibit V he was not doing his job, and he was not
communicating or cooperating with the	defendant. And the allow no continuonce.
	Judef.

CONFIDENTIAL Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct 1501 W. Washington Street, Suite 229 Phoenix, Arizona 85007	FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
COMPLAINT AGAINST A JU	DGE
Name: Judge's Name	
Instructions: Use this form or plain paper of the same size to f words what you believe the judge did that constitutes judicial mis names, dates, times, and places that will help the commission under may be attached along with copies (not originals) of relevant court of the paper only, and keep a copy of the complaint for your records.	conduct. Be specific and list all of the erstand your concerns. Additional pages
by which criminal trials assess quilt. Denial of right to self reanalysis). There seems to be a sustained systemic defect in county during PCR proceedings the "Chief Prosecutor" in County left to be the defendant receives a letter from this chief prosecutor stating the defendants Rule 32 proceeding "Major Confliet." During trial the right to self representation. However, during PCR proceedings to because the chief prosecutor, now public defender filed an lander	cannot be prepared in less than days, continuance Like Attorney needed to review a interview all witnesses, hire an expert as no basis for the continuance. This is defined the defendant of his letter a defect that fundamental undermined to harmless error review and requires an envolve defects in fundamental fraimwork coresentation not subject to harmless error in the way defendants are appointed counsel. Some a public defender. A few weeks later she has been appointed to take over the defendant was defined his letter Amendment are defendant was defined his letter Amendment are defendant was forced to proceed pro-se eas brief forcing the defendant to fend
for him self during the PVR prosecutings. She was prosecuting me the	ion detended me and quickly sad no

or these i	reasons I have fil who presided	ed this con	mplair case	noted	now a	sking for Please	any pub	olic reports me with	involvii The regu	ng the h	onorable rmation, and
nail via	legal mailto:	1							<i>y</i>		
))	,		_						

1	Totombours							
2	Telephone: Facsimile:							
3	E-Mail:							
4	Attorney for Defendant							
5	IN THE COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA							
6	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF							
7) Case No. STATE OF ARIZONA,							
8	Plaintiff,) MOTION TO WITHDRAW AS							
9	vs.) COUNSEL (Expedited Ruling Requested)							
10	Defendant.							
11								
12	Defendant, , has directed undersigned counsel to withdraw his							
13	3 representation for the following reasons, which reasons were conveyed by Defendant to							
14	undersigned counsel on the evening of :							
15	Defendant alleges conflict of interest; Defendant has filed a previous bar complaint							
16	against the office of undersigned counsel and threatens continued additional complaint;							
17	 Defendant alleges lack of due diligence on the part of undersigned counsel in his representation; 							
18 19	3. Defendant refuses to communicate or cooperate with undersigned counsel toward effective assistance of counsel;							
20	4. Defendant demands that this Court allow him to represent himself;							
21	5. Defendant is fully aware that Trial is proceeding on as scheduled.							
22	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this day of							
23								
24	By:							
25	Attorney for Detendant							
26								
27								
28								

EXHIBIT "E"

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.