State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

	Disposition of Complaint 24-029
Judge:	
Complainant:	

ORDER

May 31, 2024

The Complainant alleged improper legal rulings by a municipal court judge.

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 May 31, 2024.

CONFIDENTIAL

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

COMPLAINT IN REFERENCE TO A "Magistrate"

This report provided **printed on only one side**; a copy maintained for my records. Exhibits are **attached** included as if verbatim with this testimony.

IN BRIEF (paragraphs below, numbered for convenience, are unique to this report):

- 1. Court date of claim of "civil infractions", i did not attend;
 - (a) i am no "member of the city", neither hold any "territorial office" by which such jurisdiction would apply.
 - (b) at the time, i had no education or information by which to express such fact
 - (c) induced to pursue such education and information, i began to study and learn
- 2. Early , notice on gate delivered by , from ", without any contract with such entity, denied authorization.
- court, present by special divine appearance in order to clear the matter; asked to leave court or removed by security for refusal to stand in deference to a public servant. I believe that "the living owe no deference to the incorporate, rather, the incorporate owe deference to the living." (see: Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43 (1906), and Monell v. Department of Soc. Svcs., 436 U.S. 658, 1978).
 - (a) followed by further fines and threats to invade and damage private property
- 4. A "decision" is reached without any "answer" to charges, what I believe to be a denial of my rights to an Article III court and trial by jury; whereby "government service contractors" prohibited to trespass the rights of the people, seeming constitutional violations:
 - (a) Amendment VII: "In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law." (also: Article III. Section 2)
 - (b) apparently, with such civil matter, trespassed in denial of my right to "trial by jury"
 - (c) and apparently, this is no Article III court, as appeal or "reexamination" is prohibited i. "...prescribed rules to appeal a decision..." see: "IN CHAMBERS" court order.
 - (d) Amendment V: no "decision" could be lawful without opportunity to "answer" and thereby "deprived of life, liberty, or property" or rights to property.
 - (e) Amendment IV: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation..." in question for which, where is the damaged party who can "stand" and "claim"?

[continued next page]

In addition, in order to verify the validity and "status" of such court moving against me without any apparent "claimant", attorney, nor prosecutor presenting any "motion", neither named by which such can be addressed in their public official nor private capacity:

- 5. [failure, point #11] That "validation... [and] verification of such court, an honorable requirement that public records be presented and delivered prior to any further action", failure to present such verification i cannot see as "honorable conduct".
- 6. [trespass] (a) required and supported, per: ARS 39-121, 39-121.01, 39-122
- 7. (e) [failure] required oath of office, court officers; not present; ref: 5 USC §3331, Article VI. Clause 3: "...judicial officers... bound by oath or affirmation..."
- 8. (f) [failure] "confirmation that the magistrate," ", has sworn an oath or affirmation to uphold the "Constitution for the United States of America"
- 9. (h) [established] without "a copy of any "superior oath" under which such officers proceed as with BAR Guild oaths in courts proceeding as "private BAR Guild business meetings", it is determined that none exists, neither shall any be honored; honor of the oath of public office is required.
- 10. (j) [failure] "That each court officer submit a confirmation of their full lawful name and valid mailing contact information, in such case that a tort claim need be filed, that such "persons" as men and women can be addressed in their private capacity."
 - (a) What public servant as "officer" is acting as prosecutor? I see no "person" to address.
- 11. No public information required in accordance with ARS 39-121, 39-121.01, 39-122 is present with the " court order response; a suspected violation of Arizona law, as well as less-than-honorable professional conduct.

Details and additional concerns for the "deficiencies and irregularities" as presented to
"as "Magistrate" are attached for consideration, intended present as if included verbatim, with the several communication as "divine appearance in writing" in order to resolve such matter.

CERTIFIED PROOF OF SERVICE

Certified true

I, hereby Certify that on this;

the day of

The Bound / Attached "Special Appearance Testimony (affidavit...)" was delivered as attested to by the attached USPS 3811 Return Receipt having been tracked and presented

the day of

for certified mail delivery to the United States Postal Service.



		for:	COURT	Crow
		Phone:		Certified .
ii.	* as	1	101	0
	'Plaintiff' vs.	Docket #	di lod	Sui Juris "of one's own right"
41	" and/or " " and/or "	C	itation#	
	19	1		
This motion i	is made for the follow Special Appearance	o: Dismiss all char ring reasons: no ki restimony, a "peac	ges for lack of jurisdiction nown valid contract to ac ful and intelligent" challer	l. ljudicate; see attached per
phone;				[office]
mail: c/o	, Arizona [PCE:	nwke m	Title: Respondent / Be UCC 1-308, All Right	eneficiary date:
[] No Object	tion			
[] Object			City Prosecutor Date	
[] Set motion	n for hearing before	[] any availabl	ORDER e judge [] asTime:	signed judge
[] Granted				
[]Reset	to:	at:	time [] trial []	
[] Modify se [] Extend tin [] Denied.		[] as requested [] present proo	[] to: f: [] as requested []	
NOTIFY ALI	L PARTIES.			
			Judge/Magistrate	Date
Original-file [Yellow-Affiant	[] Pink - Prose	cutorinitials & date	
CC Form #22	1 (example - similitud	de per Rev. 8/89)		

BLANK
< over or next >

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.