

State of Arizona
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition of Complaint 08-180

Complainant: No. 1339710689A

Judge: No. 1339710689B

ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The rulings alluded to by the complainant were made in a timely fashion.

The complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: August 27, 2008.

FOR THE COMMISSION

\s\ Keith Stott
Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on August 27, 2008.

This order may not be used as a basis for disqualification of a judge.

CJC -08-180

COMPLAINT AGAINST A JUDGE

Date: 7/18/08

Instructions: Describe in your own words what the judge did that you believe constitutes misconduct. Please provide all of the important names, dates, times and places related to your complaint. You can use this form or plain paper of the same size to explain your complaint, and you may attach additional pages. Do not write on the back of any page. You may attach copies of any documents you believe will help us understand your complaint.

Judge does not uphold or abide by ARIZONA Revised Statutes, nor
does Judge uphold her oath of office under ARS Article VI § 26,
has not, under Article VI § 21 Superior Court; Speedy decisions
ruled on my motions within the sixty time frame set by The Supreme
court as in: (1) motion to quash search warrant was submitted on
57 days over the 60 DAY limit, on electronically filed
and back dated to minute entry. Judge committed
perjury under ARS § 13-2702 A false sworn statement in regard to a
material issues believing it to be false/AND Forgery under ARS § 13-
2002 (A)(3) offers or presents whether accepted or not a forged
instrument or one that contains false information A class 4 felony;
denied the motion to quash search warrant citing the states
position as state opposes defendants motion on basis that there was noth-
ing improper in the issuance of search warrant. STATE never responded
to motion to quash, and neither was it argued on as
contends in back dated minute entry, as Rule 16.1(c) EFFECT of Failure
to make motions in timely manner ~ any motion, defense, objection or
request not timely raised under Rule 16.1(b) shall be precluded.
(2) Motion to suppress all evidence due to perjured Affidavit (State v. Spears)
was submitted on and has not been ruled on. (3) Two motions
submitted on to correct
minute entry were denied and again perjury/forgery as
in back dated minute entry states they were argued on
(4) motion to Reconsider submitted was
also denied as argued on again perjury and forgery
continued

CJC -08-180

IS THIS the truth, Honesty and INTEGRITY that the courts typically uphold?

IN probation Matter

Judge

does not ABIDE by THE statutes as ARS
Court Rule 27.8(b) violation Hearing to determine
whether a probationer has violated a written condition
or regulation of probation shall be held before the
court no less than 7 and no more than 20 days
after the revocation arraignment. The last day
was