

Arizona Supreme Court
Civil Special Action

CV-26-0201-SA

WALLS-BEY v STATE OF ARIZONA

Appellate Case Information

Case Filed: 29-Jun-2026 Archive on: 9-Jul-2036 (planned)
Case Closed: 9-Jul-2026

Dept/Composition

Side 1. JOHNNY RAY WALLS-BEY, Petitioner

(Litigant Group) JOHNNY RAY WALLS-BEY

• Johnny Ray Walls-Bey

PRO SE

Side 2. STATE OF ARIZONA, Respondent

(Litigant Group) STATE OF ARIZONA

• State of Arizona

Attorneys for: Respondent

Philip D Garrow, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 22458)

CASE STATUS

Jul 9, 2026.....Case Closed

Jul 9, 2026.....Decision Rendered

PREDECESSOR CASE(S)	Cause/Charge/Class	Judgment/Sentence	Judge, Role <Comments>	Trial	Dispo
1 CA 1 CA-CR 25-0556 PRPC					
✈ MAR CR2020-001909-001			Rodney Mitchell, Judge on PC Comments: (none)		
1 CA 1 CA-CR 26-0242					
✈ MAR CR2022-001155-001			Adam D Driggs, Authoring Judge of Order Comments: (none)		
1 CA 1 CA-CR 26-0250 PRPC					
✈ MAR CR2020-001909-001			Comments: (none)		
✈ MAR CR2022-001155-001			Adam D Driggs, Judge on PC Comments: (none)		

CASE DECISION

09-Jul-2026 ORDER

* On December 24, 2025, in court of appeals case 1 CA-CR 25-0556 PRPC, Petitioner Johnny Ray Walls-Bey filed a petition for review, seeking review of the superior court's final order dismissing his petition for post-conviction relief in Maricopa County Su

Filed: 09-Jul-2026

Mandate:

Decision Disposition

Declined

William Montgomery

5 PROCEEDING ENTRIES

- 29-Jun-2026 FILED: Petition for Review (Treated as a Petition for Special Action); (Duplicate) Petition for Review (Treated as a Petition for Special Action); (Duplicate) Petition for Review (Treated as a Petition for Special Action); Order Denying Emergency Motion; Appendix A: May 6, 2026, Order of Judge Adam D. Driggs (Petitioner Walls-Bey, Pro Se)
- 29-Jun-2026 FILED: (Duplicate) Petition for Review (Treated as a Petition for Special Action); (Duplicate) Petition for Review (Treated as a Petition for Special Action); Appendix B: May 21, 2026, Order of Judge Pro Tempore McGimsey; Appendix D: May 28, 2026, Order of Judge Pro Tempore McGimsey (Petitioner Walls-Bey, Pro Se)
- 29-Jun-2026 FILED: (Duplicate) Petition for Review (Treated as a Petition for Special Action); (Duplicate) Petition for Review (Treated as a Petition for Special Action); Appendix F: June 11, 2026, Order of Judge Pro Tempore McGimsey; Appendix G: December 12, 2025, Order of Judge Mitchell (Petitioner Walls-Bey, Pro Se)
- 29-Jun-2026 FILED: (Duplicate) Petition for Review (Treated as a Petition for Special Action); Certificate of Service PETITION FOR REVIEW (Appeal from the Arizona Court of Appeals, Division One); Appendix H: Arizona Court of Appeals Docket Entries for Case No. 1 CA-CR 26-0250 PRPC; Appendix E: March 3, 2026, Order of Judge Pro Tempore McGimsey striking Petitioner's Notice of Supplemental Authority (Petitioner Walls-Bey, Pro Se)

Arizona Supreme Court

Civil Special Action

CV-26-0201-SA

WALLS-BEY v STATE OF ARIZONA

5 PROCEEDING ENTRIES

5. 9-Jul-2026 On December 24, 2025, in court of appeals case 1 CA-CR 25-0556 PRPC, Petitioner Johnny Ray Walls-Bey filed a petition for review, seeking review of the superior court's final order dismissing his petition for post-conviction relief in Maricopa County Superior Court case CR2020-001909-001, dated November 24, 2025. That petition for review remains pending before the court of appeals.
- On May 18, 2026, in case number 1 CA-CR 26-0242, Petitioner filed a notice of appeal seeking review of the superior court's order denying Petitioner's multiple claims for relief in CR2020-001909-001 and the companion case CR2022-001155-001. The superior court's May 6, 2026 order stated:
IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED denying and dismissing-pursuant to Rule 33.1(a) and (h), Rule 33.2(b), Rule 33.1 I(a), and Rule 24.2-Defendant's Motion to Vacate Judgment Pursuant to Rule 24.2(a)(2) and Successive Petition Rule 32. I(h) Petition (Okt. No. 317); Supplemental Motion to Vacate Judgment Pursuant to Rule 24.2(a)(2) and Rule 32.I(h) (Dkt. No. 319); Petitioner's Notice of State's Non-Opposition and Request for Summary Disposition (Confession of Error) (Dkt. No. 320); Notice of Bond Exoneration as Conclusive Confession of Error and Judicial Admission of No Violation (Dkt. No. 321); and Defendant's Hybrid A.R.S. § 12-75 I(A) Special Motion to Quash Retaliatory Probation Revocations, Demand for Mandatory Expedited Hearing, and Counterclaim for Civil Rights Violations (Dkt. No. 322).
- IT IS FURTHER ORDERED denying and dismissing Defendant's Combined Motion for Rehearing of April 8, 2026 Order, Motion to Vacate Judgment as Void Ab Initio, and Notice of A.R.S. § 12-751 Anti-SLAPP Applicability, filed April 11, 2026.
- IT IS FURTHER ORDERED denying all other requested relief.
Maricopa Cnty. Sup. Ct., CR2022-001155-001, Minute Entry dated 5/6/2026 (docketed 5/7/2026), at 7.
- On May 21, 2026, the court of appeals directed the clerk of the court to refile the notice of appeal as a petition for review, add Maricopa County Superior Court Case No. CR2020-001909-001 to the caption in the new case, transfer all records in 1 CA-CR 26-0242 to the new case (1 CA-CR 26-0250 PRPC), and administratively close case 1 CA-CR 26-0242.
- On May 28, 2026, in case 1 CA-CR 26-0242, the court of appeals denied Petitioner's Emergency Motion to Object to Administrative Conversion of Statutory Direct Appeal; Motion for Clarification; and Alternatively, Motion to Recuse Judge Pro Tempore Denise McGimsey.
- On June 29, 2026, Petitioner refiled his petition for review in the court of appeals in case number 1 CA-CR 26-0250 PRPC. That matter remains pending in the court of appeals.
- On June 29, 2026, Petitioner filed a pro per Petition for Review in this Court, seeking review of several interlocutory orders by the superior court and the court of appeals in the underlying matters. The Court will treat the Petition as a petition for special action because Petitioner's underlying petition for review cases in the court of appeals — 1 CA-CR 25-0556 PRPC and 1 CA-CR 26-0250 PRPC — remain pending before that court. Petitioner also makes claims in his Petition related to case 1 CA-CR 26-0242 that was administratively closed on May 21, 2026.
- Upon consideration,
- IT IS ORDERED the Petitioner's Petition for Review is accepted for filing as a petition for special action. Petitioner's Petition seeks review of multiple interlocutory orders across several pending matters in the superior court and court of appeals.
- On the Court's own motion,
- IT IS FURTHER ORDERED the matters addressed in Petitioner's Petition, as indicated in the above caption, are consolidated for the sole purpose of the Court's consideration of the Petition in this matter.
- Therefore,
- IT IS FURTHER ORDERED declining SA jurisdiction and dismissing this matter without prejudice to Petitioner seeking review of the court of appeals' final rulings in 1 CA-CR 25-0556 PRPC and 1 CA-CR 26-0250 PRPC as provided in Rule 33.16(l).
- In addition, courts have a "responsibility to see that [litigants] conform to an acceptable, minimal level of competency and performance" and "[w]e owe this responsibility to the judiciary, the bar and, more importantly, to [all] litigants and the people as a whole." Ramos v. Nichols, 252 Ariz. 519, 522 ¶ 8 (App. 2022) (quoting Evans v. Arthur, 139 Ariz. 362, 364-65 (1984)). In this regard, "Courts hold unrepresented litigants in Arizona to the same standards as attorneys and do not afford them special leniency." Id. The Court is also well-within its authority in ending frivolous proceedings. Acker v. CSO Chevira, 188 Ariz. 252, 256 (App. 1997).
- Based on the foregoing,
- IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Petitioner's continued failure to comply with the appropriate court rules, see ARCAP 4, 4.1, 6, and 12; RPSA 16, Ariz. R. Crim. P. 33.16, repetitious filings, and repeated requests and demands for emergency relief may warrant the designation of Petitioner as a vexatious litigant. Under A.R.S. § 12-3201(E)(1)(b), vexatious conduct includes unreasonably expanding or delaying court proceedings. Under § 12-3201(E)(1)(f), vexatious conduct includes a repeated filing of documents or requests for relief that have been the subject of previous rulings by the court in the same litigation. Under A.R.S. § 12-3201(B), a pro se litigant designated a vexatious litigant may not file a new pleading, motion, or other document without prior leave of the court. Arizona courts possess inherent authority to implement pre-filing restrictions that are narrowly tailored to the specific vice encountered. Madison v. Groseth, 230 Ariz. 8, 14 ¶¶ 17-18 (App. 2012); see also A.R.S. § 12-302(M); ARCAP 25; RPSA 11(h).
- IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that case number CV-26-0201-SA is closed and no further filings will be accepted in this matter. (Hon William G Montgomery)

Arizona Supreme Court
Civil Special Action

CV-26-0201-SA

WALLS-BEY v STATE OF ARIZONA

5 PROCEEDING ENTRIES