

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Ph.D., University of Cambridge, England
M.B.A., University of Michigan Business School
D.E.A., La Sorbonne, Paris

59 Crescent Street, Brooklyn, NY 11208
Dr.Richard.Cordero.Esq@gmail.com
tel. (718) 827-9521

April 11, 2009

Reporter Tisha Thompson
WTTG 5 (FOX) and WDCA my20
5151 Wisconsin Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20016

tel. (202)895-3133; www.myfoxdc.com
main (202)244-5151; newsroom (202)895-3000

Dear Ms. Thompson,

I would like to congratulate you on your report on Aging Judges and your impressive research work for the supplementary Aging Justice page.

Given your capacity to undertake a major project of investigative journalism, I would like to propose that you and Fox undertake the Watergate-like *Follow the money!* journalistic investigation into the bankruptcy fraud scheme described below.

(http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/Follow_money/7DrCordero-FoxTThompson11apr9.pdf)

The goal of the investigation is to expose bankruptcy judges all the way to the judiciary's top members participating in, or tolerating, a fraud scheme that preys on, and aggravates, the already profound misery of foreclosures and bankruptcies -1,042,993 bankruptcies were filed in FY08- brought about by the similar greed and irresponsibility of private and public officers that engaged in, or looked away from, financial fraud that resulted in our current economic crisis. Such exposure can cause widespread public outrage. It can be so intense as to pressure law enforcement authorities and Congress into opening their own investigations. Their own findings of more outrageous judicial conduct can cause politicians to adopt legislation to render judges accountable for their actions and amenable to discipline.

(Cf. http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/SCT_knows_of_dismissals.pdf)

The public and official reaction to the AIG bonuses illustrates the soundness of this strategy. It is the current version of the similar reaction elicited by the purported break-in by "burglars" into the National Democratic Headquarters at Watergate being exposed as political espionage organized by President Nixon and his White House aides.

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/Follow_money/why_j_violate_due_pro.pdf

I am willing to put at your disposal the vast amount of evidence that I have discovered during my prosecution of a cluster of related bankruptcy fraud cases for the last seven years as well as the leads that I have gathered so that you hit the ground running and conduct a pinpointed and cost-effective investigation.

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/Follow_money/How_fraud_scheme_works.pdf

For the investigative journalists that expose evidence of a bankruptcy fraud scheme as the most egregious and profitable form of institutionalized coordinated judicial wrongdoing there are rewards awaiting them: 15 minutes of fame; a Pulitzer Prize; a bestseller or movie hit like *All the President's Men*; the title of 'Our Generation's Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein'; and the most lasting and meritorious one of the recognition of a grateful nation for contributing to bringing our legal system closer to the inspirational ideal of "Equal Justice Under Law".

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely, 

Blank

Synopsis of an Investigative Journalism Proposal

Where the leads in evidence already gathered in *12 federal cases* would be pursued in a Watergate-like *Follow the money!* investigation to answer the question:

Has a Federal Judgeship Become a Safe Haven for Coordinated Wrongdoing?

with links to [references](#) at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/Follow_money/DrCordero-journalists.pdf

This is a poignant question, for it casts doubt on the integrity of the government branch that should incarnate respect for the law and high ethical values. What makes it a realistic question worth investigating is the fact that since the *Judicial Conduct Act* judges are charged with the duty to discipline themselves. Anybody with a complaint against a federal judge must *file* it with the chief circuit judge, whose decision may be reviewed by the circuit council. But according to the *official statistics*, judges systematically dismissed 99.86% of the *7,977* complaints terminated in the 1oct96-30sep07 11-year period with no investigation or private or public discipline. In the last 29 years only three judges –*currently 2,180* are subject to the Act- have been impeached and removed. This shows self-exemption from discipline and coordination to disregard a duty placed by law upon judges. Actually, in the 220 years since the creation of the federal judiciary in 1789, *only seven judges* have been impeached and removed...on average one every 31 years!

Money provides a motive for discipline self-exemption. Indeed, the chief justice of the Supreme Court and the associate justices are allotted as circuit justices to the several circuits. With their chief district and circuit judges they review *twice a year reports* showing that those judges systematically dismiss complaints against their peers. All of them know too that bankruptcy judges dispose of tens of billions of dollars annually and do so however they like: In FY08, *1,043,993 new bankruptcy cases* were filed while only 773 were appealed to the circuit courts. In turn, circuit judges dispose of *75% of appeals by summary orders*, where there is mostly only one operative word, “Affirmed”. Those orders have *no precedential value*, thus leaving judges free to decide future cases however they want. Such freedom for inconsistent and arbitrary decision-making is further ensured by circuit judges *not publishing 83.5% of opinions* and orders terminating cases on the merits. So no matter how bankruptcy judges dispose of money, their rulings are all but assured to stand or even to be reversed without any explanation.

Unaccountable power and lots of money!, the two most insidious corruptors in the hands of discipline self-exempted judges. Risklessness enables and encourages judges to engage in unlawful conduct for profit; coordination allows them to maximize the benefit. A most profitable form of coordinated judicial wrongdoing is a *bankruptcy fraud scheme*. The case described on page 2, *DeLano*, now before the *Supreme Court (08-8382)* provides evidence of such a scheme. Journalists can use it to conduct a pinpointed Watergate-like *Follow the money!* investigation reminiscent of that led once by Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward and likely to reach similar results: The exposure of coordinated or tolerated wrongdoing by judges all the way to the judiciary’s top.

If on average it took 31 years to hold accountable people like B. Madoff, who could dispose of tens of billions of dollars, including your money, and who in addition could exercise power over your property, liberty, and even life however they wanted with no more consequences than the reversal of their decisions, do you think that they would be tempted to treat you and everybody else with arrogant disregard? If all your complaints and everybody else’s ended up in the wastebasket, would you expect everybody to want to know of your efforts to force those people out of their safe haven so as to require them to treat everybody according to law or be liable to all of you? If so, you have a U.S. audience of 303 million persons waiting to know about your efforts to hold those Madoff-like judges accountable for their conduct. Hence, I invite you to read on and then contact me to discuss how I can facilitate the proposed *Follow the money!* investigation.

The Salient Facts of The *DeLano* Case

revealing the involvement of bankruptcy & legal system insiders in a bankruptcy fraud scheme

with links to [references](#) at Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/Follow_money/DrCordero_DeLano_summary.pdf

DeLano is a federal bankruptcy fraud case. As part of a cluster of cases, it reveals fraud conducted through coordinated wrongdoing that is so egregious as to betray overconfidence born of a [long standing practice](#): Fraud has been organized into a [bankruptcy fraud scheme](#).¹ This case was commenced by a bankruptcy petition filed with Schedules A-J and a Statement of Financial Affairs on January 27, 2004, by the DeLano couple. (04-20280, WBNY²) Mr. DeLano, however, was a most unlikely candidate for bankruptcy, for at the time of filing he was already a 39-year veteran of the banking and financing industry and was and continued to be employed by M&T Bank precisely as a bankruptcy officer. He and his wife, a methodical Xerox technician, declared:

1. that they had in cash and on account only \$535 (D:31), although they also declared that their monthly excess income was \$1,940 (D:45); and in the FA Statement (D:47) and their 1040 IRS forms (D:186) that they had earned \$291,470 in just the three years prior to their filing³;
2. that their only real property was their home (D:30), bought in 1975 (D:342) and appraised in November 2003 at \$98,500⁴, as to which their mortgage was still \$77,084 and their equity only \$21,416 (D:30)...after making mortgage payments for 30 years! and receiving during that period at least \$382,187...through a string of [eight mortgages](#)⁵! (D:341) Mind-boggling!
3. that they owed \$98,092 –spread thinly over 18 credit cards (D:38)- while they valued their household goods at only \$2,810 (D:31), less than 1% of their earnings in the previous three years! Even couples in urban ghettos end up with goods in their homes of greater value after having accumulated them over their working lives of more than 30 years.
4. Theirs is one of the trustee's [3,907 open](#) cases and their lawyer's [525](#) before the same judge.

These facts show that this was a scheming bankruptcy system insider offloading 78% of his and his wife's debts (D:59) in preparation for traveling light into a golden retirement. They felt confident that they could make such incongruous, implausible, and suspicious declarations in the petition and that neither the co-schemers would discharge their duty nor the creditors exercise their right to require that bankrupts prove their petition's good faith by providing supporting documents. Moreover, they had spread their debts thinly enough among their 20 institutional creditors (D:38) to ensure that the latter would find a write-off more cost-effective than litigation to challenge their petition. So they assumed that the sole individual creditor, who in addition lives hundreds of miles from the court, would not be able to afford to challenge their good faith either. But he did after analyzing their petition, filed under penalty of perjury, and showing that the DeLano 'Bankrupts' had committed bankruptcy fraud through concealment of assets.

The Creditor requested that the DeLanos [produce documents](#)⁶ as reasonably required from any bankrupt as their bank account statements. Yet the trustee, whose role is to protect the creditors, tried to prevent the Creditor from even meeting with the DeLanos. After the latter denied [every single document](#) requested by the Creditor, he moved for production orders. Despite his discovery rights and their duty to determine whether bankrupts have concealed assets, the [bankruptcy](#), the [district](#), and the [circuit judges](#) also denied him [every single document](#) and, thus due process. Then [they](#) eliminated him by disallowing his claim in a [sham evidentiary hearing](#). Revealing how incriminating these documents are, to oppose their production the DeLanos, with the trustee's recommendation and the bankruptcy judge's approval, were allowed to pay their lawyers \$27,953 in legal fees⁷...although they had declared only \$535 in cash and on account! To date \$673,657⁸ is still unaccounted for. [Where did it go](#)⁹ and for whose benefit? How many of the trustee's 3,907 cases have unaccounted for assets? Will the [Supreme Court](#) cover it [up](#)?¹⁰ Do DoJ and the FBI dare investigate [de facto unimpeachable judges](#) or their own officers so deferential to them?

¹§III infra ²§V. ³§VII ⁴§X ⁵§§I.B and VIII ⁶Cf. §XII ⁷§XI ⁸§I.B ⁹§II ¹⁰§IV

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Ph.D., University of Cambridge, England
 M.B.A., University of Michigan Business School
 D.E.A., La Sorbonne, Paris

59 Crescent Street, Brooklyn, NY 11208
Dr.Richard.Cordero.Esq@gmail.com
 tel. (718) 827-9521

<http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org>

Summary of the DeLanos' income of \$291,470 + mortgage receipts of \$382,187 = \$673,657 and credit card borrowing of \$98,092

**unaccounted for and inconsistent with their declaration in Schedule B
 of their voluntary bankruptcy petition (D:23)¹ that at the time of its filing
 on January 27, 2004, they had in hand and on account only \$535!**

Exhibit page #	Mortgages² referred to in the incomplete documents produced by the DeLanos^a to Chapter 13 Trustee George Reiber (cf.Add:966§B)	Mortgages or loans	
		year	amount
D ^b :342	1) from Columbia Banking, S&L Association	16jul75	\$26,000
D:343	2) another from Columbia Banking, S&L Asso.	30nov77	7,467
D:346	3) still another from Columbia Banking, S&L Asso.	29mar88	59,000
D:176/9	4) owed to Manufacturers & Traders Trust=M&T Bank	March 88	59,000
D:176/10	5) took an overdraft from ONONDAGA Bank	March 88	59,000
D:348	6) another mortgage from Central Trust Company	13sep90	29,800
D:349	7) even another one from M&T Bank	13dec93	46,920
D:350-54	8) yet another from Lyndon Guaranty Bank of NY	23dec99	95,000
	9) any other not yet disclosed?	Subtotal	\$382,187
The DeLanos' earnings in just the three years preceding their voluntary bankruptcy petition (04-20280, WBNY; D:23)			
2001	1040 IRS form (D:186)	\$91,229	\$91,229
2002	1040 IRS form (D:187) Statement of Financial Affairs (D:47)	\$91,859	91,655
2003	1040 IRS form (D:188) Statement of Financial Affairs (D:47)	+97,648	+108,586
to this must be added the receipts contained in the \$98,092 owed on 18 credit cards, as declared in Schedule F (D:38) ^c		\$280,736 ^d	\$291,470 ^d
		TOTAL	\$673,657

^a The DeLanos claimed in their petition, filed just three years before traveling light of debt to their golden retirement, that their home was their only real property, appraised at \$98,500 on 23nov3, as to which their mortgage was still \$77,084 and their equity only \$21,416 (D:30/Sch.A) ...after paying it for 30 years! and having received \$382,187 during that period through eight mortgages! *Mind-boggling!* They sold it for \$135K³ on 23apr7, a 37% gain in merely 3½ years.

^b D=Designated items in the record of [Cordero v. DeLano, 05-6190L, WDNY](#), of April 18, 2005.

^c The DeLanos declared that their credit card debt on 18 cards totals \$98,092 (D:38/Sch.F), while they set the value of their household goods at only \$2,810! (D:31/Sch.B) *Implausible!* Couples in the Third World end up with household possessions of greater value after having accumulated them in their homes over their working lives of more than 30 years.

^d Why do these numbers not match?

¹http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/Follow_money/DeLano_docs.pdf>§V. ²Id.>§§VI-VIII. ³Id.>§X.

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Ph.D., University of Cambridge, England
M.B.A., University of Michigan Business School
D.E.A., La Sorbonne, Paris

59 Crescent Street, Brooklyn, NY 11208
Dr.Richard.Cordero.Esq@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org
tel. (718) 827-9521

***Follow the Money!* from a Subpoena for the Financial Statements of the Weak Link, the DeLanos, to the Top of the Bankruptcy Fraud Scheme**

The weak link is the DeLanos, for if they were shown to have concealed assets, they would face up to 20 years imprisonment and up to \$500,000 in fines each. (18 U.S.C. §§152-157, 1519, and 3571) In that event, Mr. DeLano could use the wealth of inside knowledge of wrongdoing that he gained during the more than 42 years that he spent as a banker as his chip in plea bargaining for leniency. He could trade up to “bigger fish”, such as Bankruptcy John C. Ninfo, II, WBNY, the trustees, and other bankruptcy system insiders, anyone of whom could incriminate him. In turn, the Judge could trade up to “fat cats” in the federal judiciary who have either participated in running, or sharing in the benefits of, the bankruptcy fraud scheme or have knowingly looked the other way for years.

The *Follow the money!* investigation can also search the public registries, such as county clerk’s offices. (<http://www.naco.org>; for Rochester, NY, go to <http://www.monroecounty.gov/>; see also §§VI-VIII, X infra) Then it can cover private and official trustees and other bankruptcy system insiders. The following leads can pinpoint and expedite a cost-effective investigation:

David Gene DeLano, SS # 077-32-3894
DoB: September 1, 1941
Last employer: M&T Bank –Manufacturers & Traders Trust Bank-
255 East Avenue, Rochester, NY 14604
Previous employers: Central Trust, Rochester, NY;
First National Bank, Rochester, NY; employed as Vice President
Voter Identification Number: 13374201

Mary Ann DeLano, SS # 091-36-0517
DoB: September 21, 1944
Last employer: Xerox, Rochester, NY; employed as a product specialist
Last known address: 1262 Shoecraft Road, Webster, NY 14580; tel. (585) 671-8833
Previous address: 35 State Street, Rochester, NY 14814-8954

Their children and their education: **Jennifer DeLano,** born circa 1969
Mercy High School, 1988
Associate Business degree from Monroe Community College, NY

Michael David DeLano, born circa 1971
Aquinas High School, 1989
Associate Business degree from Monroe Community College, NY

Initial judges: Their investigation can begin by matching up **a)** the assets that they declared in their mandatory annual financial disclosure reports publicly filed with the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts (<http://www.uscourts.gov/>) under the Ethics in Government Act (**5 USC App. 4)** and **b)** assets –homes, cars, boats- registered in their names or their relatives’ or strawmen’s; then on to finding from drivers, barmen, maids, etc. about their conduct at judicial junkets; etc.

1. U.S. Bankruptcy Judge John C. Ninfo, II, WBNY; Rochester, NY; <http://www.nywb.uscourts.gov/>
2. U.S. District Judge David G. Larimer, WDNY; Rochester, NY; <http://www.nywd.uscourts.gov/>
3. Former CA2 Chief Judge John M. Walker, Jr.; NYC; <http://www.ca2.uscourts.gov/>
4. Current CA2 Chief Judge Dennis Jacobs
5. CA2 Judge Peter W. Hall; NYC

Table S-22 [previously S-23 & S-24]. Report of Complaints Filed and Action Taken Under 28 U.S.C. §351 for the 12-Month Period Ended Sep. 30 1997-2007. <http://www.uscourts.gov/judbususc/judbus.html>; collected at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/judicial_complaints/complaint_tables.pdf

Complaints filed in the 13 Circuits and 2 National Courts	'96-97	'97-98	'98-99	'99-00	'00-01	'01-02	'02-03	'03-04	'04-05	'05-06	'06-07	'96-07	Avr.
Complaints Pending on each September 30 of 1996-2007*	109	214	228	181	150	262	141	249	212	210	241	2197	199.7
Complaints Filed	679	1,051	781	696	766	657	835	712	642	643	841	8303	754.8
Complaint Type												0	0.0
Written by Complainant	678	1,049	781	695	766	656	835	712	642	555	841	8210	746.4
On Order of Chief Judges	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	88	0	93	8.5
Officials Complained About**													
Judges													
Circuit	461	443	174	191	273	353	204	240	177	141	226	2883	262.1
District	497	758	598	522	563	548	719	539	456	505	792	6497	590.6
National Courts	0	1	1	1	3	5	1	0	0	3	4	19	1.7
Bankruptcy Judges	31	28	30	26	34	57	38	28	31	33	46	382	34.7
Magistrate Judges	138	215	229	135	143	152	257	149	135	159	197	1909	173.5
Nature of Allegations**													
Mental Disability	11	92	69	26	29	33	26	34	22	30	20	392	35.6
Physical Disability	4	7	6	12	1	6	7	6	9	3	1	62	5.6
Demeanor	11	19	34	13	31	17	21	34	20	35	22	257	23.4
Abuse of Judicial Power	179	511	254	272	200	327	239	251	206	234	261	2934	266.7
Prejudice/Bias	193	647	360	257	266	314	263	334	275	295	298	3502	318.4
Conflict of Interest	12	141	29	48	38	46	33	67	49	43	46	552	50.2
Bribery/Corruption	28	166	104	83	61	63	87	93	51	40	67	843	76.6
Undue Decisional Delay	44	50	80	75	60	75	81	70	65	53	81	734	66.7
Incompetence/Neglect	30	99	108	61	50	45	47	106	52	37	59	694	63.1
Other	161	193	288	188	186	129	131	224	260	200	301	2261	205.5
Complaints Concluded	482	1,002	826	715	668	780	682	784	667	619	752	7977	725.2
Action By Chief Judges													
Complaint Dismissed													
Not in Conformity With Statute	29	43	27	29	13	27	39	27	21	25	18	298	27.1
Directly Related to Decision or Procedural Ruling	215	532	300	264	235	249	230	295	319	283	318	3240	294.5
Frivolous	19	159	66	50	103	110	77	112	41	63	56	856	77.8
Appropriate Action Already Taken	2	2	1	6	4	3	3	3	5	5	3	37	3.4
Action No Longer Necessary Because of Intervening Events	0	1	10	7	5	6	8	9	8	6	6	66	6.0
Complaint Withdrawn	5	5	2	3	3	8	8	3	6	9	3	55	5.0
Subtotal	270	742	406	359	363	403	365	449	400	391	404	4552	413.8
Action by Judicial Councils													
Directed Chief Dis. Judge to Take Action (Magistrate Judges only)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0.1
Certified Disability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Requested Voluntary Retirement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Ordered Temporary Suspension of Case Assignments	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.1
Privately Censured	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.1
Publicly Censured	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	0.5
Ordered Other Appropriate Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	0.3
Dismissed the Complaint	212	258	416	354	303	375	316	335	267	227	344	3407	309.7
Withdrawn	n/a	n/a	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	0.6
Referred Complaint to Judicial Conference	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Subtotal	212	260	420	356	305	377	317	335	267	228	348	3425	311.4
Special Investigating Committees Appointed	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	7	5	12	1.1
Complaints Pending on each September 30 of 1997-07	306	263	183	162	248	139	294	177	187	234	330	2523	229.4

*Revised. **Each complaint may involve multiple allegations against numerous judicial officers. Nature of allegations is counted when a complaint is concluded.

Official AO statistics: The judges in the 13 circuits and 2 national courts systematically dismiss 99.86% of complaints against them

Table S-22 [previously S-23 & S-24]. Report of Complaints Filed and Action Taken Under 28 U.S.C. §351 for the 12-Month Period Ended Sep. 30, 1997-07. <http://www.uscourts.gov/judbususc/judbus.html>; collected at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/judicial_complaints/complaint_tables.pdf

Data collected by Jud. Council 2nd Cir. for AO; 28 U.S.C. §332(g)	'96-97	'97-98	'98-99	'99-00	'00-01	'01-02	'02-03	'03-04	'04-05	'05-06	'06-07	'96-07	Avg.
Complaints Pending on each September 30 of 1996-2006*	5	10	23	65	33	60	29	34	57	31	28	375	34.1
Complaints Filed	40	73	99	59	102	62	69	23	36	14	22	599	54.5
Complaint Type													
Written by Complainant	40	73	99	59	102	62	69	23	36	0	22	585	53.2
On Order of Chief Judges	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	14	1.3
Officials Complained About**													
Judges													
Circuit	3	14	23	9	31	10	8	4	7	0	6	115	10.5
District	27	56	63	41	52	41	49	15	23	10	12	389	35.4
National Courts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Bankruptcy Judges	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	12	1.1
Magistrate Judges	8	8	11	7	17	10	11	3	6	4	4	89	8.1
Nature of Allegations**													
Mental Disability	1	9	26	2	5	4	6	3	3	1	1	61	5.5
Physical Disability	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	7	0.6
Demeanor	2	2	2	3	14	3	4	6	0	0	0	36	3.3
Abuse of Judicial Power	25	30	7	29	28	57	20	6	3	0	1	206	18.7
Prejudice/Bias	32	36	34	28	24	40	20	35	43	28	30	350	31.8
Conflict of Interest	0	0	5	11	10	18	3	4	5	1	1	58	5.3
Bribery/Corruption	0	0	10	21	2	15	4	5	2	2	1	62	5.6
Undue Decisional Delay	0	4	0	11	6	15	9	5	8	2	3	63	5.7
Incompetence/Neglect	4	1	3	1	5	2	3	3	4	0	3	29	2.6
Other	0	11	3	5	0	0	4	33	80	38	47	221	20.1
Complaints Concluded	33	56	57	80	75	93	42	51	91	45	50	673	61.2
Action By Chief Judges													
Complaint Dismissed													
Not in Conformity With Statute	3	4	0	0	4	1	1	6	5	8	1	33	3.0
Directly Related to Decision or Procedural Ruling	12	19	19	29	17	23	14	18	46	15	10	222	20.2
Frivolous	0	1	19	0	13	9	7	3	1	3	2	58	5.3
Appropriate Action Already Taken	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0.2
Action No Longer Necessary Because of Intervening Events	0	0	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	0.6
Complaint Withdrawn	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	5	0.5
Subtotal	15	24	41	30	34	37	22	29	54	28	13	327	29.7
Action by Judicial Councils													
Directed Chief District Judge to Take Action (Magistrate Judges only)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Certified Disability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Requested Voluntary Retirement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Ordered Temporary Suspension of Case Assignments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Privately Censured	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Publicly Censured	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Ordered Other Appropriate Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Dismissed the Complaint	18	32	16	50	40	56	20	22	37	17	37	345	31.4
Withdrawn	n/a	n/a	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.1
Referred Complaint to Judicial Conference	0	0	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a	0	0	0.0
Subtotal	18	32	16	50	41	56	20	22	37	17	37	346	31.5
Special Investigating Committees Appointed	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	1	2	0.2
Complaints Pending on each September 30 of 1997-2007	12	27	65	44	60	29	56	6	2	0	0	301	27.4

*Revised. **Each complaint may involve multiple allegations against numerous judicial officers. Nature of allegations is counted when a complaint is concluded.

Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts' statistics revealing 2nd Cir judges' systematic dismissal of complaints against them & 0 judge disciplined