

October 15, 2018

Exposing government interception of communications of critics of judges as an abuse of power that would cause a national scandal and launch a generalized media investigation into judges' unaccountability and consequent riskless abuse[‡]

A. Statistics as the source of probable cause to believe that there is interception

1. There is reason to believe that the communications among critics of judges, including Advocates of Honest Judiciaries, and between them and third parties are intercepted, which is prohibited as provided for in the Criminal Code under 18 U.S. §2511(*>OL:5a¹³). This is demonstrated through the statistical analysis(*>OL:19² >‡>ws:58 §7) of communications(*>ggl:1; †>OL2:476, 425, 405§§A-C) in this study, **Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Wrongdoing: Pioneering the news and publishing field of judicial unaccountability reporting** * †.
2. Statistically, people line up in a standard normal distribution, which is a continuum that goes from one extreme of low values to the opposite extreme of high values of the variable in question. This continuum, when graphically plotted on an X,Y system of coordinates produces a **bell curve**. Most people bunch up on either side of the top –the crown- of the bell. Hence, it is abnormal and a sign of manipulation to see the values for everybody on only one of the two extremes.
3. Although I email to tens of thousands of email accounts directly and through hundreds of yahoogroups, hardly ever do I receive an email that is positive and encouraging. Nevertheless, my website(*><http...org>) has 24,700 subscribers and counting; it is built on the most widely used platform in the world, WordPress. When was the last time that you liked what you read on a site so much that you subscribed to it, although you and the rest of us suffer under information overload? It is counterintuitive for people to subscribe but leave no comment. It is decidedly suspect for the number of subscribers, which had reached an average of 90 a day, with peaks of over 110, to drop to 0 in the space of a week and then pick up to only around 3 a day(OL2:604¶2).
4. To some emails I receive no reply at all. Practically every reply that I do receive is negative and critical of them. That is counterintuitive in a country as divided as ours, where at one end of the spectrum of everything there are people strongly in favor of it and at the other end people strongly against it. Cf. A rubric of one of the national TV networks, either CBS or NBC, is precisely “A Nation Divided”. Although I have communicated with some Advocates of Honest Judiciaries for years, I do not receive emails from them anymore. People email me, I reply to them with an encouraging message, but then I do not receive any more emails from them.
5. More than 2,000 Mothers in the Legal Profession and more than 2,400 law professors took out each an ad in *The New York Times* regarding J. Kavanaugh. I addressed them in the Subject: line of emails that I sent to tens of thousands. Although I am a lawyer, and a doctor of law at that, I have not received a single reply from any of them. This is suspect because we have harmonious interests(*>dcc:8¶11; Lsch:14§§2-3). Those protected under the 1st Amendment(*>jur:23^{12b}), are “freedom of speech, of the press; the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances”. Requests that I make for membership in yahoogroups are approved only for my next posting to them to be rejected because I am told I am not a member.

1. Recent cases showing government interception of communications

6. The National Security Agency (NSA) conducted a warrantless, indiscriminate, ‘dragnet’ collection of the metadata, e.g., phone numbers, callers and callees’ names, call duration, of the communications of millions of people(OL2:395§B), revealed by the documents leaked by Edward Snowden.

* http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf >all prefixes:# up to OL:393 OL2:781

‡ http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_intercepting_emails_mail.pdf

7. Former CBS Reporter Sharyl Attkisson has sued the U.S. Department of Justice for \$35 million for hacking her personal and work computers to spy on the status of her investigative reporting on the attacks by extremists on the American embassy in Benghazi, Libya, that killed the American ambassador and three of his aides; and the fiasco Fast and Furious gunrunning operation of its Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, which sold even assault rifles to track their way to Mexican druglords(OL:346¶131) and resulted in one such rifle being used to kill an American border patrol. Her articles were so incriminating that A.G. Eric Holder would respond to congressional demands for documents with entire pages blacked out. He was the first sitting member of the presidential cabinet to be held by Congress in contempt of it. Accordingly, he was forced to resign.
8. These cases show that the government, of which the judiciary is part, engages in illegal digital activity against those whom it perceives as a threat, such as a persistent investigative reporter, and even those who are suspected of nothing at all, such as those caught in NSA's surveillance dragnet.
9. It is the judges of the secret court set up under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) that approve up to 100% of the NSA's secret request for secret orders of secret surveillance. Do they do so for the quid pro quo of the interception by the NSA of the communications of critics of judges? That is what the proposed *Follow it wirelessly!* investigation must determine(OL2:600§B).

B. Money and a scandal that focuses the media on judges' abuse of power

10. Potentially, there is money to be made by suing the government for breach of constitutional rights and the right to privacy. More realistically, exposing to the national public that judges have abused their power to intercept their critics' communications and prevent their 'assembling to petition for redress of judges' abuse' would constitute a scandal far greater than that provoked by Snowden's leak. It would shock America's conscience and put you and your organization on the frontpage of every publication and at the top of every newscast, and on the list of Pulitzer Prize candidates.

C. What you can do to expose government interception of communications

11. I respectfully propose that you participate in exposing the interception of the communications of critics of judges by those who have the greatest interest therein: judges themselves. You can:
 - a. widely share and post my articles with your address as the reply address to see what kind and number of replies you receive, which you can forward to me under an unrelated Subject: line;
 - b. help finance IT experts' examination of critics' email accounts and computers, and servers;
 - c. help organize presentations(OL:194§G) by me at law, journalism, IT, and business schools, pro se groups, and venture capitalists who may be interested in my business plan(OL2:563).
12. Consider this proposal in light of these principles of strategic thinking(OL2:445§B, 475§D) and dynamic analysis of harmonious and conflicting interests(OL2:570§E, 475§D, 465§1):
 - a. The enemy of my enemy is my friend (we share the interest of defeating our common enemy).
 - b. The friend of the friend of my friend may want to become my friend (which speaks to the indirectness of connections and a means of building alliances of result even if not of interests).
 - c. People never work as hard as when they work for themselves. (Ask yourself: What interest of her own can the person that I want to persuade to do something advance by joining forces with me? Cf. Some such interests are to make herself and her group or organization known.)
13. Time is of the essence to insert the issue of unaccountable judges' abuse in the mid-term elections.

Dare trigger history!(>jur:7§5)...and you may enter it.*

April 20, 2019

Evidence of judges' interception of the communications of their critics and non-critics

The email addresses of the apparent senders of intercepted emails can be used as leads in an official or journalistic investigation; and intercepted senders can assert causes of action as parties injured in fact by deprivation of their First Amendment rights.

1. Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq., conducts professional law research and writing on judges and their judiciaries. As a result, he has produced a two-volume study*[†] thereon and its title describes what his strategic thinking aims to achieve: **Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Risk-less Wrongdoing: Pioneering the news and publishing field of judicial unaccountability reporting*[†]**. Dr. Cordero has more than 15,000 email addresses on his emailing list and posts to scores of yahoo-groups. His articles reach people of all walks of life. Currently, his website at <http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org> has more than 25,370 subscribers and many more visitors.

2. On March 25, 2017, and for the next few days, Dr. Cordero mass emailed an article([†]>OL2:546) under this subject line –hereinafter referred to as the Gorsuch email–:

How Judge Neil Gorsuch and his peers dismiss 99.83% of complaints against them and dispose of 93% of appeals with reasonless decisions; the need for *We the People* to demand that Congress hold public hearings on our experience at the mercy of unaccountably independent Judges Above the Law

3. On November 9, 2018, Dr. Cordero used the official statistics of the courts annually submitted to Congress under 28 U.S.C §604(h)(2)(*>jur:26^{23a}) to file a complaint in the District of Columbia Circuit (DCC)(^{supra}↑ 792). He charged Chief Judge Merrick Garland, Judge Brett Kavanaugh while serving as such there, and their peers and colleagues with having dismissed 100% of the 478 complaints against them and denied 100% of the petitions for review of those dismissals in the October 1, 2006-September 30, 2017, 11-year period during which Judge Kavanaugh served there.

4. By letter of March 26, 2019, DCC Circuit Executive Elizabeth Paret notified Dr. Cordero that his complaint, no. DC-18-90089, had been transferred to Chief Justice John Roberts, Jr., who in turn had transferred it to Chief Judge Ed Carnes of the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals for disposition by its Judicial Council(↑ 795a-k). Pursuant to standard practice, neither DCC nor C.J. Roberts made Dr. Cordero's name or complaint public; and the DCC March 26 letter to Dr. Cordero was not published. There was no way for the public to link these official letters to him or his complaint.

5. Yet, on March 30, 2019, on the day when the March 26 letter could have been expected to reach Dr. Cordero, and for a total of seven days until April 5, 71 emails were received in two of his accounts managed by two different Internet Service Providers with notices that the Gorsuch email sent two years earlier on March 25, 2017, had been “Not read”; no “Read” notice was received.

6. People neither deleting nor opening an email, yet saving it for two years in their email mailbox only to delete it during a period of seven days, either automatically or manually sending a “Not read” notice, is ‘beyond a reasonable doubt’ impossible. This conclusion becomes a statement of fact upon realizing that the apparent senders of the 71 notices were not people of all walks of life. Rather, they are all members of the media, but for one law professor who appears in the media routinely as a news commentator, one district attorney, and one attorney at a top national law firm:

- a. (See their names ↓885.)
dersh@law.harvard.edu, Ashton.Day@KSHB.com, Brittany.Green@WXYZ.COM,
FBohorquez@bakerlaw.com, devona.moore@kshb.com, Eric.Weiss@wptv.com,
GONZALEE@BrooklynDA.org, Jason.Davis@wptv.com,

* http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf >all prefixes:# up to OL:393 OL2:885

Jasmin.Pettaway@WEWS.COM, JDucey@abc15.com, Jennifer.Tintner@wptv.com,
joe.kernen@nbcuni.com, jon.rehagen@kshb.com, jsmoore@jsmooresq.com,
JSparksJr@wptv.com, Justin.Madden@WEWS.COM, Kathleen.Boutwell@KSHB.com,
lauren.beiler@kshb.com, Lindsay.Shively@kshb.com, Lisa.Benson@kshb.com,
Megan.Strickland@KSHB.com, nicole.phillips@kshb.com, NTotenberg@npr.org,
richard.sharp@kshb.com, Richards@wews.com, samah.assad@wews.com,
Sarah.Plake@KSHB.com, stephanie.carr@newschannel5.com, Taylor.Shaw@KSHB.com

- b. The addresses in black sent their notices to Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net and many also to DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org; those in blue only to the latter(↓890).
7. Those apparent senders are the kind of people who have the greatest professional and commercial motive, means, and opportunity to expose public servants' abuse of power. By so doing, they can win a Pulitzer Prize, command a higher salary, and move up to a more highly reputed media outlet. They could have realistically envisioned themselves earning those benefits if they **a.** exposed how Then-Judge Gorsuch had participated(*>jur:90§§b, c) in dismissing 99.83% of complaints against himself and other judges, denying review petitions, and terminating 93% of appeals with fiats (OL2:457§D, 546¶4); **b.** based their exposure on judges' statistics; and thus **c.** prevented his confirmation to the Supreme Court and even **d.** caused the resignation of justices(jur:92§d) by showing how they have continued to cover up judges' abuse, lest the justices be incriminated for their own abuse when they were judges who committed any abuse while ensuring their impunity through similar dismissals and denials. It is beyond a reasonable doubt impossible for all the apparent senders to have lacked interest in those benefits, let alone what drives media people: curiosity. But a minimum of it would have led some, if not most, of them to open and read the Gorsuch email.
 8. This shows that out of the thousands of people who received the Gorsuch email there was no random self-selection of those who became the apparent senders of the "Not read" notices. Far from it, somebody has the means of intercepting emails between critics and non-critics of judges, storing them for years, and choosing intercepted parties as apparent senders whenever expedient. If the interceptors are judges, they sent the notices to convey the message, 'just as we did before(*>ggl:1 et seq.), we control who receives your emails and when; and even intercept your mail(infra). We won't let you assemble people, not even on the Internet, to expose us'. If the apparent senders are whistleblowers, they want to hint at their existence through the intentionality of their choice of apparent senders, and say, 'This is confirmation that judges intercept your emails. Keep going! We are those you asked for(OL2: 788¶37): today's Deep Throat(*>jur:106§c). We no longer want any part in the abuse. Even if only as hidden inside informants, we cry *NotMeAnymore!*'(OL2:787§D).
 9. Edward Snowden's leak revealed that the NSA abused its means to collect without authorization the metadata of scores of millions of phone calls. Judges have the necessary national electronic network and contact with intelligence agencies to intercept the communications of even more people. They also have what the NSA has never had: the power to exonerate themselves from 100% of complaints against them. The interception of the Gorsuch email begs the question how far judges' interception of people's communications goes. To answer it there are many leads(*>OL:194§E).
 10. Do you trust judges who violate your constitutional right of 'freedom of speech and the press, and to assemble' to protect your other rights? If you do not and are outraged, share this article with everybody, beginning with the apparent senders, who were injured in fact(OL2:729). To contact them and facilitate their communication among themselves and with you, put the bloc(↑¶6a) of their addresses in the To: line of your email to them. You can thus help form a national movement for judicial abuse exposure, redress, and reform(OL2:867) and become a Champion of Justice.

Dare trigger history!(>jur:7§5)...and you may enter it*

May 10, 2019

Your emails are being intercepted if you did not send Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq., between March 30 and April 5, 2019, a “Not read” notice concerning an article on Then-Judge Gorsuch that he had emailed in the week of March 25, 2017
How you can contact the other apparent senders and help scoop the exposure of judges’ illegal and self-interested interception of the email and mail communications of *We the People*

Dear Journalists, Editors, and Publishers, Law School Students and Professors,
Lawyers, and Advocates of Honest Judiciary,

A. Inherently suspicious and verifiable facts pointing to illegal interception of emails

1. In the week of March 25, 2017, more than two years ago, I emailed you an article both based on the official statistics of the federal judges for Congress and critical of Then-Judge Gorsuch, who was undergoing the process of confirmation of his nomination to the Supreme Court.
2. More than two years later, in the days between March 30 and April 5, 2019, I received an emailed “Not read” notice concerning that article and apparently sent from these email account holders:

Ashton.Day@KSHB.com, Brittany.Green@WXYZ.COM, dersh@law.harvard.edu,
devona.moore@kshb.com, Eric.Weiss@wptv.com, FBohorquez@bakerlaw.com,
GONZALEE@BrooklynDA.org, Jason.Davis@wptv.com, Jasmin.Pettaway@WEWS.COM,
JDucey@abc15.com, Jennifer.Tintner@wptv.com, joe.kernen@nbcuni.com,
jon.rehagen@kshb.com, jsmoore@jsmooresq.com, JSparksJr@wptv.com,
Justin.Madden@WEWS.COM, Kathleen.Boutwell@KSHB.com, lauren.beiler@kshb.com,
Lindsay.Shively@kshb.com, Lisa.Benson@kshb.com, Megan.Strickland@KSHB.com,
nicole.phillips@kshb.com, NTotenberg@npr.org, richard.sharp@kshb.com,
Richards@wews.com, samah.assad@wews.com, Sarah.Plake@KSHB.com,
stephanie.carr@newschannel5.com, Taylor.Shaw@KSHB.com

3. Practically everyone on that list is a journalist, a media personality, or a lawyer. They are not representative of the tens of thousands of members of the public at large to whom I emailed my article. Somebody had access to their accounts, intercepted them, kept them available for over two years, and at a convenient moment used them to send the “Not read” notice all within a week...but not a single “Read” notice.
4. All this is inherently suspicious. So are the other circumstances surrounding this matter. They are discussed, with supporting screenshots and official documents, in the article at [†][OL2:885 et seq.](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Apparent_Senders.pdf)
[†] http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Apparent_Senders.pdf
 - a. Among those circumstances and included in that file is my complaint against Then-Judge Brett Kavanaugh, Chief Judge Merrick Garland, and their peers and colleagues of the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals for having in self-interest dismissed 100% of the 478 complaints filed against them and denied 100% of the petitions for review during the 1oct06-30sep17 11-year period. This complaint was referred to Supreme Court Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., who in turn referred it for disposition to the 11th Circuit. The file contains the decision of the 11th Circuit Chief Judge.
5. You can read it and then use that bloc of addresses to contact and ask them whether they sent me that “Not read” notice.

B. An opportunity for a scoop, a Pulitzer Prize, and a transformative impact on the judicial and legal system

6. I am sending this email to those apparent senders, to additional hundreds of professional and citizen journalists, and to tens of thousands of members of the public at large. To the extent that this email is not intercepted, it is likely that at least one of them together with an assigning editor and publisher will realize that it they were first in exposing judges' illegal interception of people's emails and mail, their exposé would provoke intense public outrage at judges:
 - a. Judges are duty-bound to safeguard all constitutional rights. Yet, in the self-interest of covering up their past abuse and ensuring their impunity for future abuse, they "abridge" *We the People's* First Amendment right to "freedom of speech, of the press, the right of the people peaceably to assemble [even on the Internet], and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances"(*>jur:22fn12b).
7. The first to expose judges' abuse of power will make a scoop. I hereby pitch to editors and publishers my article in the above-referenced file and any one or a series of those listed at †>OL2:719§C. They are based on my study of judges and their judiciaries, titled and downloadable for free thus: **Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Wrong-doing: Pioneering the news and publishing field of judicial unaccountability reporting** * †
8. The ones to make the scoop can reasonably envisage winning a Pulitzer Prize.
9. What is more, their exposé could have a public impact more transformative than the exposés of Harvey Weinstein's sexual abuse by *The New York Times* and *The New Yorker* on October 5 and 10, 2017, respectively: Within days, the *MeToo!* movement erupted here and abroad.
10. It is reasonable to expect that one or more of the 22 presidential candidates would seize upon the issue of judges' abusive interception of communications. Each of them is desperate for spearheading a national issue that provokes public outrage and earns him or her national media and public attention, donations, and campaign volunteers.
11. The *MeToo!* attitude of intolerance of any form of abuse coupled with the demands of the presidential campaign will significantly amplify the impact of exposing judges' abusive interception of communications.
12. This can give rise to a mutually reinforcing impact: The jumping on the investigative bandwagon set in motion by the scoop, the *MeToo!* attitude, and the presidential candidates, can not only embolden ever more victims of unaccountable abusive judges to speak up, but also lead to the emergence of, and the catering to, an even larger group: the huge(†>OL2:719¶¶6-8) untapped voting bloc of The Dissatisfied with The Judicial and Legal System.
13. A national movement for judicial abuse exposure, redress, and reform could be formed.
14. The combined transformative impact of all these forces could surpass anything seen or imagined up to now. They could lead *We the People*, the masters of all public servants, to assert our right to hold our judicial public servants accountable for their performance and liable to their victims.

C. Taking action in your own interest and that of the People

15. You can or help to scoop the exposure of judges' abusive interception of communications. To that end:
 - a. review the file at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Apparent_Senders.pdf;

May 17, 2019

Scott Harshbarger, Esq., Chair John Montgomery, Esq., Steering Committee
Lawyers Defending American Democracy hello@lawyersdefendingdemocracy.org; tel. (857)300-0018

Dear Chair Harshbarger, Mr. Montgomery, and LDAD Members,[‡]

1. After you published your open letter denouncing P. Trump's threat to democracy and the rule of law, I tried to contact you([infra](#) ↓ [OL2:841](#))¹, scores of members(↓¶18), your contact person Emily Demikat(840) at tel. (857)300-0018, and through your website, to ask that you be consistent by denouncing those who are held by themselves, the other branches, and the media exempt from any "checks and balances" and public scrutiny: judges. Risklessly, they abuse their power(841¶3), which exempt from any "checks" is 'absolute and corrupts absolutely'(*>jur:27²⁸). Can one defend democracy while leaving *We the People* at their mercy? I never received any reply of any kind.
2. To ascertain whether you received my emails, you may search for their two Subject: lines:
To LDAD Demikat & NLJ Barber: 'We Must Speak Out': Hundreds of Lawyers Form New Group Assailing Trump [my Subject: line + that of National Law Journal Reporter C. Ryan Barber's article on the launch of LDAD];
To LDAD S. Harshbarger and J. Montgomery: 'We Must Speak Out': ...Trump

A. Unaccountable judges' disregard for the law and a strategy to defend *the People*

3. *We the People* are the democratic source of all public power. We are the masters who entrusted some to our judicial public servants. But judges are in fact unaccountable and disregard their duty to exercise that power according to the rule of law, abusing it in their personal and class interest.
4. This letter provides probable cause to believe that our communications and those to and from other lawyers, journalists, law professors and students, etc.(↓[Appendix](#)), were intercepted by judges, who have the most to lose from being exposed. This should concern, if not outrage, you, as it would the public, because it threatens democracy, which depends on an informed public that speaks out.
5. Moreover, judges' self-interested interception of people's communications is an outrageous betrayal of the entrustment of public power to safeguard Americans' most cherished and fundamental democratic right, guaranteed by the First Amendment: the right to "freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble [even by email and social media], and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances"(*>jur:22^{12b}).
6. Hence, this letter asks whether you received my previous communications and replied to them. It also proposes our joining of forces to expose the interceptors by implementing a strategy that takes advantage of the presidential campaign to insert into the national debate the counterpart to, and more important exercise than, public hearings on the qualifications of judicial candidates: public assessment of judges' performance. We can expose how through their exemption from "checks", judges have institutionalized their abuse of their enormous power over people's property, liberty, and all their rights and duties. Thereby we can defend "government of, by, and for" *the People* from what they have impermissibly carved out for themselves: Judges' State of Above the Law.

¹ The materials corresponding to the(* †>vol:pg# references) are found in my two-volume, professionally researched and written study of judges and their judiciaries, titled and downloadable thus:

Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Wrongdoing:
Pioneering the news and publishing field of judicial unaccountability reporting* †

* http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf >all prefixes:# up to OL:393 OL2:901

‡ <http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/LDAD/DrRCordero-LDAD.pdf>

B. Statistical analysis shows interception of our communications

7. One need not be a statistician or have written a Brandeis brief^(†) by supporting a brief with statistics to know that the normal distribution of a series of statistical values goes from one extreme through increasing and decreasing degrees to the opposite one. When those values are plotted on an X, Y system of coordinates, they delineate a bell-like curve: The fewest values near the point of intersection of the X and Y axes begin the curve; ever more values raise it toward the crown of the bell; and ever fewer values lower the curve on the other side toward the bell rim.
8. The normal distribution of responses to my communications, whether through emails or letters, would have caused the fewest recipients to react so negatively to them as to demand that I be disbarred and imprisoned for blasphemous contempt of court. Ever more recipients would have tempered their negative reaction until reaching the other side of the crown of the bell, where recipients would have expressed an ever more positive reaction to them until the fewest recipients would have acclaimed my communications as the best pieces of writing since the Declaration of Independence. At the least, somebody would have seen my communications and said something.
9. However, all the scores of LDAD members that I contacted multiplied by the many times that I repeated my contact attempts had only one single response: none. The bell curve was reduced to the graph point 0, 0. That defies reasonable statistical expectations, never mind professional courtesy. It required intention and manipulation. That provides probable cause to believe that delivery of original and replying emails and letters to you and yours to me were intercepted and prevented.

C. Why it is reasonable to believe that judges are the interceptors

10. The rule of reason is a key analytical tool of the law. By applying it one can conclude that it is reasonable to believe that the people who have the most to lose from being criticized and even exposed in public for their riskless abuse of power are the interceptors: unaccountable judges.
 - a. The law is written to be understood and complied with by “a reasonable man [or woman]”.
 - b. The Constitution protects only “against unreasonable searches and seizures”.
 - c. What is reasonable in light of the experience shared as peers of the parties to a lawsuit provides the foundation of our jury system.
 - d. The strictest standard of proof is “beyond a reasonable doubt”.
 - e. The conduct of ‘a reasonable person’ determines liability in torts. Indeed, a person is deemed to intend the reasonably foreseeable consequences of his or her acts.
 - f. Contracts and treaties must be given the reasonable interpretation that fairly informed parties negotiating in good faith and at arm’s length must be presumed to have intended.
 - g. What is most reasonable support the maxim: When you hear hooves, think horses, not zebras.
 - h. Occam’s razor cuts out anything superfluous and improbable to retain what is at the core: the simplest explanation. Here: The target of the attack has the strongest reason to fight back.

D. Motive, means, and opportunity to illegally intercept communications

11. To intercept communications judges have:
 - a. the motive to prevent their critics from “assembling” among themselves and with ever more people through emails, social media postings, and letters to ‘speak and publish’ about judges’ unaccountability and their interest in keeping their past abuse secret and their future riskless;

- b. the means to intercept any communication thanks to their vast Information Technology network and expertise that allow the filing and retrieval of hundreds of millions of briefs, records, orders, decisions, rules, etc., e.g., PACER (Public Access to Court Electronic Records); and
 - c. the opportunity to extort intercepting aid in exchange for granting law enforcement agencies' requests for subpoenas and warrants, and the NSA's and other intelligence agencies' secret requests for secret orders of secret surveillance under FISA and state equivalents(*>OL:5⁷).
12. Nobody is entitled to fight back by engaging in unconstitutional, illegal, and unethical conduct. Just as LDAD members are outraged at P. Trump for doing so, they should be at judges for retaliating against critics of judges' deprivation of their rights(↑5¶); and violating the provisions of 18 U.S.C prohibiting the interception of communications, §2511; fraud and related activity in connection with computers(*>OL:5a^{13,14}), §1030; and obstruction of mail, §§1701-1708(↑>OL2:909).

E. A complaint v DCC judges, referred to the Chief Justice and on to the 11th Circuit, betrays institutionalized 100% self-exemption from accountability

- 13. Judges' interception of the emails of 29 journalists and lawyers is evidenced with screenshots in the file at <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-11Circuit.pdf>>OL2:885 et seq.
- 14. That file contains a complaint against judges of the District of Columbia Circuit (DCC) for having dismissed 100% of the 478 complaints against them and denied 100% of the petitions for review of dismissals in the 1oct06-30sep17 11-year period, grabbing 100% self-interested exoneration.
- 15. The DCC Court of Appeals invoked "exceptional circumstances" to refer the complaint to Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., who in turn assigned it to the 11th Circuit for disposition. The latter's chief judge dismissed it out of hand without any investigation. His decision, included in that file, shows sophistry bound to outrage any person who would deem it reasonable to appoint a rule-provided special committee to investigate the inherent suspiciousness of defendants of complaints acting also as judges to dismiss them. Abusing their power, they have granted themselves impunity.

F. Requested action: call me, join forces to investigate, and make history

- 16. If you are outraged at, or concerned by, judges' threat to democracy, I respectfully ask that you:
 - a. call me at (718)827-9521 to set up a presentation by me to LDAD members and their guests via video conference or in person on the strategy for exposing unaccountable judges' abuse by bringing this issue to each of the 25 presidential candidates, each of whom is desperate to become the standard-bearer of an issue that provokes public outrage and earns him or her national media and public attention, donations, campaign volunteers, and the indispensable qualification to participate in the presidential debates that begin in June. Each of them can reasonably be expected to want to learn how to approach the huge(OL2:719¶¶6-8) untapped voting bloc of The Dissatisfied with The Judicial and Legal System and become their leader;
 - b. join resources to do what Former CBS Reporter Sharyl Attkisson did before filing her \$35 million suit against the Justice Department for roaming her office and home computers(OL2:782¶7): She had three Information Technology experts conduct independent forensic examinations to ascertain whether her computers had been intercepted and, if so, by whom; and
 - c. join forces to do a first in history: form a *MeToo!*-like civic movement of the masters in a democracy to hold their judicial public servants accountable for their performance and liable to their victims: *Dare trigger history!*...and you may enter it as historic Champions of Justice.

Sincerely, s/Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

APPENDIX

Parties whose to and from communications have been intercepted

17. The following email account holders and addressees of letters have had their communications from and to me intercepted. They and I have suffered injury in fact and can be parties in an action(†16a), as can others who as a result of our exposure become aware of the interception that they have suffered.
18. Signers of the LDAD open letter to whom a letter was mailed; <http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/LDAD/DrRCordero-LDAD.pdf>

Scott Harshbarger, Esq.
Senior Counsel
Casner & Edwards, LLP
303 Congress Street
Boston, MA 02210
info@casneredwards.com
hello@lawyersdefendingdemocracy.org
Tel. 617.426.5900; 617.426.5900
Fax 617.426.8810

John Montgomery, Esq.
Member of LDAD's Steering
Committee
c/o Ropes & Gray
Prudential Tower
800 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02199-3600
John.Montgomery@ropesgray.com
Tel. (617) 951 7565; 617 951 7000

Jon S. Bouker, Esq.
Arent Fox LLP
1717 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20006
jon.bouker@arentfox.com
Tel. 202.857.6183; 202.857.6000

Stanley McDermott, Esq.
DLA Piper LLP
1251 6th Ave
New York, NY 10020
stanley.mcdermott@dlapiper.com
Tel. (212)335-4790, (212) 835-6290

William G. Meserve, Esq. (Ret.)
c/o Ropes & Gray
Prudential Tower
800 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02199-3600
contactus@ropesgray.com
Tel. 617 951 7000 Boston

Robert M. Dell, Esq. (Ret.)
Latham & Watkins LLP
505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111
Robert.dell@lw.com
Tel. 415.391.0600
Fax 415.395.8095
Tel. 212.906.1200

Emanuel L. Rouvelas, Esq.
K&L Gates LLP
1601 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20006-1600
Emanuel.Rouvelas@klgates.com
Tel. 202.778.9000; Fax 202.778.9100
Tel. 202.661.6262; Fax 202.778.9100

Eugene R. Fidell, Esq.
Feldesman Tucker Leifer Fidell LLP
1129 20th Street, NW, Suite 400
Washington, D.C.
efidell@ftlf.com; Tel. 202-466-8960

Jonathan D. Blake, Esq. (Ret.)
Covington & Burling LLP
One CityCenter
850 Tenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001-4956
jblake@cov.com; Tel. 202 662 5506

Nicholas Fels, Esq. (Ret.)
Covington & Burling LLP
One CityCenter
850 Tenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001-4956
nfels@cov.com; n/a

Kathy B. Weinman, Esq.
Hogan Lovells US LLP
100 High Street, 20th Floor
Boston, MA 02110
kathy.weinman@hoganlovells.com
Tel. 617 371 1004; Fax 617 371 1037

Stanley A. Twardy, Jr., Esq.
One Stamford Plaza, 7th Floor
263 Tresser Boulevard
Stamford, CT 06901
satwardy@daypitney.com
Tel. 203 977 7368; Fax 866 458 1037
Tel. (203) 977 7300 (203) 977 7301

Robert A. Skinner, Esq
Ropes & Gray
Prudential Tower
800 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02199-3600
Robert.Skinner@ropesgray.com
Tel. 617 951 7560

Robert E. Saudek, Esq. (Ret.)
Morris, Manning & Martin LLP
1600 Atlanta Financial Center
3343 Peachtree Road, NE
Atlanta, GA 30326; n/a

Donald K. Stern, Esq.
Affiliated Monitors Inc.
P.O. Box 961791
Boston, MA 02196
DStern@affiliatedmonitors.com
info@affiliatedmonitors.com; n/a

Stanley Marcuss, Esq.
Bryan Cave LLP
1155 F Street NW
Washington, DC 20004-1357
Stanley.Marcuss@bclplaw.com,
smarcuss@bclplaw.com,
Stanley.Marcuss@bryancave.com,
smarcuss@bryancave.com
Tel. 202 508 6000; Fax 202 508 6200

Ralph Levy, Esq. (Ret.)
King & Spalding
1180 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30309-3521
RLevy@kslaw.com
Tel. 404-572-4600; Fax 404-572-5100

Gershon M. (Gary) Ratner, Esq.
Executive Director
Citizens for Effective Schools, Inc.
8209 Hamilton Spring Ct.
Bethesda, MD 20817
info@citizenseffectiveschools.org
Tel. (301) 469-8000

Ivan Espinoza-Madrugal, Esq.
Executive Director
Lawyers for Civil Rights
1 Battery March St.
Boston, MA 02110; n/a
Tel. 617 482-1145; Fax 617 482-4392

Ruth Ellen Fitch, Esq.
The Ludeke Foundation
c/o Ms. Carolyn Ray and Mr. Phil
Cappello
Foundation Assistants

GMA Foundations
2 Liberty Square, Suite 500
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
n/a

Carolyn Rau, Foundation Assistant
crau@gmafoundations.com
Phil Cappello, Foundation Assistant
pcappello@gmafoundations.com
Tel. 617-391-3101; 617-399-1852

Ruth Ellen Fitch, Esq.
c/o: The Dimock Center
55 Dimock Street
Roxbury, MA 02119 |
n/a; Tel. 617.442.8800

Fred M. Lowenfels, Esq.
General Counsel Emeritus
Trammo, Inc.
One Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10020-2078
n/a; Tel. 212-223-3200;
Fax 212-759-1410

Lois Jane Schiffer, Esq.
c/o Office of the General Counsel
National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration
1401 Constitution Av NW, Rm 5128
Washington, D.C. 20230
NOAA.Staff.Directory@noaa.gov; n/a

Professor John Q. Barrett
St. John's University School of Law
8000 Utopia Parkway
Queens, NY 11439
barrettj@stjohns.edu
Tel. (718) 990-6644

Laura Blank, Esq.
Senior University Executive Director
of Labor Relations
City University of New York
205 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017
Laura.Blank@mail.cuny.edu
Tel. (646) 664-2976.
Fax (646) 664-2960; (212) 794-5347

Robert K. Drinan, Esq.
Executive Agency Counsel
New York City Transit Authority
130 Livingston St
Brooklyn, NY 11201
n/a; Tel. (718) 694-1600, (718) 694-
3335; (718) 330-3001, (212) 772-2370

Bradford D. Conover, Esq.
Conover Law Offices

345 7th Avenue
New York, NY 10001
brad@conoverlaw.com
Tel. (212) 588-9080

Michael J. Devereaux, Esq.
39 Broadway, Suite 910
New York, NY 10006
mdevereaux@devlegal.com
Tel. 212 785-5959; Fax 212 785-4487
Tel. (646) 485-3145

Tal Dickstein, Esq.
Partner, Loeb & Loeb LLP
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154
tdickstein@loeb.com
Tel. 212.407.4963

Gregory Diskant, Esq.
Of Counsel
Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler,
LLP
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York NY 10036
n/a; Tel. 212-336-2710; 212.336.2000
Fax 212-336-2222

Louis Epstein, Esq.
Senior Vice President and General
Counsel
Trammo, Inc.
One Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10020-2078
n/a

Eric M. Freedman, Esq.
250 W 94th St
New York, NY 10025
Eric.M.Freedman@hofstra.edu
Tel. 212 665-2713; Fax 212-665-2714
Tel. 516-463-5167; Fax 516-463-7261

Whitney Gerard, Esq.
Of Counsel
Norton Rose Fulbright LLP
301 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10019-6022
whitney.gerard@nortonrosefulbright.com;
Tel. 212 408 5265

Robert A. Grauman, Esq.
Baker & McKenzie LLP
452 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10018
robert.grauman@bakermckenzie.com
Tel. 212 891 3587; Fax 212 310 1687

Professor Arthur S. Leonard
New York Law School

185 West Broadway
New York, NY 10013
arthur.leonard@nyls.edu,
suzanne.tirado@nyls.edu,
Tel. 212.431.2156; 212.431.2100

Andrew H. Levy, Esq.
Senior Counsel
DLA Piper LLP
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York City, NY
andrew.levy@dlapiper.com
Tel. 212 335 4544; Fax 917 778 8544

William E. Markstein, Esq.
Trammo, Inc.
Senior Vice President, CFO
One Rockefeller Plaza, 9th floor
New York, NY 10020-2078; n/a
Tel. 212 223-3200; Fax 212 759-1410

Joan McPhee, Esq.
Ropes & Gray LLP
1211 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036-8704
n/a; Tel. 212 596 9443

Ryan Papir, Esq.
Associate General Counsel
Trammo, Inc.
One Rockefeller Plaza, 9th floor
New York, NY 10020-2078
n/a

Eli B. Richlin, Esq.
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Fl
New York, NY 10019
erichlin@wsgr.com
Tel. (212)497-7781

Keith J. Roberts, Esq.
Brach Eichler LLC
5 Penn Plaza, 23rd Floor
Manhattan, NY 10001
kroberts@bracheichler.com,
jgreydak@bracheichler.com
Tel. 973.364.5201
<http://www.bracheichler.com/>

Gary L. Rosenthal, Esq.
400 Carleton Ave
Central Islip, NY 11722
n/a; Tel. (631) 853-5431

Robert M. Safron, Esq.
Patterson Belknap Webb and Tyler
LLP
1133 6th Ave
New York, NY 10036

rmsafron@pbwt.com
Tel. 212-336-2250; Fax 212-336-7984
Tel. (212) 819-8200

James Shifren, Esq.
Scarsdale Synagogue
Temples Tremont and Emanu-El
2 Ogden Road
Scarsdale, NY 10583; n/a

Professor Norman I. Silber
School of Law
Hofstra University
121 Hofstra University
Hempstead, NY 11549
Norman.I.Silber@hofstra.edu
Tel. 516-463-5858; 516-463-5866
Fax 516-463-4962

Jo Anne Simon, Esq.
Jo Anne Simon, P.C.
356 Fulton St # 3
Brooklyn, NY 11201; n/a
Tel. 718 852-3528; Fax 718 875-5728

Bonnie Singer, Esq.
Former Deputy Director
Labor Hearings & Appeals
City University of NY
205 East 42nd Street, 10th floor
New York, NY 10017
n/a; Tel. 646 664-2970; Fax 646 664-2960; [website](#)

Daniel Sleasman, Esq.
1 Crumitie Rd
Albany, NY 12211-1609; n/a

Marilyn Tebor Shaw, Esq.
118 N. Tioga St., Suite 400
Ithaca, NY 14850
mat48@cornell.edu
Tel. (607)-275-8064 (office)
Cell (607)-793-0752

Steven D. Uslander, Esq.
Littman Krooks LLP
655 Third Avenue, 20th Floor
New York, NY 10017

suslaner@littmankrooks.com
Tel. (212) 490-2020

John S. Beckerman, Esq.
128 S Oxford St
Moorestown, NJ
n/a

Patrick English, Esq.
Dines & English
685 Van Houten Ave # 1
Clifton, NJ 07013
n/a; Tel. (973) 778-7575
[website](#)

James Yoakum, Esq.
Dechert LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2808
james.yoakum@dechert.com
Tel. 215 994 2461; 215 994 2222

- a. Email addresses collected from the above paragraph and to be placed as a bloc in the To: line of an email to facilitate contacting their holders:

hello@lawyersdefendingdemocracy.org, cbarber@alm.com, John.Montgomery@ropesgray.com,
info@casneredwards.com, hello@lawyersdefendingdemocracy.org, cbarber@alm.com, jon.bouker@arentfox.com,
stanley.mcdermott@dlapiper.com, contactus@ropesgray.com, Robert.dell@lw.com,
Emanuel.Rouvelas@klgates.com, efidell@ftlf.com, jblake@cov.com, nfels@cov.com, kathy.weinman@hoganlovells.com,
satwardy@daypitney.com, Robert.Skinner@ropesgray.com, DStern@affiliatedmonitors.com,
info@affiliatedmonitors.com, Stanley.Marcuss@bclplaw.com, smarcuss@bclplaw.com, mat48@cornell.edu,
Stanley.Marcuss@bryancave.com, smarcuss@bryancave.com, info@citizenseffectiveschools.org,
RLevy@kslaw.com, crau@gmafoundations.com, pcappello@gmafoundations.com,
NOAA.Staff.Directory@noaa.gov, barrettj@stjohns.edu, Laura.Blank@mail.cuny.edu, brad@conoverlaw.com,
mdevereaux@devlegal.com, tdickstein@loeb.com, gldiskant@pbwt.com, Eric.M.Freedman@hofstra.edu,
whitney.gerard@nortonrosefulbright.com, robert.grauman@bakermckenzie.com, arthur.leonard@nyls.edu,
suzanne.tirado@nyls.edu, communications@nyls.edu, andrew.levy@dlapiper.com, Joan.McPhee@ropesgray.com,
erichlin@wsgr.com, kroberts@bracheichler.com, jgreydak@bracheichler.com, rmsafron@pbwt.com,
james@sstte.org, Norman.I.Silber@hofstra.edu, suslaner@littmankrooks.com, james.yoakum@dechert.com

- b. LDAD contacted by email and letter of 20may19:

barrettj@stjohns.edu, elabaton@labaton.com, robert.grauman@bakermckenzie.com, newman@yu.edu,
dbaldwin@onbar.org, info@milbank.org, James.Dreyfus@nortonrosefulbright.com, mail@hlalaw.org,
bkarp@paulweiss.com, brennancenter@nyu.edu, Elaine.Ingulli@stockton.edu

19. The following 29 journalists and lawyers are the apparent senders between March 30-April 5, 2019, of 71 “Not read” notices to me concerning an article on Then-Judge Gorsuch that I had emailed to them and many others in March 2017, two years earlier! The suspiciousness of those notices and their temporal connection to my complaint against Then-Judge Kavanaugh and his peers and colleagues at the District of Columbia Circuit([supra §E](#)) is discussed in detail([OL2:881-886, 899](#)). Were the notices sent by taunting interceptors or by Deep Throat-like([*>jur:106§c](#)) whistleblowers?; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Apparent_Senders.pdf

Ashton.Day@KSHB.com, Brittany.Green@WXYZ.COM, dersh@law.harvard.edu, devona.moore@kshb.com, Eric.Weiss@wptv.com, FBohorquez@bakerlaw.com, GONZALEE@BrooklynDA.org, Jason.Davis@wptv.com, Jasmin.Pettaway@WEWS.COM, JDucey@abc15.com, Jennifer.Tintner@wptv.com, joe.kernen@nbcuni.com, jon.rehagen@kshb.com, jsmoore@jsmooresq.com, JSparksJr@wptv.com, Justin.Madden@WEWS.COM, Kathleen.Boutwell@KSHB.com, lauren.beiler@kshb.com, Lindsay.Shively@kshb.com, Lisa.Benson@kshb.com, Megan.Strickland@KSHB.com, nicole.phillips@kshb.com, NTotenberg@npr.org, richard.sharp@kshb.com, Richards@wews.com, samah.assad@wews.com, Sarah.Plake@KSHB.com, stephanie.carr@newschannel5.com, Taylor.Shaw@KSHB.com

20. The following are some of the Harvard and Yale law professors and students, journalists, lawyers, etc., whom I have tried to contact (†>OL2:768, 773, 805, 808, 872¶29; 671, 672, 676 683, 698-700, etc.) to no avail; yet, they have publicly expressed interests harmonious(*>OL:52§C) with mine.

a. By email and individualized mailed letter:

dersh@law.harvard.edu, susan.rose-ackerman@yale.edu, judith.resnik@yale.edu, A.DeGuglielmo@yale.edu, Alyssa.Peterson@yale.edu, Chandini.Jha@yale.edu, Lisa.Hansmann@yale.edu, Megan.Yan@yale.edu, Rita.Gilles@yale.edu, Serena.Walker@yale.edu, ksloan@alm.com, president@thecrimson.com, managingeditor@thecrimson.com, editorial@thecrimson.com, aidan.ryan@thecrimson.com, shera.avionah@thecrimson.com, jamie.halper@thecrimson.com, clerkletter2017@gmail.com, joshua_benton@harvard.edu, laura@niemanlab.org, newsletter@niemanlab.org, christine@niemanlab.org, pitches@theappeal.org, tips@theappeal.org, jaimeestades@yahoo.com, sdesantis@alm.com, sdesantis@alm.com; (cf. †>OL2:853-863)

b. By individualized mailed letter:

21. Dean Heather K. Gerken, Dean of **Yale Law School**;
 Professor Abbe R. Gluck;
 Professor Judith Resnik;
 Professor Susan Rose-Ackerman;
 Professor Vicki Schultz;
 YLS student Scott Stern;
 YLS student Andy DeGuglielmo and the Working Group;
 YLS student Rita Gilles and the Working Group;
 YLS student Lisa Hansmann and the Working Group;
 YLS student Ms. Chandini Jha and the Working Group;
 YLS student Serena Walker and the Working Group;
 YLS student Megan Yan and the Working Group;
 YLS student Alyssa Peterson and Pipeline Parity Project;
 Yale Law School, 127 Wall Street, New Haven, CT 06511
22. Dean John Manning, Dean of **Harvard Law School**;
 Dean Marcia Sells, Dean of Students
 Dean Catherine Claypoole, Associate Dean and Dean for Academic and Faculty Affairs;
 Dean Mark Weber, Assistant Dean of Career Services, The HLS Office of Career Services
 Dean Kevin Moody, Assistant Dean and Chief Human Resources Officer;
 Professor Janet Halley;
 Professor Michael Klarman;
 Professor Richard Lazarus;
 Professor Jeannie Suk Gersen;
 Professor Andrew Crespo, Assistant Professor of

Law, and the HLS Clerkship Committee;
 Professor Daphna Renan, Assistant Professor of Law;
 Professor Alan Dershowitz, Emeritus;
 HLS student Emma Janger, JD 2020;
 Harvard Law School, 1563 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, MA 02138

23. Ms. Sarah B. Affel, J.D., Harvard Law School Title IX Coordinator, Dean of Students Office, **Harvard Law School**, Wasserstein Hall 3039, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
24. President Derek G. Xiao;
 Ms. Hannah Natanson, Managing Editor;
 The **Harvard Crimson**, and the Crimson Staff;
 Harvard Law School, 14 Plympton St., Cambridge, MA 02138
25. Jaime Estades, Esq., MSW Adjunct Professor, **Columbia University** Graduate School of Social Work, 1255 Amsterdam Ave, New York, NY 10027; jaimeestades@yahoo.com (†>OL2:808)
26. Ms. Kendall Turner, Law Clerks for Workforce Accountability, c/o: O'Melveny & Myers LLP, 1625 Eye Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006
27. Dean M. Elizabeth Magill, Dean and Richard E. Lang Professor of Law, **Stanford Law School**, 559 Nathan Abbott Way, Stanford, CA 94305
28. Ms. Karyn Koos, Executive Assistant to Dean M. Elizabeth Magill, **Stanford Law School**, Office of the Dean, William H. Neukom Building, Room 305,

555 Nathan Abbott Way, Stanford, CA 94305-8610

29. Dean Erwin Chemerinsky, Dean and Jesse H. Choper Distinguished Professor of Law, **Berkeley School of Law**, University of California, 215 Boalt Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720
30. Prof. Dr. Jennifer A. Drobac, R. Bruce Townsend

Professor of Law, Robert H. McKinney **School of Law, Indiana University**, Lawrence W. Inlow Hall, 530 W. New York Street, Indianapolis, IN 46202-3225

31. Mr. Russell Wheeler, Visiting Fellow, Governance Studies, **The Brookings Institution**, 1775 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20036

G. Subscribe for free to, and support the work of, Judicial Discipline Reform

32. Visit the website at, and subscribe for free to its articles thus: <http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org> >left panel >↓Register or + New or Users >Add New
33. No meaningful cause can be advanced without money. Support Judicial Discipline Reform's:
- professional law research and writing, and strategic thinking(†>OL2:445§B, 475§D);
 - enhancement(OL2:563) of its website at <http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org> into:
 - a clearinghouse for complaints about judges that anybody can upload; and
 - a research center for searching many complaints for the most persuasive type of evidence, i.e., patterns, trends,(OL:274, 304), and coordinated abuse schemes(OL2:614);
 - tour(OL:197§G) of Programmatic Presentations(OL2:821-824) on forming a national movement for judicial abuse exposure, redress, and reform during the presidential campaign(895);
 - call for unprecedented citizen hearings(†>OL2:812§E) on judges' abuse, to be held at universities and media stations, conducted by journalists and news anchors, journalism and business professors, and Information Technology experts; and broadcast multimedia interactively;
 - investigation(OL:194§E) of judges' abuses that will outrage the nation: failure to read most briefs(†>OL2:760); interception of people's communications(781, 885, 899), and a bankruptcy fraud scheme(614) involving \$100s of billions(*>jur:27§2, 65§§1-3) and harming millions;
 - holding a press conference and publishing one or a series of articles(OL2:719§C) to make an Emile Zola's *I accuse!*-like(jur:98§2) denunciation of institutionalized(49§4) judges' abuse;
 - holding the first-ever and national, multimedia conference(jur:97§1) on judges' abuse to start judicial reform and energize the 34 states' call for a constitutional convention(OL2:878¶15);
 - launching a multidisciplinary academic and business venture(*>jur:119§1) that leads to the creation of the institute for judicial unaccountability reporting and reform advocacy(jur:131§5).

**Put your money where
your outrage at abuse and
passion for justice are.**

DONATE to Judicial Discipline Reform
at the **GoFundMe** campaign at
<https://www.gofundme.com/expose-unaccountable-judges-abuse>

or



34. To retain my legal services, see my model letter of engagement(*>OL:383).

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/dr-richard-cordero-esq-0508ba4b>

Dare trigger history!(>jur:7§5)...and you may enter it.*

ENDNOTES

18 U.S.C. Release point 115-196, 24apr19; <http://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml>
Also at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/18usc_Criminal_Code.pdf

§1701. Obstruction of mails generally

Whoever knowingly and willfully obstructs or retards the passage of the mail, or any carrier or conveyance carrying the mail, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

§1702. Obstruction of correspondence

Whoever takes any letter, postal card, or package out of any post office or any authorized depository for mail matter, or from any letter or mail carrier, or which has been in any post office or authorized depository, or in the custody of any letter or mail carrier, before it has been delivered to the person to whom it was directed, with design to obstruct the correspondence, or to pry into the business or secrets of another, or opens, secretes, embezzles, or destroys the same, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

§1703. Delay or destruction of mail or newspapers

(a) Whoever, being a Postal Service officer or employee, unlawfully secretes, destroys, detains, delays, or opens any letter, postal card, package, bag, or mail entrusted to him or which shall come into his possession, and which was intended to be conveyed by mail, or carried or delivered by any carrier or other employee of the Postal Service, or forwarded through or delivered from any post office or station thereof established by authority of the Postmaster General or the Postal Service, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being a Postal Service officer or employee, improperly detains, delays, or destroys any newspaper, or permits any other person to detain, delay, or destroy the same, or opens, or permits any other person to open, any mail or package of newspapers not directed to the office where he is employed; or

Whoever, without authority, opens, or destroys any mail or package of newspapers not directed to him, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

§1705. Destruction of letter boxes or mail

Whoever willfully or maliciously injures, tears down or destroys any letter box or other receptacle intended or used for the receipt or delivery of mail on any mail route, or breaks open the same or willfully or maliciously injures, defaces or destroys any mail deposited therein, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

§1708. Theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally

Whoever steals, takes, or abstracts, or by fraud or deception obtains, or attempts so to obtain, from or out of any mail, post office, or station thereof, letter box, mail receptacle, or any mail route or other authorized depository for mail matter, or from a letter or mail carrier, any letter, postal card, package, bag, or mail, or abstracts or removes from any such letter, package, bag, or mail, any article or thing contained therein, or secretes, embezzles, or destroys any such letter, postal card, package, bag, or mail, or any article or thing contained therein; or

Whoever steals, takes, or abstracts, or by fraud or deception obtains any letter, postal card, package, bag, or mail, or any article or thing contained therein which has been left for collection upon or adjacent to a collection box or other authorized depository of mail matter; or

Whoever buys, receives, or conceals, or unlawfully has in his possession, any letter, postal card, package, bag, or mail, or any article or thing contained therein, which has been so stolen, taken, embezzled, or abstracted, as herein described, knowing the same to have been stolen, taken, embezzled, or abstracted—

Shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

May 29, 2019

Taking action so that the national public be informed about, and outraged at, the probable cause to believe that judges intercept people's communications; and thereby insert the issue of their abuse of power into the presidential campaign

A. Dealing with your problems in a knowledgeable way and by thinking strategically

1. There are concrete, realistic, and feasible steps that you can take to improve your situation and that of millions of people similarly situated to you. To begin with, read this email because KNOWLEDGE IS POWER.
2. If you "will be in a position to fund a portion of the documentary concerning what goes on in Florida", then you will be interested in learning what you can do to draw to it the attention of presidential candidates, journalists, and the rest of the national public. There is strength in numbers.
3. Indeed, the only entity strong enough to force judges and politicians to apply the law, provide redress to those abused by judges, and undertake judicial reform is an informed and outraged We the People, when the People are strongest, namely, during a presidential campaign. Such People can demand nationally televised congressional hearings as well as unprecedented citizen hearings(†>OL2:812§E) on the issue.
4. A documentary can inform and outrage the People, just as we can by sharing and posting the article below.
5. Think strategically. That you can do on the strength of KNOWLEDGE IS POWER. Empower yourself by acquiring knowledge from my 2-volume study* † of judges and their judiciaries.

Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Wrongdoing:

Pioneering the news and publishing field of judicial unaccountability reporting* †

B. The illusion of an appeal to the Supreme Court tempered by the reality of official statistics and facts

6. The Supreme Court takes up for review fewer than one case out of every 93 petitions for review, called petitions for certiorari. The ratio is even much worse for petitions filed by pro ses(†>OL2:455§B). You are wasting your effort and time by preparing a petition to the Supreme Court, which requires that you read, understand, and comply with its Rules of Procedure, https://www.supremecourt.gov/filingandrules/rules_guidance.aspx. If you do not comply with those rules, the Clerk of Court will not even file your petition and the justices will never even see your brief or rather, the summary of it prepared by their pool of clerks(†>OL2:459§E).

C. Employing your effort and time reasonably by joining forces to take advantage of the presidential campaign and form a national civic movement for judicial abuse exposure, redress, and reform

7. By now you all must have realized that we cannot force judges to do in court, their turf, the right thing according to law. They will do whatever they want in their own personal and judicial class interest. That statement is based on their own statistics that they must, and do, submit to Congress annually. Their statistics are analyzed and supported with screenshots in the file at <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-11Circuit.pdf>.

8. Even if you continue to pursue your case in court, you should hedge your bet by joining forces with those who are implementing the out-of-court inform and outrage strategy described below and intended to take advantage of the presidential campaign. A substantial incentive that we can offer candidates to denounce judges' abuse of power is the opportunity to appeal to the huge (>OL2:719¶¶6-8) untapped voting bloc of The Dissatisfied with The Judicial and Legal System.

D. We need show, not “proof”, but rather probable cause to believe that judges are abusing their power

9. The purpose of my emails and articles is not to establish a debating society or wax erudite. Rather, I pursue a pragmatic, result-oriented objective guided by legal, ethical, and moral principles, and strategic thinking. That objective is to persuade you all and as many others as possible to join forces so that working together we are more effective than working in isolation or against each other, thus gaining synergy. We want to join in informing the national public about, and outraging it at, judges' abuse. Thereby we can advance our objective of forming that national civic movement for judicial abuse exposure, redress, and reform.
10. The basis of that persuasion is probable cause to believe that judges abuse their power, e.g., by intercepting the emails and mail communications of people, in general, and their critics, in particular. Probable cause is a standard lower than any of the three standards of proof applied in the courtroom, namely, by a preponderance of the evidence (50% + 1); clear and convincing evidence; and beyond a reasonable doubt.
11. The concept of “probable cause to believe” is used in this volume 2 of my study of judges and their judiciaries some 46 times; and in volume 1 it appears some 31 times. Click on the binocular icon on the pdf menu bar of each volume file to open the search box and search for *ble cause*.
12. Yet, in less than five minutes a prosecutor can present to a judge at arraignment his probable cause to believe that the defendant committed the crimes with which she is charged. In spite of the defendant entering a not guilty plea and without being presented any proof of her guilt, the judge can rely on the prosecutor's probable cause and decide to send the defendant to jail pending the outcome of her trial, and even deny bail. But even if the judge sets bail, the defendant may not be able to pay it and is sent to jail. Paying bail can itself be onerous, for the defendant must either disrupt her finances to come up with bail money, which may entail mortgaging her property, or pay the bailman a hefty commission.
13. In addition, the defendant may have to comply with judge-ordered restrictions on her freedom of movement, such as wear an ankle bracelet or be confined to her house, the equivalent of 'house arrest'. Of course, the defendant must prepare for trial and may have to retain an expensive lawyer.
14. After presenting his probable cause, the prosecutor continues to gather “proof” through discovery, which may include the issuance and execution of subpoenas and search warrants. Eventually, he is “ready for trial”. All that process is set in motion on probable cause presented in less than five minute...and the judge gavels and shouts “*Next!*” to keep the arraignment conveyor belt moving.

E. Presidential candidates need be presented with, and present to journalists and the public, only probable cause to believe that judges abuse their power, e.g., by intercepting people's communications

15. Each presidential candidate is desperate to become the standard-bearer of an issue that earns him or her national media and public attention, donations, campaign volunteers, and the qualification

necessary to participate in the presidential debates that begin in June 2019, i.e., donations from at least 65,000 donors resident in at least 20 states.

16. At a press conference, a rally, or a townhall meeting, a candidate can denounce judges' interception of people's communications based on the probable cause discussed in the article below, which relies on a statistical study and is verifiable by Information Technology experts examining computers and servers(OL2:885).
17. That outrage will be graver than that provoked by Edward Snowden revealing NSA's illegal, non-eavesdropping, content non-listening, dragnet collection of metadata of scores of millions of phone calls, e.g., phone numbers, time and date of call, duration.
18. By contrast, at stake here is the prevention of delivery of email and mail communications by judges to prevent people like us from "assembling", even on the Internet and through social media, to expose their past abuse and ensure the risklessness of their continued abuse.
19. To carry out such prevention judges must employ means of reading emails and mail of a large number of people to identify those that criticize them and stop their delivery, such as the means employed by the intelligence agencies to identify communications among terrorists(OL2:781 on judges' national digital network and vast expertise, and a quid pro quo between judges and intelligence agencies). By exposing judges' abuse, we, presidential candidates, and journalists can set in motion a historic political transformation: *We the Masters* for the first time ever can assert our right to hold our judicial public servants accountable.

F. Take action: join the action: share, donate, and organize a presentation

20. So, I respectfully encourage you to:

- a. share this article and similar ones(OL2:755, 760; 781, 719§C, 901) with all your friends, family, and post it on social media as widely as possible; share and post the article below
- b. donate to the professional law research and writing, and strategic thinking of Judicial Discipline Reform. No meaningful cause can be advanced without money. See the business plan (OL2:563) for investors to help develop my website, which has 25,522 free subscribers(†> Appendix 3) and many more visitors. It can be turned into a clearinghouse for complaints against judges; and a research center to search for patterns, trends, and schemes of abuse.

DONATE to Judicial Discipline Reform
at the **GoFundMe** campaign at

<https://www.gofundme.com/expose-unaccountable-judges-abuse>

or



Put your money where your outrage at abuse and passion for justice are:

- c. organize and invite me to make a presentation in person or via video conference on how you and your guests can expose judges' abuse and become nationally recognized by a grateful *We the People* as their Champions of Justice.

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/dr-richard-cordero-esq-0508ba4b>

21. I engage in substantial action for free on behalf of the public at large. It is not reasonable to expect that I drop it so that I may perform professional law research and writing pro bono for any one person who sends me his or her legal questions. If you want to hire me to render you any legal service, read my model letter of engagement(*>OL:383). I do incur office and living expenses and must pay them too.

Dare trigger history!(>jur:7§5)...and you may enter it.*

* http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf >all prefixes:# up to OL:393 OL2:913

July 27, 2019

Proposal to expose judges' unlawful interception of their critics' emails and mail by using Information Technology and approaching the presidential candidates so that an outraged *We the People* may demand judicial reform and compensation‡

1. This is a proposal for you to help reform our judicial system by ensuring that ours is “government, not of men and women, but by the rule of law”(*>OL:5⁶). It aims to apply its corollary Nobody is Above the Law also to judges and their judiciaries by enabling parties to lawsuits and the rest of *We the People* to hold them accountable for their performance and liable to compensate the victims of their malpractice due to mistakes or abuse of power as principals or accessories(*>jur:88§§a-d). That is how judges hold lawyers and their law firms, doctors and their hospitals, police officers and their departments, priests and their churches, and everybody else, for The Law is the Same for All. The proposal uses Information Technology to detect judges' most outrageous abuse: their warrantless and self-interested interception of their critics' emails and mail(†>OL2:781). It uses strategic thinking to expose them by disseminating the findings through those who have the most to gain by so doing and access to the national media and the public: the presidential candidates.
2. Experience shows that nobody feels a need to respect the law by abiding by its constraints where one suffers no consequences from disrespecting it because one is unaccountable. So are judges. Immune from liability, they need not comply with the strictures of due process, treat pro ses as they do represented parties, or write factually truthful decisions. Yet, they wield enormous power over people's property, liberty, and the rights and duties that frame their lives and shape their identities. Unaccountability breeds riskless abuse of power. The result is “absolute power, which corrupts absolutely”(*>jur:27²⁸). Rather than fact checking their decisions or establishing that one judge went rogue to exceed his or her discretion, judges can be exposed by their coordinated, institutionalized abuse and held accountable by the most powerful entity: an outraged *People*.

A. Basis for showing that judges' unaccountability leads to their abuse of power

3. You can find the factual, statistical, and argumentative basis for stating that judges abuse their power in my two-volume study of judges and their judiciaries, titled and downloadable thus:

Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Wrongdoing:
Pioneering the news and publishing field of judicial unaccountability reporting* †

4. The study shows how the judges of the only national judiciary, the Federal Judiciary, the model for its state counterparts, are the most powerful and unaccountable public officers(*>OL:267§4). They are the only ones to have a life-appointment; dismiss 100% of complaints against them(†>OL2:918); and suspend nationwide orders and activities of the President. Neither the President nor Congress dare investigate them, lest they become the target of judges' retaliation(*>Lsch:17§C). Thus, in the last 230 years since the creation of the Federal Judiciary in 1789, the number of federal judicial officers, of whom there were 2,255 in office on 30sep18, impeached and removed is 8! Once a judicial candidate is put on the bench, he or she can do anything risklessly because judges' reciprocal complaint dismissal agreement and the historic record insure their virtual unimpeachability and irremovability(*>jur:21§1). Held unaccountable by politicians and themselves, judges have no incentive to respect the law. On the contrary, they are lured into breaking it by the benefits (OL:173¶93) to be grabbed by abusing(OL:154¶3) their power as their modus operandi(jur:49§4).

B. The abuse to investigate: judges' interception of their critics' emails and mail

5. To cover up their abuse, judges engage in the warrantless and self-interested interception of peo-

ple's emails and mail in order to detect and prevent the delivery of those that can expose it. They have the means, motive, and opportunity to intercept their critics' communications(jur:21§§1-3):

- a. the Federal Judiciary's vast IT expertise and network for filing and retrieving hundreds of millions of pleadings, dockets, decisions, etc.; <https://www.PACER.gov/> (Public Access to Court Electronic Records); <https://www.uscourts.gov/courtrecords/electronic-filing-cmecf>;
- b. the power to grant or deny the intelligence agencies, e.g., the National Security Agency (NSA), what is indispensable for them to operate legally, that is, their secret requests for secret orders authorizing secret surveillance under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA; *>OL:5⁷). So, judges abuse their power to force the agencies into a quid pro quo where 100% surveillance requests are granted(id.) in exchange for intercepting assistance. While the agencies can allege that they are operating "in the national security interest", judges act in their crass personal and class interest in both escaping liability for the benefits that they have already grabbed(jur:105²¹³) and being able to grab ever more of them(102§a).

C. The proposal to investigate and expose, and the precedents for it

6. There is proposed that you and I together with other IT experts and others whom we may persuade to join a multidisciplinary academic and business team(*>jur:128§4), examine computers for crawlers and digital dust, keyloggers, malware, suspicious behavior(†>OL2:901), etc., and send test emails and mail to satisfy the lowest evidentiary standard applied by judges themselves: *probable cause to believe*(OL2:912§D; 461§G) that the people identified by real or fictitious – John Doe, Jane Widget– names have engaged in the abusive conduct of which they are suspected.

1. IT experts found hacking by the U.S. Department of Justice

7. There is precedent for what you are being asked to do: Former CBS Reporter Sharryl Attkisson(*>OL:215) noticed suspicious behaviors in her office and home computers. She and CBS hired three independent IT experts to examine them. They found digital dust that allowed them to conclude that the computers had been hacked by the Department of Justice, which wanted to eavesdrop on the two stories by Reporter Attkisson that were embarrassing it and the Obama administration:
 - a. DoJ's Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives' ill-conceived and disastrous Fast and Furious operation for selling guns and tracking their journey to Mexican druglords, led to the use of one such gun to kill an American border patrol. For his refusal to produce unredacted documents thereon, Congress held in contempt AG Eric Holder, who resigned.
 - b. The killing of the American ambassador and his aides at Benghazi, Libya, and the failure to heed the warning of an attack and protect the embassy were being investigated to determine the responsibility of Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and the State Department.
8. Rep. Attkisson is suing the Justice Department for \$35 million. This shows that doing what is right could lead to making money. Hence the proposed academic and business venture(†>OL2:846).

2. Edward Snowden's leak and NSA's unlawful surveillance of the public

9. Your findings can ignite hotter national outrage than that sparked by the documents leaked by E. Snowden showing that NSA was collecting unlawfully, without warrants, metadata –e.g., phone numbers, callers' and callees' names, call dates and duration– of scores of millions of phone calls. The documents showed that; he did not have to prove anything. Moreover, NSA did not prevent any calls, whereas the judges prevent the delivery of emails and mail based on their contents critical of them and damaging to their pretended reputation for respect for the law(*>OL:194§E).

D. Strategic thinking: presenting your findings to the presidential candidates

10. We may publish the findings of the investigation. However, the strategic thinking behind this proposal is for us to do something reasonably calculated to be more effective: present them to each of the presidential candidates. Each of them desperately needs to attract national media and public attention by informing his or her audiences at rallies, townhall meetings, press conferences, and interviews about an issue that launches a media buzz and investigative journalism leading to an eruption of public outrage. The candidate can become the public's voice for the issue and earn donations, campaign volunteers, positive word of mouth, and thereby something that is a life or death matter for his or her campaign: qualification for the next nationally televised presidential debate.
11. Desperate people, such as the 25 candidates, do desperate things, such as taking on judges. What warrants taking that risk is what they stand to gain: the attention of the parties to the more than 50 million new suits filed in the state and federal courts every year(*>jur:8^{4,5}), increased by the parties to the hundreds of millions of suits pending or deemed to have been wrongly or wrongfully decided. They form the huge untapped voting bloc of The Dissatisfied with the Judicial and Legal System.
12. All this supports the reasonable expectation that one or more of the candidates will accept our offer of a presentation of our findings and probable cause and will even act on them by making an Emile Zola's *I accuse!*-like denunciation(*>jur:98§2) of unaccountable judges' riskless abuse of power. It may be as transformative of the judicial and legal system as the exposés of Harvey Weinstein's abuse published by *The New York Times* and *The New Yorker* on October 5 and 10, 2017, respectively, were of society: from one where sexual abusees suffered in isolation, silence, and shame, into a courageous *MeToo!* national public that shouts a self-assertive, compensation-demanding(†>OL2:914¶4), rallying cry: *Enough is enough! We won't take abuse of any kind by anybody anymore.*

E. IT expertise to enhance <http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org>

13. You and the rest of us on the multidisciplinary team can also make a name for ourselves by applying our expertise to attract venture capital(†>OL2:914) to develop Judicial Discipline Reform as described in the business plan(OL2:563). The first stage will enhance its website from a free informational site into one with advanced features and offering fee-paying services(jur:130§5):
 - a. a clearinghouse for complaints about judges that anybody can upload free of charge; and
 - b. a research center for the fee-paying auditing(*>OL:274-280, 304-307) of judicial writings through statistical, linguistic, and literary analysis in search of the most persuasive type of evidence, i.e., patterns, trends, and schemes(†>OL2:614) of abuse of power(†>OL2:760).

F. The action that you can take now

14. I encourage you to discuss this proposal(†>OL2:929) with multidisciplinary experts. Then we can hold a video conference where I can make a presentation to you and your guests. Hence you may share and post it to social media widely. That requires swift action to take advantage of the competition among the largest number of candidates for an issue that can save their campaigns.
15. You can thus contribute to informing *We the People* how judges, who took an oath to defend the Constitution and apply the law, deprive *the People* of their most cherished constitutional rights, those that under the First Amendment guarantee “freedom of speech, of the press, the right of the people peaceably to assemble [through the Internet and on social media too], and to petition the Government [of which judges are the third branch] for a redress of grievances”(†>OL2:792¶1). That is how you can become nationally recognized as one of *the People's* Champions of Justice.

Dare trigger history!(†>OL2:1125)...and you may enter it.

March 30, 2020

**Proposal to publishers and lawyers to adapt to
a shrinking and Covid-dried up legal market
to make money while
pioneering transformative change in the system of justice**

Mr. Tyler Duke[‡] tyler.duke@lexisnexis.com
Associate Tele Account Exec
LexisNexis
9443 Springboro Pike
Miamisburg, OH 45342 USA
work tel. +1(937)247 3182

Dear Mr. Duke and associates Mr. Austin Dunn, Ms. Lane Okney, Mr. Connor McGovern, and Assigning Editors...and all other publishers and lawyers,

Thank you, Mr. Duke, for your email, where you ended with this empathetic statement:

...today is not normal. So, we want to do everything we can to support you – so you can support your clients. If there is anything I can do in the meantime, please reach out.

A. An already shrinking legal market totally shrunk by Covid-19

1. I am reaching out with a proposal that may not be the normal way in which you support your clients, but is what you can do to support them as well as your employer, LexisNexis, and even grow your and its pool of clients nationwide.
2. Indeed, with the courts closed and jury trials suspended, clients are not paying anymore, never mind bringing new business to lawyers.
3. In fact, the only sector of the legal market growing today is that of the pro ses. It will only keep growing, for people who are or have been unemployed due to the epidemic will not flock to lawyers after it is over to pay them attorney's fees of \$100, \$200, \$300, \$400, \$500 or more per hour. The prospect for lawyers is bleak.
4. By contrast, the prospect for LexisNexis can be bright if it adapts to these new long-term realities of the legal market and the rest of the economy. Here is how:
5. Clients and 100% of the non-essential workforce is staying home. They have much more time to read emails and postings to your online publications. This is the most opportune time to offer them information about how judges run judicial process. The latter forces people to go through one of the most anxiety-causing experiences, for so much is at stake, it is so difficult to understand, and it confronts them with expenses that run into the \$1Ks and even \$10Ks.
6. Judges affect 100% of the workforce and everybody else, regardless of whether they are, have been, or will never be parties to lawsuits but will continue to be susceptible to the precedential value of judicial decisions. Everybody is subject to judges' exercise of their enormous power over our property, liberty, and all the rights and duties that frame our lives and shape our identities.
7. Judges abuse that power because they are unaccountable so that 'their power is absolute, which corrupts them absolutely'(*>[jur27fn28](#)). Their abuse is riskless. Committing it only has an upside: grabbing gain and convenience.

8. Nothing reaches deeper into the human soul and festers longer therein than the feeling of being or having been abused; nothing makes people more passionate and committed than the quest for Justice. Very often, that quest aims to obtain or can only end up receiving monetary compensation. The insightful appreciation of these facts and the competitively savvy handling of them open a business opportunity for a pioneering publisher.

B. Adapting to the new normal legal market by informing the public about, and outraging it at, judges' abuse of power

9. Providing information about how judges abuse their power and outraging the people who were and may be abused by going to court constitute the foundation of a reasonably calculated strategy for adapting to these times of a shrinking legal market, which Covid-19 has reduced to zero, while pioneering a new one.
10. Consequently, my proposal is for LexisNexis([†]>OL2:744) and others to publish one or a series of my articles, whether already written([†]>OL2:719§C) or written on commission, on how unaccountable judges risklessly abuse lawyers, parties, and everybody else.
11. These articles are supported by my 2-volume professional study* [†] of judges and their judiciaries, titled and downloadable thus:

**Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and
Consequent Riskless Wrongdoing:
Pioneering the news and publishing field of
judicial unaccountability reporting* [†]**

C. Articles for pioneering a legal news and publishing market

12. The following is a sample of subjects of articles apt for LexisNexis and others([†]>OL2:1060) to apt to the new normal legal market by informing and outraging the national public concerning unaccountable judges' riskless abuse of power.

1. Sen. Warren's denunciation of judges' abusive self-enrichment

13. In her "plan for the Judiciary too"[‡], Sen. Elizabeth Warren dare denounce federal judges for failing to recuse themselves from cases in which they hold shares in the company of one of the parties before them and resolving such conflict of interests in their own favor so as to protect or enhance the value of their shares. Sen. Warren explains judges' abusive self-enrichment by their reliance on their unaccountability. Her plan envisages the adoption of legislation to hold judges accountable for enriching themselves abusively([†]>OL2:998, 1003[‡]).
- [‡] http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-media_DARE.pdf
14. Sen. Warren's denunciation unwittingly validates the key finding of the study* [†]: The class of judges acting collectively as opposed to rogue judges acting individually, have institutionalized their abuse of power as their and their judiciary's modus operandi.
15. Their abusive self-enrichment necessarily entails judges' committing in an organized way the crimes of concealment of assets, tax evasion, money laundering, and fraud.
16. A key circumstance enabling these crimes is that judges file misleading annual financial disclosure reports(*>jur:65^{107c}) required by the Ethics in Government Act(jur:65^{107d}). While they are public documents(jur:105^{213a}), they are filed pro forma with, since they are approved as a matter of course by, not independent non-judges, but rather other judges, who are their peers, colleagues, and

* http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf >all prefixes:# up to OL:393 OL2:1067

friends; subject to the same filing obligation([jur:102§a; 213b](#)); and dependent for their survival on reciprocal approval since they too commit and cover up crimes([jur:88§§a-c](#)). The resulting unaccountability removes the moral reins on greed and allows it to run amok into corruption.

17. Another area of organized criminal activity is the bankruptcy fraud scheme([†][OL2:614](#)) involving \$100s of billions([jur:27§2](#)). Judges abuse bankrupts, most of whom for obvious reasons cannot afford lawyers; appear pro se; are incapable of understanding the mind-boggling complexity of the Bankruptcy Code and procedural rules; and although *unfair game* are *wiped out!*
18. The editor and publisher who support the publication of this story can reap commercial and reputational benefits for years to come(^{*}[OL:3§F](#)). They will be acting like *Washington Post* editor Benjamin Bradlee and publisher Katherine Graham. Both of them approved the publication of the story by reporters Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein of the break-in at the Democratic National Committee headquarters at the Watergate complex in Washington, DC, on June 17, 1972. Thereafter they unflinchingly supported their follow-up stories until President Nixon resigned on August 8, 1974.
19. This story of judges' criminal self-enrichment can force the resignation of judges and even justices(^{*}[jur:92§c](#)), who have committed it and covered up its commission by their peers and colleagues. The story can set in motion the downfall of the Federal Judiciary itself by exposing it –and its state counterparts, whose judges are unaccountable too([OL2:887§A](#))– as corruptly organized to function as a racketeering enterprise([†][OL2:1051](#)).

2. Judges do not read the vast majority of briefs

20. This is demonstrated by “the math of abuse”([†][OL2:608§A](#)), which constitutes an innovative way of analyzing judges' performance using the objectivity of math rather than the subjectivity of a personal assessment of their decisions.
21. Judges require that each party file in support of its case or motion a brief that costs \$Ks and even \$10Ks to produce([†][OL2:760§A](#)) although they know that they will in all likelihood not read it. Instead, they have their clerks dump most briefs out of the judges' caseload by applying robotically guidelines to identify those cases to be disposed of by the clerks issuing unresearched, unreasoned, arbitrary orders lacking any discussion of the facts and the law, and contained in what the clerks only need to date, fill out the blanks, and rubberstamp: *a dumping form!*

3. Judges intercept people's emails and mail to detect and suppress those of their critics

22. Judges' interception and suppression of people's emails and mail([†][OL2:781, 929](#)) amounts to their trampling on Americans' most cherished rights, namely, those under the First Amendment guaranteeing “freedom of speech, of the press, the right of the people peaceably to assemble [through the Internet and on social media too], and to petition the Government [of which judges are the third branch] for a redress of grievances”([†][OL2:792¶1](#)).
23. Exposing this interception by judges will cause national outrage graver than that resulting from Edward Snowden's leak of documents showing the NSA's unlawful surveillance of scores of millions of phone calls to collect their metadata, e.g., phone numbers of callers and callees, duration of the call, call origin and destination, but without suppressing any call at all.

4. The sham hearings on judicial accountability

24. Sham hearings on judicial accountability have been held by politicians and the judges that they put and protect on the bench, lest the judges defend their unaccountability by resorting to their devastating power of retaliation(*>Lsch:17§C). As a result, neither court/law clerks nor parties to lawsuits can expect a fair and impartial hearing of their grievances against judges(†>OL2:1056^φ).

^φ http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-reporters_clerks.pdf

5. Judges' abusive dismissal of 100% of complaints against them

25. Judges self-ensure their unaccountability by dismissing 100% of complaints against them, which must be filed with them, and deny 100% of petitions to review those dismissals(*>jur:10-14; †>OL2:548, 748). Through such systematic self-interested dismissals and their power of retaliation, judges maintain the status that they have arrogated for themselves: a State within the state.

6. Invoking the Chief Justice's conduct at the impeachment trial

26. After the courts reopen for business, parties can invoke as precedent for their own benefit the disregard by Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., during the Senate impeachment trial of "traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice"(†>OL2:1040^φ, 1045); and his application in connivance with the Senate of a mutual self-serving live and let live complicit arrangement: 'I will let you run the impeachment trial however you want, and you let us, the judges, run the Judiciary however we want, regardless of the requirements of due process and equal protection of the law'.

^φ http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-parties_invoking_impeachment_trial.pdf

D. Pioneering citizens hearings and the conference on judges' abuse of power

27. The articles mentioned above and similar ones will allow LexisNexis to take the lead in joining forces to hold unprecedented citizens hearings.
28. As opposed to congressional hearings, citizens hearings are to be held at reputable media outlets, particularly national publications and TV/radio networks, and universities; nationally broadcast live through interactive multimedia; conducted by reporters, professors, and other experts, who will take the testimony of victims of, and witnesses to, judges' abuse; likely to appeal to presidential and all other 2020 candidates, who have an electoral interest in gaining the attention, donations, and votes of the huge(*>OL:8^{4,5}) untapped voting bloc of The Dissatisfied with the Judicial and Legal System.
29. The findings of the citizen hearings can be presented to the national public at an event that LexisNexis can also take the lead in organizing: the first-ever conference on judicial abuse exposure and compensation of victims, hosted by a top university and media networks and attended by live and digital audiences.

E. Abuse institutionalized for millennia and deemed impossible to change has been defeated through transformative change

30. Forms of abuse have been institutionalized for thousands of years to protect powerful abusers and maintain the season open to keep preying on the weak. But courageous and stubborn people have never stopped fighting the abuse although theirs appeared to be a losing battle. Yet, it was not.
31. Slavery, in place since the beginning of mankind when some people realized that they were stronger than others, was abolished by the 13th Amendment in 1865.

32. The ban on women voting, a symbol of the oppression of women by men, was lifted by the 19th Amendment in 1920.
33. Beginning with a Louisiana case in 1985, judges have held pedophilic priests and their churches accountable and liable despite their invocation of the state and church separation clause of the First Amendment. This was the first time in the recent past that a form of institutionalized abuse that had lasted thousands of years began to undergo transformative change.
34. To date, the Catholic Church has paid its victims of sexual abuse well over \$2.2 billion in compensation. After the enactment in at least 15 states of lookback laws that allow the filing of sexual abuse claims stretching back decades and otherwise barred by the statute of limitations, some 5,000 new cases could force the Catholic Church to compensate the victims by paying them more than \$4 billion.
35. Sexual abuse of women and the disbelief of their claims had been an institution of society for millennia. But then *The New York Times (NYT)* and *The New Yorker (NY)* published on October 5 and 10, 2017, respectively, their exposés of Harvey Weinstein's sexual predation. In less than a week, on October 16, the *MeToo!* movement began to emerge worldwide after actress Alyssa Milano called on Twitter for victims of sexual abuse to accuse their abusers. *MeToo!* accusers have brought people at the top of the entertainment and news industry and the rest of society down for their sexual abuse.
36. Those are reliable precedents for other forms of abuse, also reputed to be millennial impossibles, such as holding judges accountable for their performance and liable to compensate the victims of their abuse of power, to be defeated by transformative change.

F. Judges' abuse of power exposed through a scoop and leading to investigations

37. Judges and their judiciaries are among the last bastions of institutionalized abuse of power. The time has come for them to be held accountable and liable to compensation, for in government by the rule of law Everybody is Equal Before the Law.
38. By publishing my articles, LexisNexis can make a scoop. The articles may go viral. They can launch the first salvo against the judges' and their judiciaries' bastion.
39. Other publishers will join the fight in a Ukrainian scandal-like generalized media investigation into unaccountable judges' riskless abuse of power and its several manifestations mentioned above ([†]>OL2:1060).
40. That investigation will be conducted by professional journalists with the support of an army of citizen journalists among the scores of millions of people who have been abused by judges. It will lead, not just to the impeachment and trial of one officer, but rather to the resignation of judges, justices(^{*}>OL:92§c), and even a whole branch.
41. The investigation conducted jointly by LexisNexis and me can jump ahead from the springboard of a wealth of leads(^{*}>OL:194§E). Both my articles and our investigation can cause an informed and outraged public to keep coming back to us for more information and the latest findings.

G. Facilitating people coming to us through a website enhancement, and going to them on a tour of presentations

42. To facilitate people coming to us, LexisNexis can support[‡] the professional law research and

writing, and strategic thinking([†]>OL2:445§B, 475§D) of Judicial Discipline Reform.

‡ https://www.paypal.com/cgi-bin/webscr?cmd=_s-xclick&hosted_button_id=HBFP5252TB5YJ;

or at

<https://www.gofundme.com/expose-unaccountable-judges-abuse>

43. Articles like this one have been posted to its website at <http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org>. They consist only of text with no graphics, pictures, video, or sound. Yet, they have been assessed so positively by countless visitors that 30,811 have become website subscribers as of this writing. You can join them by going to the website and either surfing to <left panel ↓Register or clicking + New or Users >Add New.
44. Ever more visitors and subscribers can be attracted to the website so that they bring with them their information and investigative leads as well as their business. Indeed, as proposed in the business plan(OL2:1022) of Judicial Discipline Reform, its website can be enhanced to add to it:
 - a. a **clearinghouse** for complaints([†]>OL2:792, 918) about judges that anybody can upload; and
 - b. a **research center** for auditing(*>OL:274-280, 304-307) many complaints in search of (*>jur:131§b, OL:255) the most persuasive type of evidence, which a single complaint cannot provide, namely, patterns([†]>OL2:792§A), trends(OL2:455§§B, D), and schemes(OL2:614, 929) of abuse of power. The research tools can include sophisticated software(*>OL:42; [†]>OL2:846) that:
 - 1) on the one hand, allow anybody to frame queries using natural language; and
 - 2) on the other hand, enable researchers(*>jur:128§4) to take advantage of artificial intelligence to conduct advanced statistical, linguistic, and literary analysis (jur:131§b) of judges' decisions as well as all other writings;
 - c. the website center can be developed into a **multidisciplinary academic(*>OL:60, 255) and business(*>jur:153§§c-g) center** that functions as a department of LexisNexis or is attached to a top university that sponsors it.
45. Simultaneously, LexisNexis can go to the public by sponsoring a tour where I present(*>jur:119§1) the articles and the investigation findings at numerous appropriate venues(*>OL:197§G), such as journalism, law, business, and Information Technology schools, bar associations, public defender and pro se organizations, etc.

H. Victims seeking compensation through local chapters of a national movement

46. The articles and the presentations can alert parties to the abuse that judges inflicted, are inflicting, and will likely inflict upon them. Almost all parties, whether pro se or represented by an attorney, go to court alone and prosecute their cases separately. As a result, they suffer in isolation and silence judges' abuse and the anger that it provokes incessantly. *They need not be alone*. Rather, they can join forces to shout self-assertively the rallying cry:

Enough is enough!
We won't take any abuse
by anybody, even judges, anymore.

47. LexisNexis and I can promote their joining of forces by relying on another current and repeatable

precedent: the emergence of the Tea Party. Advocating the single issue of tax reduction, the Tea Party sparked ever more local chapters. They coalesced into a national movement that in less than 10 years rose to dominate national politics.

48. The Tea Party and the *MeToo!* movement make it realistic for LexisNexis and me to strive to form local chapters and coalesce them into a national, single issue, apolitical civic movement for judicial abuse of power exposure, compensation of victims, and reform. This is a realistic and commercially promising proposition since we would be catering to the huge^(†>OL2:719¶¶6-8) bloc of The Dissatisfied with the Judicial and Legal System.
49. In this context, the article on, and subsequent investigation into, judges who do not read most briefs and have their clerks dump the corresponding cases out of their caseload through dumping forms(^{supra ¶¶21-22}) can provide a potent incentive for the formation of the local chapters. The latter will be constituted of parties before the same judge or in the same court who join forces to demand the refund of their court filing fees, compensation for briefs intentionally rendered wasteful, and punitive damages for fraud.
50. LexisNexis and I can promote these local chapters by channeling to them necessary legal assistance directly and indirectly by:
 - a. publishing adequate how-to pamphlets(^{*>OL:274-280, 304-307}) and standardized arguments accessible to laypeople(^{*>jur:123§§a-c}) as well as offering webinars (^{†>OL2:957});
 - b. calling on law school deans(^{†>OL2:644}), professors(^{†>OL2:1045, 973, 932, 773}) and student class officers(^{OL2:747, 641}) to offer and enroll in clinics where students supervised by professors assist the chapters(^{†>OL2:571¶24a}); and
 - c. developing a niche market for recently graduated, the glut of unemployed, and established lawyers to represent victims as they jointly as chapter members or as individual parties file a host of motions for refund of court filing fees and compensation as well as for vacating decisions and remanding for new trial or appeal process.
51. That is how LexisNexis and I can for the first time in history bring about, to begin with in our country and then abroad, a system of justice where *We the People of the World*, the masters of all public servants, hold also our judicial public servants accountable and liable to compensate the victims of their abuse. That is how for the sake of *the People* we can become pioneers of transformative change in the system of Justice.

I. Offer of a presentation

52. I offer to present this proposal to you and your group of colleagues and other guests via video conference. You may use the information below to contact me and discuss the presentation's terms and conditions and its scheduling.
53. To decide whether to organize such a presentation watch my video together with its supporting slides(^{†>OL2:958}) using the following links:

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_video.mp4

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_slides.pdf

I look forward to hearing from you.

Dare trigger history!(^{†>OL2:1003})...and you may enter it.

April 17, 2020

The facts and precedent giving rise to probable cause to believe that judges have intercepted our emails and mail, and that exposing them can be a scoop leading to the resignation of judges and justices for running their judiciary as a racketeering enterprise

Mr. Austin Dunn Austin.Dunn@lexisnexis.com
Legal Solutions consultant tel. (937)247-8120 direct
LexisNexis

Dear Mr. Dunn, Mr. Tyler Duke, Rep. Lane Okney, LexisNexis, and all other publishers, journalists, and lawyers,

Thank you, Mr. Dunn, for your email under the subject line "Re:" [and nothing more]. There you wrote, "Good Morning. I wanted to circle back around on my below email as this promotion ends April 30th. Is there a good time today to speak?" You may call me at (718)827-9521.

A. My repeated effort to communicate with you

1. Kindly, before calling me, read the below proposal to you, your colleagues, LexisNexis itself, and other publishers. It can also be downloaded through this link in the footer[‡].
2. That proposal replies to the email that your colleague, Mr. Tyler Duke (+1(937)247-3182), sent me under the subject line: "Re: New: LexisNexis Economic Relief Promotion".
3. Before Mr. Duke emailed me, you, Mr. Dunn, had taken the initiative to call me last January 14,. Since then, I have sent you and your colleagues from my three email accounts more than 10 emails with your names in the salutation. I have also sent you all many other emails addressed to publishers in general and to specific professionals. I have not received any reply to any of my emails from either you, your colleagues, or the overwhelming majority of the other addressees. Your latest email -of April 16- neither is addressed to me nor refers to my emails. It is a general email. Facts and statistics(OL2:781, 885, 889-913, 929) support probable cause to believe that there are...

B. Emails/mail interceptors: the usual suspects are those with the most to lose

4. All my emails to you included a group of the same addressees. Had they received them, some would have replied or protested receiving the same email so many times, some even rebuking me, 'I've not replied because I'm not interested in your email. *Don't you get it?!* TAKE ME OFF YOUR EMAILING LIST RIGHT AWAY.' But nobody protested, for nobody received the same email repeatedly.
5. In the same vein, if you did not receive any of my emails, and if you did and sent me a reply but it did not reach me, you can reasonably conclude that our emails have been intercepted in a non-accidental, non-coincidental way. Rather, their interception is intentional and systematic.
6. My emails criticize unaccountable judges for risklessly abusing their power and call for holding them accountable for their performance and liable to compensate the victims of their abuse. The most likely interceptors are those most interested in preventing their critics from communicating with each other and others. The interception of emails and mail is a federal crime involving interstate means of communication and a deprivation of the constitutional guarantees of "freedom of speech, of the press, the right of the people peaceably to assemble [via email and on social media], and to petition the Government [of which judges are the third branch] for a redress of grievances [e.g., compensation for abuse]".

* http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf >all prefixes:# up to OL:393 OL2:1081

‡ http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_intercepting_emails_mail.pdf

7. Can you imagine the national outrage provoked by the publication by LexisNexis or another courageous and commercially savvy publisher of my article exposing judges' interception of the emails and mail of scores of millions of people in order to detect and suppress those of their critics?

C. The precedent for the reasonable expectation about exposing judges' abuse

8. Only imagine a repeat of what happened after the publication by *The New York Times* and *The New Yorker* on October 5 and 10, 2017, respectively, of their exposés of Harvey Weinstein's sexual abuses. In less than a week, on October 16, his victims began to speak out and the *MeToo!* movement erupted, spreading worldwide with unprecedented celerity and assertiveness. It now constitutes a precedent. It is repeatable.
9. Since then *MeToo!* accusers have brought decades-long untouchable VIP sexual abusers at the top of the entertainment and news industries and other high places of society down to where their victims and other common people can hold them accountable and liable. Indeed, abuser Weinstein was convicted and sentenced by a federal court (SDNY) to 23 years in prison; he has settled or offered to settle with some of his victims for millions of dollars ...and he must still stand trial in California for even more of his abuse.

1. Your publishing can repeat the precedent & have graver consequences

10. Your publication of one or a series of my articles exposing judges' abuse of power, summarized below, can have far graver consequences: It can launch a process that ends up making unavoidable the resignation of both the judges who have coordinated their institution's systemic abuse and all those who have covered for them.
11. Among them are the Supreme Court justices. As 'circuit justices', they supervise the judges of each circuit. What is more, they can reasonably be suspected of having abused their power as lower court judges and still abusing it from the high court...after all, the justices too are unaccountable. Why walk away from all the gain and convenience that can be grabbed by abusing power?
12. Therefore, the exposure of judges' and justices' coordinated abuse can provoke such national outrage as to render untenable their holding on to office. This makes it reasonable to expect the resignation of the Supreme Court itself as well as the rest of the Federal Judiciary. They have turned abuse into their modus operandi so as to run their institution as a racketeering enterprise.
13. Your publication of my articles can set in motion this graver repeat of the *MeToo!* precedent.
14. **What is in it for you?** You can even repeat and surpass another precedent of historic proportions: the courageous publication by *Washington Post* editor Ben Bradlee and publisher Katharine Graham of the articles of reporters Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein exposing President Nixon's participation in the Watergate scandal. They were instrumental in setting off a generalized media investigation that extended and deepened the exposure. Their initial publication eventually forced Nixon's resignation on August 8, 1974, and led to the conviction and imprisonment of "*All the President's Men*", i.e., all his White House aides.

D. Articles based on a study; and a website for "Making Money While Doing Justice"

15. My articles and the above statements are supported by my 2-volume professional study* † of judges and their judiciaries, titled and downloadable thus:

Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Abuse of Power:
Pioneering the news and publishing field of judicial unaccountability reporting* †

16. My law research and writing and strategic thinking also support my website at <http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org>. It has attracted so many visitors that 31,099 of them and counting have become subscribers as of April 17.
17. I trust that number of subscribers catches your imagination and that of your colleagues, Lexis-Nexis, and all savvy publishers and investors who know how the Internet economic model works: A website that has proven its attraction for the national public is further developed to provide advanced services for a fee and sell goods to visitors and all the more so to subscribers, such as:
 - a. a **clearinghouse** for complaints([†]>OL2:918) about judges that anybody can upload;
 - b. a **research center** for auditing(*>OL:274-280, 304-307) decisions, complaints, and other writings in search of(jur:131§b; OL:255) the most persuasive type of evidence, i.e., patterns ([†]>OL2:792§A), trends(OL2:455§§B, D), and schemes(OL2:614, 929) of abuse of power
18. The website also proposes a program of concrete, realistic, and feasible actions(OL2:978§E) to engage visitors and subscribers in forming local chapters for parties with cases before the same judge or in the same court to join forces to demand compensation for the abuse that judges have inflicted upon them. The expectation of being compensated by pursuing their quest for justice through a promising joint effort is bound to attract many people and motivate them into action.
19. They will also be inspired to act by a purpose greater than their own benefit and apt to foster the common good of Equal Justice Under Law: coalescing the local chapters into a national, single issue, apolitical civic movement for judicial abuse of power exposure, compensation, and reform.
20. The development of the website and implementation of the program of actions are supported by a business plan([†]>OL2:1022) that is guided by the motto Making Money While Doing Justice. All this shows a realistic appreciation of the fact that every meaningful cause needs resources for its advancement; none can be continued, let alone advanced, without money.

E. What is in it for you and my offer of a presentation to you and your guests

21. Exposing the Federal Judiciary, the model for its state counterparts, as a racketeering enterprise, would be a scoop. You can open the door to making it and winning a Pulitzer Prize. Instead of selling books for your company for the rest of your life or you can make history as an agent of transformative change([†]>OL2:1069§E) in the system of justice worldwide: You can help to turn the millennial impossible of holding judges accountable into the reality of holding them so accountable as to be liable to compensate the victims of their abuse. Your choice and legacy.
22. To lay this out in greater detail and answer your questions and those of your colleagues and other guests, I offer to make via video conference a presentation on this proposal for your publication of one or a series of my articles and participation in the commercial development of my website and implementation of the rest of the business plan. You may call me or use the information in the letterhead to contact me and discuss the presentation's terms and conditions and its scheduling.
23. To help you decide whether to organize the presentation you may share the link[‡] to this proposal with your colleagues and guests, and watch my video together with its slides([†]>OL2:958):

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_video.mp4

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_slides.pdf
24. Meantime, I look forward to hearing from you.

Dare trigger history!([†]>OL2:1003)...and you may enter it.

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

Judicial Discipline Reform

New York City

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

Exposing
Judges' Unaccountability
and
Consequent Riskless Abuse of Power

Pioneering
the news and publishing field
of
judicial unaccountability reporting

A study of judges and their judiciaries, who held unaccountable by themselves through their self-exemption from complaints and by politicians, have turned abuse of power into their institutionalized way of doing business; and their exposure by applying a strategy that out of court informs of, and outrages at, judges' abuse the only entity capable of forcing reform and holding them liable:

We the People, the masters of all public servants, including judicial public servants

Volume I:

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf

Volume II: http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf

<https://independent.academia.edu/DrRichardCorderoEsq>

©2019 Richard Cordero

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

Judicial Discipline Reform

New York City

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

Exposing
Judges' Unaccountability
and
Consequent Riskless Abuse of Power
Pioneering
the news and publishing field
of
judicial unaccountability reporting

A study of judges and their judiciaries, who held unaccountable by themselves through their self-exemption from complaints and by politicians, have turned abuse of power into their institutionalized way of doing business; and their exposure by applying a strategy that out of court informs of, and outrages at, judges' **abuse** the only entity capable of forcing reform and holding them liable: *We the People*, the masters of all public servants, including judicial public servants

Volume II:

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf

Volume I: http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf

<https://independent.academia.edu/DrRichardCorderoEsq>

©2019 Richard Cordero

- Dashboard
- Posts
- Media
- Pages
- Comments 10
- WooCommerce
- Products
- Appearance
- Plugins 6
- Users**
- All Users
- Add New
- Your Profile
- Tools
- Settings 1
- Collapse menu

Users [Add New](#)

SSL activated!

- Take the time to review these things
- > Don't forget to change your settings in Google Analytics and Webmaster tools. [More info](#)
 - > Improve your security [with security headers](#)

Really Simple SSL Pro



Hi, Really Simple SSL has kept your site secure for a month now, awesome! If you have a moment, please consider leaving a review on WordPress.org to spread the word. We greatly appreciate your questions or feedback, leave us a [message](#).

- Rogier

- [Leave a review](#) [Maybe later](#) [Don't show again](#)

All (32,756) | Administrator (1) | **Subscriber (32,755)**

[Bulk Actions](#) [Apply](#) [Change role to...](#) [Change](#)

32,756 items

<input type="checkbox"/>	Username	Name	Email	Role
<input type="checkbox"/>	1970mdegcf	—	einarcruickshank1989@e.bengira.com	Subscriber
<input type="checkbox"/>	1Barrett1cuple	—	tornado102034@hotmail.com	Subscriber
<input type="checkbox"/>	1oftheman	—	terree@comcast.net	Subscriber
<input type="checkbox"/>	365betv31h	—	yana.negrebetskaya.95@mail.ru	Subscriber
<input type="checkbox"/>	3aplust63von	—	sam@3aplust63.ru	Subscriber

Blank

End page