

November 1, 2020

**Proposal of a strategy to defend American democracy
from politicians in connivance with unaccountable abusive judges,
by the media and universities holding
UNPRECEDENTED CITIZENS HEARINGS
through which victims of abuse and an outraged national public
can lead to the constitutional convention petitioned by 34 states
and a new constitution of *We the People*.**

A reply to
Lawyers in Defense of American Democracy (LDAD) and
the 2,000+ signatories of its open letter
"A Primer on the Damage Done to Our Democracy and Repairs Needed" ‡

Dear LDAD, the 2,000+ signatories of your letter, the media, universities, and people with abuse stories to tell at citizens hearings,

1. I read with interest your above-mentioned open letter of Wednesday, October 28. Therein you state, "it is important for all lawyers...to consider the impact of what the President [Trump] has done on the future of our democracy [and] think about what you can do, and what you can urge others to do,...to stop what in the last analysis has all of the earmarks of a coup in slow motion".

A. The damage that P. Trump will cause by appealing to *his* justices

2. What follows is what I urge LDAD, the signatories of its open letter, the media, universities, and others to do. I urge our joining of forces to adopt and implement a reasonably calculated strategy to counter starting now what President Trump has stated for months he will do if he loses the election next November 3:
3. He will claim that his loss is the outcome of "the most corrupt election in the history of our country" as a result of Democrats' electoral fraud through mail-in ballots. Hence, he will mount legal challenges that should lead him all the way to the Supreme Court. There he expects his newly confirmed Justice Barrett and her other conservative peers to declare him the winner or invalidate the election.
4. His manipulation of the court system will throw the country into a protracted period of political and social chaos. It will be followed by an even longer period of popular distrust of the Supreme Court, the rest of the Federal Judiciary, and democracy itself, thus shown to be, not in the hands of *We the People*, but rather at the mercy of 5 or 6 justices.
5. More ominous than "a coup in slow motion", P. Trump will stage 'a coup with *his* justices'. They are members of his private army: many of the more than 200 district and circuit judges with whom Trump has 'packed' the Federal Judiciary during the past four years with the assistance of Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, who has limited the hearing on confirming each of them to a life-appointment to two hours. Ten of the nominees, a record high number, were found by the American Bar Association not to be qualified for the judgeship for which the President had nominated them. The damage already done to the Judiciary and democracy will be aggravated.

B. The damage caused by judges dismissing 100% of complaints against them

* http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf >all prefixes:# up to OL:393 OL2:1187

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

6. The repair can start now. The open letter is a clear and loud informative cry about the damage done.
7. This email and [the article below*](#) lay out a strategy for repairing the damage. It begins by using the official statistics, in particular, of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, where Then-Judge Barrett sat, and, in general, of the rest of the Federal Judiciary, on the 100% dismissal by federal judges of complaints against them.
8. What that statistic implies is a threat to democracy: Judges abuse their self-discipline authority entrusted to them by Congress to self-exonerate from the underlying complained-about abuse of power.
9. Judges have turned the Federal Judiciary from the last bastion of defense of democracy based on the rule of law into a fiefdom of their own where ‘judges can do no wrong’. The fiefdom castle has been packed with the justices that P. Trump has appointed to the Supreme Court.
10. However, all the other lords have been nominated by Republican and Democratic politicians, all of whom have abdicated their duty to exercise checks and balances on judges in order to avoid their retaliation. A life-appointment gives judges a very long memory during which to hold grudges against those trying to hold them accountable.
11. Thus, politicians of both parties are the enablers of judges’ unaccountability and consequent riskless abuse of power.
12. In fact, a politician as knowledgeable about financial matters and their regulation as Senator Elizabeth Warren dare denounce in her “I have a plan for the Federal Judiciary too” how federal judges fail to recuse themselves from cases in which they own stock in one of the companies that is a party to the case before them in order to resolve the ensuing conflict of interests in their favor by protecting or increasing their stock’s value. Sen. Warren refers to such practice throughout that Judiciary as federal judges’ abusive self-enrichment. She attributes it to their unaccountability.
13. Their abusive self-enrichment necessarily entails their commission of the crimes of concealment of assets, tax evasion, money laundering, fraud, and breach of contract for judicial services, of public trust, and of the oath of office.
14. As shown by the official statistics and such denunciation, *We the People* have become the prey of judges’ hunting parties everywhere all the time, for it is open season anytime *the People* come within the jurisdiction of their fiefdom.

C. A study that ascertains “repairs needed” by a democracy damaged by judges and their Judiciary

15. Your defense of American democracy must begin by exposing the full nature, extent, and gravity of judges’ abuse of it. Such exposure must precede any discussion of reformative “repairs needed”.
16. A solid basis for the exposure is the original analysis of official court statistics, reports, and statements found in my two-volume study* † of judges and their judiciaries, which is the product of the professional law research and writing and strategic thinking of **Judicial Discipline Reform: Exposing Judges’ Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Abuse of Power: Pioneering the news and publishing field of judicial unaccountability reporting* †**
17. The exposure can continue with the information that lawyers can move for in court and that *the People* can provide at unprecedented citizens hearings. The latter are different from congressional

hearings, which the members of Congress who have connived with abusive judges will turn into sham hearings, as they did previous ones.

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

D. Motions for recusal, release of FBI vetting reports, and an independent investigation through citizens hearings

18. Herein there is no impugning of judges' competence, which is a matter subject to discretionary judgment and personal and partisan bias.
19. Rather, it is judges' integrity that is being impeached based on their own actions officially reported to Congress in the statistics contained in the Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, as shown in the article below.
20. If 'the integrity of attorneys general and his law enforcement officers should not be in doubt', as asserted in your letter, a fortiori neither should be that of judges. The integrity of judges "is paramount" in defending democracy.
21. The statistics showing justices' and judges' compromised integrity can be used as an objective and indisputable basis for lawyers with cases before the Supreme Court to move for: http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_JgACBarrett_condonation_judges_power_abuse.pdf
 - a. Justice Barrett to recuse herself;
 - b. the rest of the justices to recuse her;
 - c. the Court to order, not another exercise in deception of the public similar to the internally produced and self-exonerating Breyer Report, ordered by Chief Justice Rehnquist in 2004 and submitted to Chief Justice Roberts in 2006, but rather an *independent* investigation of the Federal Judiciary. It should begin with the Court ordering:
 - 1) the FBI, the Department of Justice (DoJ), and the Senate to release the reports by the FBI/DoJ on their vetting of the justices and the lower court judges while they were being considered for judgeships and justiceships and after being nominated therefor (if P. Trump prohibited the FBI/DoJ from complying with such release order, he would risk devastating retaliation from the Court);
 - 2) those reports to be examined and reported on publicly by a seven-member pool of both the anchors of national newscasts and reputable and politically unaffiliated former presidents of universities unconnected to the Court, for instance, because neither the justices nor any of their current clerks or those in the past five years, or super-lawyers, i.e., those who argue most cases in the Court, have graduated from those universities' law schools;
 - 3) the release for auditing of the judges' annual financial disclosure reports mandated by the Ethics in Government Act and the justices' equivalent reports to the pool and the aides that it has chosen for their superior reputation as experts in fraud and forensic accounting, money laundering, Information Technology, tax evasion, etc.;
 - 4) the release to the pool of all the complaints that complainants have filed with the clerks of the respective circuit court of appeals as well as those written –referred to as "identified"– by the circuit chief judges;
 - 5) the submission to the pool by actual or potential complainants of copies of the

complaints against federal judges that they have filed or would like to file;

- 6) the pool to cause investigative media outlets and universities all over the country to hold the proposed UNPRECEDENTED CITIZENS HEARINGS. The latter are to be conducted by journalists, professors, and the above-mentioned experts to take via video conference the testimony of victims of, and witnesses to, abuse of power committed and/or covered up by the judges and the justices, whether the latter did so as lower court judges, justices, or circuit justices, including the abuse underlying the complaints filed with the appeals court clerks or identified by the chief judges; and to be transmitted to a national audience live, multimedia, and interactively so as to allow the receipt of audience feedback in real time; and to be made available on the pool's website for later viewing and through podcasts.
- 7) Cf. the program for a focused, cost-effective investigation of judges and their judiciaries that takes off from an abundance of leads already gathered; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Reuters_judges_investigation.pdf.

22. The Supreme Court ordered busing in *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954 as an unprecedented means of desegregation. It can appoint the pool and order it to organize the proposed unprecedented citizens hearings.
23. Of course, the Supreme Court is not going to order any independent investigation of federal judges whatsoever, for it is bound to expose riskless abuse of power institutionalized as the modus operandi for grabbing gains and convenience by judges held unaccountable by conniving politicians and themselves: They run the Federal Judiciary as a racketeering enterprise.

E. Citizens hearings for fact-finding before repairing

24. The investigation of the Supreme Court is not dependent on its ordering it. Lawyers with cases before the Court, LDAD, the open letter signatories –many of whom are university professors and/or officers– as well as the media and universities, can take the initiative in organizing and conducting the proposed citizens hearings.
25. Urging these citizens hearings is realistic: LDAD and the signatories profess to be motivated by their condemnation of the President's trampling on core principles of democracy; and guided by a principled commitment to saving democracy on behalf of *We the People*. If so, they should take action to expose the abuse of power by those who trample on the rule of law, which is the core principle of democracy, namely, federal judges.
26. Only after full exposure of the damage to the integrity of judges, justices, and judicial process can the "repairs needed" be determined and undertaken.

F. Citizens hearings to enable *the People* to exercise direct democracy and enforce accountability to them

27. In a democracy, *We the People* are the sovereign source of all political power. As the ones who run "government of, by, and for the people", *the People* are the masters of all public servants, including judicial public servants as well as legislative ones in Congress and those in the Executive. *The People* hire and pay for all of them to provide services needed by *the People*.
28. Judges are hired hands too. They are supposed to provide the service of applying the rule of law to determine controversies between parties.

29. Nevertheless, due to their unaccountability, judges have become free agents. Together they have formed a State so powerful that it lords it over *the people's* democracy.
30. The citizens hearings are meant to enable *the People* to exercise the foundational rights of democracy and their birthrights: those under the First Amendment guaranteeing their "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".
31. The citizens hearings will concern judges' unaccountability and consequent riskless abuse of power. They will be but the first ones, setting the precedence for hearings on all sorts of subjects of concern to "the government of the people".
 - a. To learn and share with others a method for writing a story of abuse by judges in up to 500 words only, see http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_your_story_for_Reuters.pdf.
32. Therefore, the citizens hearings will enable *the People* to exercise a measure of direct democracy. They will open the way to the next natural stage: ensuring that they do not become mere talking shows, but rather lead to mechanisms implementing what *the People* have stated is their grievances and their demands to repair them. Those mechanisms must put *the People* in a position to hold their servants accountable for their exercise of the power entrusted to them to render services to *the People*, and liable to compensate the victims of their abuse of power.
33. All this is as realistic as:
 - a. women celebrating this year the centenary of their right to vote;
 - b. Black people gaining the right to equal education and even to freedom from slavery;
 - c. the poor asserting their right for not only their boys, but also their daughters, to go to school and for all of them to have access to health care;
 - d. employees asserting their right to go on strike, on vacation, have safe working conditions, and be protected against wrongful termination;
 - e. tenants asserting their right to safe housing conditions and against arbitrary evictions;
 - f. same sex people gaining the right to civil unions and then to marriage; etc.
34. These are millennial impossibles turned into hard-fought realities. They are accomplishments of assertive, stubborn, inspiring people who did not know when to quit.
35. *We the People* can defend democracy and repair the damage done to it by doing what has never been done in history: The Masters of Government holding their servants in the judiciary accountable for their performance and liable to compensate the victims of their abuse; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_inform_outrage_be_compensated.pdf
36. This can begin by organizing and holding the proposed unprecedented citizens hearings as digital agora/marketplace/town square meetings. There *the People* will find the facts of judges' abuse of power, ascertain what damage has been done to the rule of law, and agree on the repairs needed.
37. This is how we lawyers, so profoundly distrusted and held in contempt by the public at large, can lead *the People* in using video conferences, with which Covid has so dramatically familiarized the whole of the country, to gain access to a measure of direct democracy and go beyond...

G. From citizens hearings to a constitutional convention and a new constitution

38. A constitutional convention is what since April 2, 2014, 34 states, constituting the two thirds of states required by the amending provisions of Article V of the Constitution, have petitioned Congress to convene.
39. However, the congressional leaders will never call such convention because it is likely to upset the status quo and diminish the power and privilege that they have accumulated over the 231 years since the adoption of the current Constitution in 1789.
40. In the same vein, the attack by P. Trump on the constitutional separation of power by his systemic use of acting appointments; refusal to comply with congressional subpoenas; abuse of executive orders; etc., is only possible because congressional leaders and other members expect to benefit from not opposing him, just as they expect to avoid retaliation by not holding judges accountable.
41. The attack on democracy will continue whether P. Trump or VP Biden becomes the next president: if the former, because he attacked it and got away with it; if the latter, because *'it's payback time!'*, the continued damaging of democracy notwithstanding.
42. Therefore, to expect Congress or a different president to defend democracy, never mind repair it, at the expense of their own partisan and personal interests is self-contradictory and betrays lack of understanding of the dynamics of current interbranch and party politics.
43. To persist in that course of action calls into application Einstein's aphorism: "Doing the same thing while expecting a different result is the hallmark of irrationality". This is so because it is irrational to ignore or disregard the fundamental law of both the natural and human worlds, to wit, cause and effect.
44. By contrast, the proposed citizens hearings are unprecedented. Instead of the media telling the national public how things are, it will be people telling *the People* through the media and universities how the most powerful and only life-tenured officers in our country have abused them to grab gain and convenience.
45. The national outrage that the hearings will provoke will provide the media a professional and commercial incentive to further investigate judges' abuse; their findings will exacerbate the outrage. A self-reinforcing cycle will ensue.
46. *The People*, who already have a *MeToo!* intolerance of any form of abuse, will be energized to shout even more assertively their rallying cry:

Enough is enough!

We won't tolerate any abuse by anybody anymore.

47. The citizens hearings can be an opportunity for their conductors, witnesses, and members of the national audience to form Internet groups in the guise of Tea Party local chapters to demand the calling of, or even coalesce into, a constitutional convention.
48. This is how by implementing the strategy of inform and outrage, the citizens hearings can take on a life of their own that develops into a runaway national civic movement for a constitutional convention. The latter can produce a new concept of *People*-government relation that is defined in a new constitution. That is how a new form of governance emerges.
49. This process brings about transformative change. Through it, what comes out repaired is qualitatively and significantly different from what went in damaged.

50. We lawyers can set in motion transformative change in defense of democracy. Filing the motions for recusal and investigation is a formal step. However, we can join forces among ourselves and then with media outlets and universities to bypass the presidency, Congress, and the STATE OF JUDGES ABOVE BOTH OF THEM.
51. Outside of them while together among ourselves, we can pioneer the citizens hearings. Thereby we can set rolling a series of event that defend our democracy, repair the damage already done to it, and lead to a more direct, self-defending Democracy: *the People's Sunrise*.

H. My offer of a presentation to you

52. I offer to present this proposal via video conference to LDAD, the signatories of the open letter, the media, universities, and their guests.
53. Your decision whether to accept my offer will be facilitated by your watching my [video](#) and following its [slides](#):
- http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_video.mp4
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_slides.pdf
54. . To set the presentation's terms and scheduling, please use my contact information below.

I. Every meaningful cause needs resources for its advancement; none can be continued, let alone advanced, without money

55. This propositive email, the explanatory article below, and their supporting study*[†] of judges and their judiciaries(*supra* ¶16) are the product of the professional law research and writing and strategic thinking conducted by:

Judicial Discipline Reform:

Visit its website at

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

to strengthen yourself by reading its articles because
KNOWLEDGE IS POWER.

So have done its many webvisitors,
which explains why 35,629+ have become subscribers.

Join them thus:

go to <http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org> <left panel ↓Register or
+ New or Users >Add New.

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

Donate

through *Paypal*

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

by making a deposit or an online transfer to
Citi Bank, routing number 021 000 089, account 4977 59 2001; or

by mailing a check to the address in the letterhead above.

Dare trigger history!...and you may enter it.

* http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf >all prefixes:# up to OL:393 OL2:1193

October 23, 2020

Judge Amy Coney Barrett sits on the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals, whose tables of complaints against federal judges show that she has condoned the systematic dismissal of 100% of complaints, thus protecting herself and her fellow judges, who remain unaccountable through abusive self-exemption from any discipline; harming complainants and the rest of the public, who are left unheard, uncompensated, and exposed to judges ever more emboldened to abuse; and impairing her and the other judges' integrity, which is bound by her oath to "administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich [in relations to judges]"¹, and to "avoid impropriety and even the appearance of impropriety"²†

A. Judges' power to hold themselves and be held unaccountable

1. You may be affiliated with one or the other party or be an independent or even hold no political views at all and still recognize the factual accuracy of the aphorism: "Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely" (*>jur:27²⁸). The enabling circumstance of absolute power is unaccountability. The latter is the faculty of exercising one's power however and for whatever purpose one wants with the certainty that one will suffer no adverse consequences from anyone: one can get away with anything. Unaccountability is substantially different from independence in exercising one's power without being directed by anybody to do so one way or the other. Judges are not independent from the fundamental requirement of the rule of law: its fair and impartial application, even to themselves. That requirement is expressed in the inscription on the frieze of the Supreme Court building thus: Equal Justice Under Law³.
2. Nobody has as much power as a single federal judge: One of them, District J. James Robart of Seattle, Washington State, suspended *nationwide* the Muslim travel ban ordered by President Trump, who had campaigned on issuing it and was elected by more than 62.5 million voters; three circuit judges on a three-judge federal appellate panel upheld the suspension, although only two would have sufficed to uphold it nationwide. Now imagine how much power all the federal judges wield.
3. Republican and Democratic politicians in Washington and everywhere else are equally to blame for having allowed judges to become so powerful. Politicians recommend, endorse, nominate, and confirm candidates for federal judgeships and justiceships and, after their confirmation, protect them as 'our men and women on the bench': The judges appointed by one party are the ones expected to declare the constitutionality of the respective party's laws and subpoenas, and the winning of its electoral candidate; and hold those of other party unconstitutional and its candidate the loser. Judges' counter-expected declarations constitute the key source of their power of devastating retaliation against politicians and parties that try to limit their unaccountability. This is how judges give practical effect to the gang mentality that Then-Judge Neil Gorsuch manifested when he said: "An attack on one of our brothers and sisters of the robe is an attack on all of us." (†>OL2:546)
4. This explains how in the last 231 years since the creation of the Federal Judiciary in 1789 the number of federal judges impeached and removed from office is 8!⁴ To gauge that number's implications compare it against the 2,340 federal judicial officers on the bench on September 30, 2019.⁵ Politicians have heard loudly and clearly judges' menacing cry: «Don't you ever mess with us!»
5. Another source of judges' power is the Constitution. In Article III, Section 1⁶, it authorizes judges to hold office for life. Actually, they are the only officers in our country with life-tenure, whether through appointment or election. However, their holding of office is "during good Behaviour" only. This constraint is a source⁷ of politicians' constitutional right to exercise checks and balances

on judges by investigating and removing them for ‘bad Behaviour’. But exercising that right makes a politician, all his or her supporters, and their party as a whole run the risk of antagonizing judges and provoking their retaliation. So, in the interest of their own preservation, politicians have abdicated their duty of interbranch supervision by entrusting judges with a unique power: to administer self-discipline. This has been in defiance of common sense and knowledge of human nature, expressed in the axiom: “Nobody can be an impartial judge of himself, his friends, or his peers”.

6. Judges have strong motives for protecting their unaccountability: self-interest and example. By so doing they ensure a benefit to them: the approval by their fellow judges. That protects them from judges’ retaliation against judges who dare denounce their abuse of power, who can be deemed traitors and ostracized as pariahs. To ensure continued social acceptance by fellow judges, judges keep silent. Progressively, the abuse that they condone becomes normal. Their integrity is impaired by the example of abusive judges. It becomes ineffectual at keeping them as only silent abettors of the principals’ abuse. They commit the abuse that they allow others to commit. From ‘live and let live’, for ‘it is what *they* do’, they transition to «*I too grab all I can!*», for ‘that’s what *we* do’. Far from only looking away in silence, they join the others in bragging about how smart they are at grabbing. Integrity is corrupted by watching in silence the abuse of one’s friends and peers.
7. This is shown in both the table[‡] and the two-volume study^{* †} of judges and their judiciaries that support this article, both based on original law research and writing, and strategic thinking:

Exposing Judges’ Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Abuse of Power:

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

B. Judges self-exonerate from all complaints to ensure their unaccountability

8. Any complaint against a federal circuit, district, bankruptcy, or magistrate judge must be filed with the clerk of the court of appeals for the circuit where the judge sits⁸, as provided for under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980 (the Act; 28 U.S.C. §§351-364)⁹. The complaint is processed, in the first instance, by the circuit chief judge. Any petition for review of his or her decision is determined by the circuit judicial council¹⁰, composed of circuit and district judges, including the chief. Each circuit court must prepare its statistics on the handling of complaints against judges in the circuit; and send them to the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts (AO)¹¹, as provided for in §604(h)(2). AO compiles and reports them in the Annual Report¹² of its Director, who is appointed by the chief justice of the Supreme Court. The chief justice is the presiding member of the Judicial Conference¹³ of the U.S., §331, which is the highest policy making body of the Federal Judiciary and includes all the circuit chief judges and one district judge per circuit. The Director must submit his Report to the Conference and Congress, §604(a)(3, 4); it is a public document.
9. The complaint statistics appear on Table S-22 of the Report. Since 1996 they are available online. I have collected all of them and made them available in one running file with links to the originals in AO¹⁴. In addition, I have made tables that aggregate their values for all the circuits for all the years and for some circuits for some years¹⁵. The table¹⁶ supporting and accompanying this article[‡] collects all the statistics on the complaints that were processed between May 11, 2008 and September 30, 2019, in Judge Barrett’s Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit, with links to the originals¹⁷.
10. Covering decades, these statistics show that even in consecutive years judges have dismissed 100% of complaints and denied 100% of dismissal review petitions; this justifies rounding up the mathematical average of 99.83%. Such consistency in 13 circuits and two national courts across the country cannot be achieved but for an institutionalized policy of the Federal Judiciary. Its adoption is facilitated by the secrecy that pervades the Judiciary: It holds all its policy-making, adminis-

trative, disciplinary, and adjudicative meetings behind closed doors and holds no press conference. Although "Justice should not only be done, but should manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done"¹⁸, judges ensure that what they do is not to be seen. The Judicial Conference meets secretly, thus setting the example for the rest of the Judiciary and its judges. Justice Brandeis said "Sunshine is the best disinfectant" precisely because secrecy breeds the mold of conspiratorial corruption.

11. So, circumstantial evidence gives probable cause to believe that the policy institutionalizes judges' implicit or explicit complicit agreement for reciprocal exoneration from all complaints: 'Today I exempt you from the complaint against you, and tomorrow you exempt me and my friends from any complaint against us, no matter the nature, extent, and gravity of the abuse complained-about'; cf. "Allegations" listed in the official Tables (and at table infra, Lines A21-40=A21-40).

C. J. Barrett has condoned judges' self-exoneration & compromised her integrity

12. In the 7th Circuit during the more than 11 years covered by the table, 984 complaints were filed (O3), but only 3 judges were censured or reprimanded (O89). Its chief judges dismissed 902 complaints in whole or in part (O48); 4 (N1) were pending on September 30, 2019. Only 5 Special Investigative Committees were appointed (O63), but only 1 report was submitted to the circuit judicial council (O70). Of the 476 dismissal review petitions (O71), 475 were denied (O75). "Denied" is the only operative word, with no reasoning, that appears in the 5¢ preprinted, pro forma notification of denial: *a dumping form!*¹⁹, issued as a kneejerk reaction to review petitions. The 7th Circuit judicial council was a dead end, for it did not return any complaint to the chief judge for appointment of an Investigative Committee (O77). Dismissal without investigation was systematic.
13. The systematic complaint-dismissal by the chiefs and petition denial by the council were a cover-up operation to protect their fellow judges. They arrogated to themselves the power to abrogate in effect the Act of Congress. Complainants never had a chance of establishing their complaints, let alone getting compensation. The judges ran a deceptive complaint mechanism. It was a sham²⁰.
14. One cannot know whether Judge Barrett has been complained-about because complaints are kept secret, not even the names²¹ of the complained-against judges are disclosed. This facilitates covering up their abuse²², be it an illegal or unethical act or an impropriety. But she has imputed knowledge of judges' complicit reciprocal exoneration agreement and of the sham. Indeed, she began her legal career as an insider of the courts, clerking in 1997-1998 for Circuit Judge Laurence H. Silberman at the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit²³, and in 1998-1999 for Justice Antonin Scalia at the Supreme Court. She worked as a lawyer at a top law firm and was a law professor for almost 17 years. She took the bench on November 2, 2017²⁴, as a circuit judge of the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals, where the circuit complaint statistics are prepared.
15. Judge Barrett has participated in the judges' secret meetings. She has met with judges in the lounge, their chambers, and the corridors, where they formally and informally have discussed, among other things, the complaint filed against any of them and where they have reassured each other: 'Don't sweat it. The chief and the council will get rid of it, as they always do.' Willful ignorance or blindness (*>jur:90§§b, c) are of no avail to her. It was impossible for her not to know how complainants had been abused and would be further abused by their complaints and review petitions getting '*dumped by form*'. Knowingly, she failed her duty to report²⁵ the judges and joined the dumping as an accessory: By looking the other way in silence after the complained-about abuse, she facilitated the judges' keeping and enjoying the gain or convenience that they had grabbed, thus becoming an accessory after the fact. Her silence informed them or others that she would not report them if they committed another abuse, encouraging them as an accessory before the fact. Through both dumpings, she harmed abusees. She also harmed the Judiciary's and her own integrity (supra ¶6).

16. Nothing protects integrity: Politicians' self-preservation interest leaves judges unrestrained to give free rein to their pursuit of the motive of gain and convenience at every opportunity by abusing their means: their enormous power over people's property, liberty, and all the rights and duties that frame their lives and shape their identities. Hence, judges start chipping away at their duties. Gradually, discharging them becomes optional²⁶; grabbing takes precedence. Instead of working as public servants in "government of, by, and for the people"(*>jur:82¹⁷²), they work as free agents for life for their own account. They maximize the return on their investment of abuse of power.
17. In fact, a politician as knowledgeable about financial matters as Sen. Elizabeth Warren dare denounce in her "I have a plan for the Federal Judiciary too"²⁷ how federal judges fail to recuse themselves from cases in which they own stock in one of the companies that is a party to the case before them in order to resolve the ensuing conflict of interests in their favor by protecting or increasing their stock's value. Sen. Warren refers to such practice throughout the Federal Judiciary as judges' abusive self-enrichment. She attributes it to their unaccountability. Such self-enrichment necessarily entails their commission of the crimes of concealment of assets, tax evasion, money laundering, fraud, and breach of contract for judicial services, of public trust, and of the oath of office. But it is riskless for judges. So they become predators, always prowling for the next prey.
18. In addition to abusing for gain, judges also abuse for convenience: Circuit judges defraud appellants of their filing fees by disposing of 93% of appeals in decisions that are "procedural [mostly the catchall pretext of "lack of jurisdiction"], unsigned, unpublished, without comment, and by consolidation"²⁸. Unreasoned, they are unprecedential, ad hoc, arbitrary fiats. They cause injury in fact to the people whose money they grab and the participants in judicial process, whose effort, time, and money spent on discovery, briefs, court and attorney's fees, etc., they render wasteful.
19. Judge Barrett has compromised her integrity by in self-interest failing to denounce her fellow judges' unaccountability and abuse of power. If she is confirmed as a Supreme Court justice and you filed a petition for certiorari challenging judges' unaccountability and abuse of power, would it be reasonable to expect her to vote against even taking up your petition for review? For the rest of her life-appointment, she must avoid by all means the risk of incriminating herself by allowing the investigation of current and even new judges, each of whom knows or can find out from other judges about her own abuse and shout at her menacingly: "If you let them take me down, I'll bring you with me!" She is extortionable. To preserve herself, she will not supervise the abuse of the judges of the circuit to which she will be allotted as circuit justice²⁹. She will have to resist any attempts of Congress, law enforcement authorities, and the media and academia conducting unprecedented citizens hearings³⁰, to investigate her, any of her fellow judges, and the Judiciary itself. She must strive to preserve by law and by fact the independence and secrecy of the Judiciary so that she and her fellow judges continue to be an unaccountably grabbing State within *the state*.
20. At her confirmation hearings, Judge Barrett answered senators' questions by affirming that her integrity would not have allowed her to be nominated to carry out the mission of declaring *Roe v. Wade* [allowing abortions] and the Affordable [Health] Care Act/Obamacare unconstitutional, and P. Trump the winner of a suit over the election outcome. Her self-serving affirmation is doubtful because the facts show that her integrity is apt to compromise: Instead of abiding by her oath to administer "Equal Justice under Law", she has joined her fellow judges in providing themselves *Unequal Protection from the Law* to keep grabbing. This begs the questions whether if confirmed, Justice Barrett can be impeached and removed for materially deceiving the Senate about her integrity; and whether answering it can start now by investigating judges' unaccountability and abuse, including 100% dismissal of complaints and denial of review petitions, as proposed³¹.

Dare trigger history!...and you may enter it.

October 21, 2020

Table collecting the official statistics of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit, where Judge Amy Coney Barrett sits, on its handling of complaints against federal judges in the Circuit between May 11, 2008, and September 30, 2019, for presentation to Congress in the Annual Reports of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, showing the systematic dismissal of 100% of those complaints and denial of 100% of petition for review of dismissals‡

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
Line	Data of the Judicial Council, 7th Cir., filed with AO ¹ [from previous Oct. 1 to Sep. 30 of year stated here] ³²	'09A ³³	'09B	'10 ³⁴	'11 ³⁵	'12 ³⁶	'13 ³⁷	'14 ³⁸	'15 ³⁹	'16 ⁴⁰	17 ⁴¹	18 ⁴²	19 ⁴³	totals
1.	Complaints Pending on Sep. 30 of previous fiscal year ^{44*}	0	36	10	10 [‡]	9	14	12	15	9	11	8	4	
2.	Complaints Concluded/Terminated by final action	0	136	105	77	102	92	105	83	98	46	80	66	990
3.	Complaints Filed ⁴⁵	46	111	110	71	93	103	114	81	101	50	77	73	984
4.	Complaint Type/Source ⁴⁷													
5.	Written/Filed by Complainants		110	110	71	93	103	114	81	100	50	76	73	
6.	On Order of/Identified by Circuit Chief Judges		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1		
7.	Complainants ^{♦♦}													
8.	Prison inmates		49	19	20	31	32	63	38	39	16	24	19	
9.	Litigants		60	85	50	55	67	44	42	60	32	71	49	
10.	Attorneys		1	5	1	4	2	0	0	1	1	3	4	
11.	Public Officials		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
12.	Other		4	0	0	3	5	8	1	1	1	2	5	
13.	Judges Complained About **													
14.	Circuit Judges		44	30	15	30	16	31	14	26	5	18	15	
15.	District Judges		59	54	45	53	72	63	53	69	37	49	39	
16.	Court of International Trade Judges		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
17.	Court of Federal Claims Judges		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
18.	Bankruptcy Judges		3	11	6	2	3	6	2	2	5	3	9	
19.	Magistrate Judges		5	15	5	8	12	14	12	4	3	7	10	
20.	Tax Court Judges		n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i		0	0		
21.	Nature of Allegations													
22.	Data of the Judicial Council, 7th Cir., filed with AO	'09A	'09B	'10	'11	'12	'13	'14	'15	'16	'17	'18	'19	totals
23.	Delayed Decision		18	0	2	5	9	17	8	1	1	1	2	
24.	Failure to Give Reasons for Decision		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
25.	Improper Discussions With Party or Counsel		2	2	0	2	1	4	1	0	0	1	1	
26.	Hostility Toward Litigant or Attorney		3	2	4	3	5	0	1	0	0	2	1	
27.	Racial, Religious, or Ethnic Bias		2	2	0	1	1		0	2	1	0	0	
28.	Personal Bias Against Litigant or Attorney		32	2	7	7	9	4	1	1	1	2	1	
29.	Conflict of Interest (Including Refusal to Recuse)		1	2	2	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	
30.	Failure to Meet Financial Disclosure Requirements		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
31.	Improper Outside Income		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
32.	Partisan Political Activity or Statement		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
33.	Acceptance of a Bribe		3	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	
34.	Effort to Obtain Favor for Friend or Relative		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
35.	Data of the Judicial Council, 7th Cir., filed with AO	'09A	'09B	'10	'11	'12	'13	'14	'15	'16	'17	'18	'19	totals
36.	Solicitation of Funds for Organization		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
37.	Violation of Other Standards		2	5	1	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	
38.	Retaliation against complainant, witness, or others involved in the process		n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	0	0	0	
39.	Other Misconduct ⁴⁸		74	105	66	72	7	5	8	7	3	0	0	
40.	Disability		2	1	0	1	1	0	0		0	0	0	
41.	ACTIONS REGARDING THE COMPLAINTS													
42.	Withdrawn		n/i		n/i	n/i	1	0		0		0	0	
43.	Concluded/Terminated by Complainant or Subject Judge/Withdrawn		0	0	0	0					0			
44.	Complaint Withdrawn with Consent of Circuit Chief Judge		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
45.	Withdrawal of Petition for Review		0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	
46.	Actions by Chief Circuit Judge													
47.	Matters Returned from Circuit Judicial Council/or Judicial Conference Committee		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
48.	Complaint Dismissed ♦ in Whole or in Part		113	100	73	87	86	98	72	92	35	77	69	902
49.	Not in Conformity With Statute/Not Misconduct or Disability	0	5	4	3	9	1	10	4	6	6	7	16	71
50.	Directly Related to Decision or Procedural Ruling/ Merits Related	0	89	94	68	66	80	63	45	53	23	58	57	696
51.	Frivolous	0	28	35	2	1	9	9	16	22	0	5	2	129
52.	Lacked Factual Foundation/Allegations Lack Sufficient Evidence	0	9	2	1	10	6	15	10	14	8	9	4	88
53.	Allegations Incapable of Being Established	n/i	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		0	0	0	
54.	Filed in Wrong Circuit	n/i	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
55.	Otherwise Not Appropriate	n/i	2	0	4	3	0	5	0	1	0	1	0	16
56.	Complaints Concluded in Whole or in Part	n/i	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
57.	Informal Resolution Before Complaint Filed ⁴⁹	n/i	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
58.	Voluntary Corrective Action Taken	n/i	1	0		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
59.	Action No Longer Necessary Because of Intervening Event	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
60.	Appropriate Action Already Taken	0		n/i		n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i					
61.	Complaint Withdrawn	0	n/i	n/i		n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i					
62.	Subtotal		n/i											
63.	Special Investigative Committee Appointed/Complaint Referred to Special Committee	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	5
64.	Actions by Special Committees													
65.	Matter Returned from Circuit Judicial Council		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
66.	New Matter Referred to Circuit Chief Judge		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
67.	Circuit Judicial Council Proceedings													
68.	Matter Returned from Judicial Conference		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
69.	Complaint Transferred to/from Another Circuit		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
70.	Special Committee Reports Submitted to Circuit Judicial Council		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
71.	Received Petition for Review ⁵⁰		53	54	45	42	73	60	27	49	20	32	21	476
72.	Withdrawn	0	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i				

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O
73.	Data of the Judicial Council, 7th Cir., filed with AO	'09A	'09B	'10	'11	'12	'13	'14	'15	'16	'17	'18	'19	totals
74.	Action on Petition for Review													
75.	Dismissed Complaint ⁵¹ /Petition Denied		57	58	39	43	55	60	34	49	25	35	20	475
76.	Matter Returned to Circuit Chief Judge		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
77.	Matter Returned to Circuit Chief Judge for Appointment of Special Committee		0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	
78.	Ordered Other Appropriate Action/Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
79.	Received Special Committee Report/Special Committee Reports Submitted to Judicial Council		0	0	0	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	
80.	Remedial Action Taken/Action on Special Committee Report			0	0				0	1	0		2	
81.	Complaint Dismissed	0	0	n/i	0	0	0	1	0	0		0	0	
82.	Not Misconduct or Disability		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
83.	Merits Related		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
84.	Allegations Lack Sufficient Evidence		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
85.	Otherwise Not Appropriate		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
86.	Corrective Action Taken or Intervening Events		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
87.	Referred Complaint to Judicial Conference	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
88.	Remedial Action Taken		0						0				0	
89.	Censure or Reprimand		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3
90.	Privately Censured	0	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i			0		
91.	Publicly Censured	0	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i	n/i			0		
92.	Suspension of Assignments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
93.	Directed Chief District Judge to Take Action (Magistrates only)/Action Against Magistrate Judge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
94.	Removal of Bankruptcy Judge		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
95.	Request of Voluntary Retirement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
96.	Certification of Disability of Circuit or District Judge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	
97.	Additional Investigation Warranted		0											
98.	Returned to Special Committee		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
99.	Retained by Circuit Judicial Council		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
100.	Actions by Chief Justice						1	0						
101.	Transferred to Judicial Council		0	0		0	0	n/i	0	0				
102.	Received from Circuit Judicial Council		0	0		0	1	n/i	0	0	0	0	0	
103.	Complaints Concluded/Terminated by Final Action													
104.	During 12-month Period Ending Sep. 30 of reported year	0	136	105	77	102	92	105	83	98	46	80	66	
105.	Complaints Pending on Sep. 30 [end of reported year]	0	11	15	4	0	25	21	13	12	15	4	9	
106.	Data of the Judicial Council, 7th Cir., filed with AO	'09A	'09B	'10	'11	'12	'13	'14	'15	'16	'17	'18	'19	totals
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O

[These notes are in the official Tables.]

- ♦ Each complaint may involve multiple reasons for dismissal.
- ♦♦ Number of complainants may not equal total number of filings because each complaint may have multiple complainants.
- ♦*Revised

Note: Excludes complaints not accepted by the circuits because they duplicated previous filings or were otherwise invalid filings.

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

Each complaint may involve multiple allegations. Each complaint may have multiple reasons for dismissal.

ENDNOTES

-
- ¹ 28 U.S.C. §453. Oaths of justices and judges; this is title 28 of the code of federal laws, section 453. This title is known as the Judicial Code; <https://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml;jsessionid=527DE001938E7042255B83AAF055949A;> http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/28usc_Judicial_Code.pdf.
- ² Code of Conduct of United States Judges, Canon 2; <https://www.uscourts.gov/judges-judgeships/code-conduct-united-states-judges>; and [*>jur:68](http://www.uscourts.gov/judges-judgeships/code-conduct-united-states-judges)^{123a}.
- ³ See the photo of the frieze at [†>OL2:1040](https://www.supremecourt.gov/); <https://www.supremecourt.gov/>.
- ⁴ Federal Judicial Center, the research and education agency of the judicial branch of the U.S. government; <https://www.fjc.gov/history/judges/impeachments-federal-judges>
- ⁵ Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Judicial Business 2019, official statistics on circuit, district, bankruptcy, and magistrate judges; <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2019>; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/statistics&tables/number_jud_officers.pdf.
- ⁶ http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/US_Constitution.pdf
- ⁷ Id., see also U.S. Constitution, Article II, Section 4; and http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_no_judicial_immunity.pdf.
- ⁸ Each of the 11 numbered regional federal judicial circuits, the District of Columbia Circuit, the Federal Circuit, and the two national courts, i.e., the U.S. Court of International Trade and the U.S. Court of Federal Claims, must file its statistics on complaints against its judges; <https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/federal-courts-public/court-website-links#appeals>.
- ⁹ Under the Act([supra fn. 1](#)), any person, whether a party to a case or a non-party, even a judge, can file a complaint against the conduct or disability of a federal judge. The complaint is not a means of avoiding an appeal on the merits from a judge's decision. In fact, the complaint need not be related to any lawsuit at all; e.g., it may concern the attendance of a judge at a seminar where she became drunk and disorderly or at a fund raising meeting in favor of a political candidate or against a given issue where the judge appeared to breach her impartiality or place the prestige of judicial office in favor or against thereof. But it is obvious that the most frequent occasion when a person comes in contact with a judge and complaints against her arise is a lawsuit, whether at the trial or the appeal level.
- ¹⁰ On judicial councils see [*>jur:57](#)⁹⁶ and [supra endnote 1 >28usc§332](#). Judicial councils of circuits.
- ¹¹ On AO, see [*>jur:21](#)¹⁰ and <https://www.uscourts.gov/>.
- ¹² <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/analysis-reports/directors-annual-report>
- ¹³ https://judicial-discipline-reform.org/Follow_money/JConf_systematic_dismissals.pdf
- ¹⁴ The tables for the fiscal years 1oct96-30sep2019 have been collected in the file at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/statistics&tables/statistical_tables_complaints_v_judges.pdf. In that file, Table S-22 for each year also has the link to the original held at AO (Administrative Office). Readers can conveniently download that file to verify the data presented in this table and to prepare similar tables for each of the other circuits and courts and any period of years. To that end, that file contains a table template that readers can fill out.

-
- ¹⁵ See this table collected to similar tables for all and other individual circuits at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_complaint_dismissal_statistics.pdf.
- ¹⁶ http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_JgACBarrett_condonation_judges_power_abuse.pdf
- ¹⁷ The table for the 7th Circuit is representative of the other circuits' systematic dismissal of complaints against their respective judges and their judicial councils' systematic denial of petitions for review of those dismissals.
- ¹⁸ *Ex parte McCarthy*, [1924] 1 K. B. 256, 259 (1923). Cf. "Justice must satisfy the appearance of justice", *Aetna Life Ins. v. Lavoie et al.*, 475 U.S. 813; 106 S. Ct. 1580; 89 L. Ed. 2d 823 (1986).
- ¹⁹ Cf. http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_do_not_read.pdf >OL2:608¶5
- ²⁰ http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-reporters_clerks.pdf
- ²¹ By contrast, neither the law nor judges raise any objections to the disclosure of the names of, and the complaints themselves concerning, those accused of malpractice or abuse, whether they are doctors and their hospitals; lawyers and their law firms; police officers and their departments; pedophilic priests and their churches; greedy Wall Street financiers and their firms; corner-cutting pharmaceutical and polluting oil companies and their officers; and everybody else, including you ...that is, if you are not a member of judges' class. Its privilege of unaccountability, arrogated to themselves through the threat of retaliation and the abuse of self-discipline, provides. Benefiting from, and condoning, it impairs the integrity of every judge.
- ²² Nevertheless, complainants can make their complaints against judges public on grounds of equal protection of the law and through the exercise of their 1st Amendment right of "freedom of speech, of the press, the right of the people peaceably to assemble [on the Internet and social media too], and to petition the Government [of which judges are the third branch] for a redress of grievances [including their request for compensation from judges and their judiciaries]"; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/US_Constitution.pdf; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_inform_outrage_be_compensated.pdf
- ²³ Cf. Complaint filed with Supreme Court Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-SupCt_CJ_JGRoberts.pdf
- ²⁴ <http://www.ca7.uscourts.gov/judges-biographies/biographies7.htm> and <https://www.fjc.gov/history/judges/barrett-amy-coney>
- ²⁵ 18 U.S.C. §3057; <https://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml;jsessionid=527DE001938E7042255B83AAF055949A>; and supra endnote 2, Code of Conduct for Judges, Canon 3B(6).
- ²⁶ http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judicial_accountability_presentation.pdf >OL2:455§§B, D
- ²⁷ <https://elizabethwarren.com/plans/restore-trust?source=soc-WB-ew-tw-ro>
- ²⁸ Table B-12 of AO's Annual Report, reproduced at †>OL2:462 and commented on at 457§D.
- ²⁹ 28 U.S.C. §42. Allotment of Supreme Court justices to circuits
- ³⁰ http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_your_story_for_Reuters.pdf >¶73c

-
- ³¹ http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Reuters_judges_investigation.pdf
- ³² AO (Administrative Office) modifies Table S-22, mostly by adding line entries or rewording their description. As a result, if an entry had not yet been included in the Table used in a reported year, the corresponding cell in this table for that year shows the value “n/i” for “not included”.
- ³³ <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2009>. While the 2009 Judicial Business Report covers only the fiscal year that started on October 1, 2008, its table on complaints against judges includes the complaints filed under the new rules during May 11 through September 30, 2008. This period alone is reported in Table S-22B of 2008.
- ³⁴ <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2010>
- ³⁵ <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2011>
- ³⁶ <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2012> >Complaints against judges, Table 10 Judicial Complaints Commenced, Terminated, and Pending Fiscal Years 2010-2012 >Table S-22, <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/s-22/judicial-business/2012/09/30>
- ³⁷ <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2013> >Complaints against judges, <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/complaints-against-judges-judicial-business-2013> >Table 10 Judicial Complaints Commenced, Terminated, and Pending Fiscal Years 2011-2013 >Table S-22, <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/s-22/judicial-business/2013/09/30>
- ³⁸ <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2014> >Complaints against judges, <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/complaints-against-judges-judicial-business-2014> >Table 10 Judicial Complaints Commenced, Terminated, and Pending Fiscal Years 2012–2014 >Table S-22, <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/s-22/judicial-business/2014/09/30>
- ³⁹ <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2015> >Complaints against judges, <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/complaints-against-judges-judicial-business-2015> >Table 10 Judicial Complaints Commenced, Terminated, and Pending Fiscal Years 2013-2015 >Table S-22, <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/s-22/judicial-business/2015/09/30>
- ⁴⁰ <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2016> >Complaints against judges, <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/complaints-against-judges-judicial-business-2016> >Table 10 Judicial Complaints Commenced, Terminated, and Pending Fiscal Years 2015-2016 >Table S-22, <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/s-22/judicial-business/2016/09/30>
- ⁴¹ <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/s-22/judicial-business/2017/09/30>
- ⁴² <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/s-22/judicial-business/2018/09/30>
- ⁴³ <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/s-22/judicial-business/2019/09/30>
- ⁴⁴ There are several instances where the last line of Table S-22 for a given year states that the number of complaints pending on September 30 of that year is X. Yet, the first line of the Table for the following year states a different number of complaints pending on that same date. No explanation has been found for these repeated discrepancies.
- ⁴⁵ Over the years, the judges have added some headings and removed others to and from the table for reporting the statistics on complaints against judges. This is a composite table that aggregates all headings and entries and place them in the most logical position in the series of headings and

entries. The most significant addition and removal came when the new rules for processing these complaints were adopted in 2008. The use of the new rules became mandatory on May 11, 2008. Since then a new reporting table with more numerous and detailed headings and entries has been used to report the statistics on complaints filed under the new rules.

Although the new rules for filing complaints against federal judges provided more numerous and detailed causes for complaint, the systematic dismissal of them and denial of petitions for review of such dismissals by judges protecting their own as well as themselves –‘I protect you today, and if tomorrow I’m or any of my friends is the one complained against, you protect me or them’– continued unabated. The new rules was a ruse by the judges to dissade Congress from taking action to correct the fact that the judges had applied for over 20 years the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980 in such a way as to render it useless so that judicial discipline was as inexistent as it had been since the creation of the Federal Judiciary in 1789. During that period there was no formal mechanism for complaining against judges. See the history of, and comment on, the new rules. at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/judicial_complaints/8-4-3DrRCordero_new_rules_no_change.pdf.

⁴⁶Table S-22A(stat:28) for the fiscal year 1oct08-30sep09 deals only with the action taken on the complaints filed under the old rules up to and including May 10, 2008. By definition, none of those complaints could have been filed during that fiscal year. Consequently, that table does not report any complaint filed.

⁴⁷ In the original Tables S-22, some headings above a set of related line entries present in their cells the sum of the corresponding columns under them while other headings have their cells blank. This amounts to format inconsistency. This may be intentional but unexplained, or unintentional and careless. In either case it is troubling, for it begs the question: how many other inconsistencies are there in the way of composing each table as well as the several tables over the years?

⁴⁸ In several years, the number of “Other Misconduct” is many times larger than the total of all the other entries under “Nature of Allegations”. Throwing together so many complaints of misconduct under such a nondescript entry betrays laziness or the cover-up of entries too embarrassing to identify. In any event, if the other circuits are capable of sorting their complaints under the other descriptive entries, there appears to be no reason why the 7th Circuit cannot do likewise.

⁴⁹ If a complaint was not filed because before that happened it underwent “informal resolution”, how did it make it to Table S-22? Actually, how did it become considered a “complaint” in the first place?

⁵⁰The table(cf. stat:24) used to report complaints about judges filed under the old rules did not report the number of complainants’ petitions to the judicial circuit to review the unfavorable disposition of their complaints, which consisted in their systematic dismissal without any investigation. Accordingly, it did not report on the disposition by judicial councils of such petitions. The table(cf. stat:26) used for reporting under the new rules began reporting both the number of petitions for review and their disposition. This explains why the number of “Received Petitions for Review” is 176(L65), yet the number of “Petitions Denied” is 242(L68). This illustrates that the circuit and district judges on the judicial council of the respective circuit overwhelmingly disposed of those petitions through their systematic denial. Thereby they attained the same objective: their self-exemption from discipline to ensure their unaccountability as Judges Above the Law.

⁵¹ Cf. stat:28. The entry “Action on Petition for Review: Petition Denied” under the heading Judicial Council Proceedings” first appear in Table S-22B of 2009(stat:30).

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

Dr%C3%9Cordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

Judicial Discipline Reform

New York City

www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

Volume I

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

A study of coordinated wrongdoing as judges' institutionalized modus operandi and its out-of-court exposure through a multidisciplinary academic and business venture based on strategic thinking centered on dynamic analysis of harmonious and conflicting interests

Volume I:

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

or

<http://1drv.ms/1kvhB8>

or

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/jur/DrRCordero_jud_unaccountability_reporting.pdf

or

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

Volume II:

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

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

Judicial Discipline Reform

New York City

www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

Volume I

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

A study of coordinated wrongdoing as judges' institutionalized modus operandi and its out-of-court exposure through a multidisciplinary academic and business venture based on strategic thinking centered on dynamic analysis of harmonious and conflicting interests

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

or

<http://1drv.ms/1kvhB8>

or

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/jur/DrRCordero_jud_unaccountability_reporting.pdf

or

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

Really Simple SSL Pro banner with a padlock icon and text: 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.

Really Simple SSL Pro banner continuation with buttons: Leave a review, Maybe later, Don't show again

User management controls: All (35,697) | Administrator (1) | Subscriber (35,696) | Bulk actions | Apply | Change role to... | Change | 35,697 items

Table of users with columns: Username, Name, Email, Role. Rows include: 1970mdegcf, 1Barret1cuple, 1ofthemany, 365betv31h, 3aplus63von, 791064087357326, AAAGlennbeish, AaaPiopsy.

Blank

End page