

March 7, 2020

Ms. Molly Coleman  
Ms. Sejal Singh  
Ms. Emma Janger

Ms. Vail Kohnert-Yount  
Ms. Alyssa Peterson  
People’s Parity Project

hello@peoplesparity.org,  
The Center for Popular Democracy  
cpd@populardemocracy.org; tel. (347)985-2220

Dear Meses. Peterson, Kohnert-Yount, Janger, Singh, Coleman, and PPP and CPD members,

1. At the hearing on “Protecting Federal Judiciary Employees from Sexual Harassment, Discrimination, and Other Workplace Misconduct”, held last February 13, by the Courts Subcommittee of the U.S. House Judiciary Committee, the key witnesses were associates of yours, including Olivia Warren, Esq., owarren@cdpl.org; tel. (919)956-9545; Deeva V. Shah, Esq., Founder of Law Clerks for Workplace Accountability, dshah@keker.com, tel. (415)676-2268; Ms. Chai Feldblum, Esq., chai.feldblum@morganlewis.com; and Dahlia Lithwick, Esq., senior legal correspondent, Slate, dahlia.lithwick@slate.com. One key reporter was Ms. Jacqueline Thomsen, National Law Journal, ALM, jathomsen@alm.com.

2. Their testimony and your support of it show that you all and I have harmonious interests, which we can advance as set forth in this proposal for pursuing them jointly. Indeed, I have researched and written the two-volume study\* † on 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\* †**

3. The attached article‡ shows that the politicians who conducted the hearing never intended to hold judges accountable for their abuse(§A). They confirmed those judges to the bench and have held and will continue to hold them unaccountable to avoid provoking their retaliation. The judges held sham hearings, attended by some of you, on Rules for processing complaints against them because their self-exoneration therefrom ensures their continued benefit from their abuse(§B), e.g., their self-enrichment by solving conflicts of interests in their favor, denounced by Sen. E. Warren(¶20). You and millions of clerks and litigants will go uncompensated and keep being abused by judges.

4. The article proposes that you, other victims, and I jointly think and proceed strategically: We can take advantage of other people’s and entities’ interests harmonious with ours, i.e., politicians, who can benefit from advocating an issue that earns them the attention and donations of the huge(\*>jur:8<sup>4,5</sup>) untapped voting bloc of The Dissatisfied with the Judicial and Legal System; law schools facing a crippling diminution in enrollment and the prestige of the legal profession; and the media in need to counter its disparagement as ‘the enemy of the people that spreads fake news’.

5. To counter sham hearings there are proposed a. a test case that has the potential for attracting ever more victims, for it will ask for something that all of them want: compensation, and facilitate their forming local chapters to demand it(§C); b. unprecedented citizen hearings(§D), to be held at media outlets and universities; nationally broadcast live through interactive multimedia; and conducted by reporters, professors, and other experts, who will take the testimony of victims of, and witnesses to, judges’ abuse; apt to attract national attention and support to you and entities such as yours; followed by c. the first-ever conference on judicial abuse exposure and compensation, hosted by a top university and media networks; d. the publication of one(e.g., †>OL2:760, 781, 1051) or a series(719§C) of my articles; and e. joint investigations(\*>OL:194§E) to Follow the money! and expose judges’ interception of people’s emails and mail to detect and suppress their critics’.

6. So, I respectfully request that you invite me to present this proposal to you, your associates, classmates, professors, and assigning editors, with all of whom you may share it‡. To decide whether to hold such presentation you may watch my video♦ and follow its slides(OL2:958).

Dare trigger history!(†>OL2:1003)...and you may enter it. Sincerely, s/Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Blank

February 28, 2020

**Proposal to reporters, law clerks, academics, and civic entities for denouncing sham hearings on judicial accountability held by politicians and the judges that they put and protect on the bench; and for holding unprecedented citizen hearings to expose judges' abuse of power and racketeering<sup>‡</sup>**

**A. Politicians do not intend to set up a system for holding judges accountable**

7. House Judiciary Committee Chairman Rep. Jerrold Nadler (D-NY) opened the Courts Subcommittee hearing on “Protecting Federal Judiciary Employees”(supra ¶1) with a statement where he only pointed out “the extreme power imbalance between clerk and judge” and that “experts have identified some best practices to ensure that these power imbalances do not result in working conditions where employees have no recourse or where there is no accountability”. But he did not dare state that the judges were abusing their clerks(†>OL2:1052¶5), never mind hint at any system, let alone one run by non-judges or their political appointers, to hold judges accountable, not to mention liable to compensate their victims. Yet, he knew that the written statements submitted in advance by the witnesses had identified judges as the abusers, not other types of “employees”.
8. Similarly, the Courts Subcommittee would not dare state in the title(supra ¶1) of its hearing that the judges were the abusers. Courts Subcommittee Chairman Hank Johnson does not even list on his official webpage judges’ abuse of their clerks among his “Justice, Civil Liberties, & Government [but not ‘judicial’] Accountability” issues’. His “statement after the hearing”, referred to by *NLJ* reporter Jacqueline Thomsen in her article on the hearing, is nowhere to be found. She wrote:

Rep. Johnson said in a statement after the hearing that the testimony of Olivia Warren [who clerked in 2017-2018 for, and was sexually harassed by, the late Judge Stephen Reinhardt of the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit, where former Chief Judge Alex Kozinski also sat(†>OL2:1053¶10)] reminded lawmakers “of what we have long known is a problem—that systemic harassment, discrimination, and abuses of power are entrenched in our federal court system.”
9. Rep. Johnson’s Press Releases webpage does not include any on the hearing. Neither do the pages of Subcommittee members Rep. Hakeem Jeffries (D-NY), Rep. Ben Cline (R-VA), and Rep. Martha Roby (R-AL). “Harassment, discrimination, and abuses in the federal courts”, let alone by their judges, is a non-issue for them. Their statements were lip service. The hearing was a sham.
10. No politician wants to give an opponent the opportunity to make up a charge, e.g., campaign finance violation, and be dragged into court where he would be branded before the judge or recognized by her as ‘the judges’ nemesis’. That would provoke retaliation by the judge attuned to Then-Judge Gorsuch’s gang mentality expressed in his statement in the Senate: “An attack on one of our brothers and sisters of the robe is an attack on all of us”(OL2:546). No politician or anybody else for that matter, stands a chance against a judge, for the Supreme Court has removed judges beyond their reach: “A judge will not be deprived of immunity because the action he took was in error, was done maliciously, or was in excess of his authority”( \*>jur:26§d). They are Judges Above the Law.
11. Aware of judges’ retaliatory power(\*>Lsch:17§C; jur:23<sup>17</sup>), guaranteed impunity, and capacity to harbor grudges during their life-appointment, politicians have allowed judges to dismiss from 99.82% to 100%(jur:10-14; †>OL2:548, 748) of complaints against judges, which must be filed with them under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980(jur:24§b). Those statistics have been computed from those(OL2:772§G) that the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts(jur:21<sup>10</sup>), who is appointed by the Chief Justice under 28 U.S.C. §601, has provided in his Annual Report to Congress, a public document, as required under §604(a)(4) and (h)(2)(jur:26<sup>23</sup>).

12. To implement the Act, the judges of the several courts adopted Rules for Processing Judicial Conduct and Disability Complaints. They were amended in 1986 by the Illustrative Rules adopted by the Judicial Conference(\*>jur:54<sup>91a</sup>), whose president is the Chief Justice and which includes all the circuit chief judges. The Conference amended them in 2000, 2008, 2015, and 2018(†>OL2:768). But they never intended to hold each other accountable(OL2:792, 918). Nor have the politicians ever intended to stop judges from misleading *We the People* into filing complaints by pretending that under the “new”(jur:125<sup>264</sup>) rules they would be effective. Rather, the judges with the connivance of politicians have kept dismissing them at the same rate for 40 years: up to 100%.

## **B. Judges have conducted sham hearings on Rules not intended to be applied**

13. Why did reporters(OL2:768), the students at the top law schools represented in the People’s Parity Project, and their professors(OL2:773, 774) fail to heed the alerts brought to their attention(OL2:790, 791) revealing the hearing on the “new” Rules scheduled for October 30, 2018 as a sham?: The notice of the hearing was given only by the Administrative Office (AO), which most people, even lawyers, have no clue what it is; so most people do not know its website and have no reason to go to it and see the notice. The latter was given less than a month before the date of the hearing. For the first week, “a glitch” prevented AO’s email system from receiving comments. People had to appear in person to testify on Rules that ran to 89 pages for only 5 minutes at a single hearing in the country, held at AO in Washington, DC, rather than at every federal court; beginning at 9:00 a.m., thus requiring taking off the previous day and staying at a hotel at personal expense; but judges could speak for any length of time, even via video conference, all at government expense; etc.(OL2:783). This was a pretense at compliance with the requirement under 28 U.S.C. §358(c) of a hearing before Rule adoption. The hearing, the Rules, and their underlying Act were a sham!
14. The reporters, the students, and their professors failed to do their due diligence to review the hearings and Rules history to determine whether they were honestly conducted, adopted, and applied with the intention to hold judges accountable or fraudulently to keep abusing and avoiding liability.

## **C. Test case by students to rehabilitate themselves as the best and the brightest**

15. Let the students and the other witnesses, all of whom naively thought they were participating in an honest hearing, and their professors, who should have known better, demand in a test case(cf. OL2:571¶24a) the reimbursement of their expenses to attend that sham hearing on the review of the Rules and punitive compensation for fraud on them and the public at large, who as taxpayers had to pay the cost of the hearing. The defendants would be Judge Anthony J. Scirica, Chair of the Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability; Judge Ralph R. Erickson, Chair of the Committee on Codes of Conduct; their fellow members(OL2:783, 796); and Chief Justice John Roberts, Jr.
16. The Chief set off the process(OL2:642§A, 645) leading up to that 2018 sham hearing on Rules review just as he had for the sham hearings in 2008 and 2015. That establishes a pattern of deception of *the People* to their detriment; cover up of his peers’ abuse for their benefit(cf. OL2:1049¶8); and of racketeering under 18 U.S.C. §1961(5). The Chief, as circuit justice(jur:26<sup>23a</sup>) and recipient under 28 U.S.C. §604(a)(3) of the official court statistics showing up to 100% dismissal of complaints against and by judges, knew and has imputed knowledge that the hearings and the review of the Rules were a sham. Of course, neither the Chief Justice nor the judges will pay compensation.
17. But they will have to file an answer. Will they claim that while they have imposed liability on priests and their churches despite their claim of immunity under the 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment clause guaranteeing the separation of church and state, and made them pay over \$2 billion to their victims, judges have self-granted absolute immunity although the Constitution, Art. III, Sec. 1, provides for their

accountability by allowing them to hold office only “during good Behaviour”(OL:158)? Their failure to “avoid even the appearance of impropriety”, as required by Canon 2 of their Code of Conduct(jur:68<sup>123a</sup>), will become apparent and put them under pressure and on the defensive(jur:92§d).

18. Dissension among the judges may grow, for no pretense at accountability will prevent a judge accused of, let alone investigated for, abuse from shouting at his or her peers what all have written on their forehead: “I and my friends know about the abuse that each of you has committed and covered up. So, if you bring me down, *I’ll take you with me!*” They may be overheard by their clerks. The latter may also want to prove that they are the best and the brightest. Thinking strategically, they can become confidential informants(OL2:1015§D) to the students prosecuting the test case. Students supported by such insiders could be in the strongest position imaginable... unless judges disgusted by the abuse that they have committed voluntarily or under duress become the judges’ most frightening potential exposé: the Federal Judiciary version of *Whistleblower!*

## **D. Rallying cry at citizen hearings to victims, The Dissatisfied, and politicians**

19. The students’ demand for reimbursement and compensation may encourage the coming forward and joining them of many other victims of judges’ most extensive and grave forms of abuse(OL2:1052§C). This is a reasonable expectation based on a reliable, repeatable precedent: 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, overnight the first of over 100 women publicly accused him and within days the *MeToo!* movement had erupted...and he was convicted on 24Feb20(OL2:644). The victims of abuse by the same judge(OL:276§C) will be encouraged to join in local chapters of a movement to make joint demands on their respective abuser. This encouragement can be imparted broadly by reporters, students, and professors mass announcing their demand and holding at universities and media outlets unprecedented citizen hearings(supra ¶5b).
20. Imparting the encouragement can be started now by reaching out to all 2020 candidates, who, desperate to obtain every additional support possible, may appeal to the huge(\*>jur:8<sup>4,5</sup>) untapped voting bloc of The Dissatisfied with the Judicial and Legal System(†>OL2:1027¶3). This is realistic, for Sen. E. Warren has dare denounce judges for failing to recuse themselves from cases where they hold shares in one of the parties before them and resolving that conflict of interests in their favor so as to enrich themselves at the expense of the other party. She has "a plan for that too": to sponsor legislation holding judges accountable for abusive self-enrichment(OL2:998). All politicians can be persuaded to address the issue of judges’ abuse at every appearance(1020, 1027); thus forcing the other candidates to do likewise so as not to cede The Dissatisfied to any opponent (1019, 1029). Thereby they will insert the issue into the campaign. You all can portray yourselves as fighting back for satisfaction, including compensation, thus setting the example for others.

## **E. My presentation to you on wearing the Suit of the Best and the Brightest**

21. I respectfully request that you invite me to make a presentation via video conference or in person to you and your associates, students, professors, assigning editors, etc., with whom you may share this proposal‡, on advancing our harmonious interests by **exposing** politicians’ and judges’ sham hearings, condonation and commission of abuse of power; **demanding** compensation for yourselves in a test case; **forming** local chapters for others to get compensated; **publishing** articles of mine; **reaching** out to 2020 candidates; **holding** unprecedented citizen hearings; **launching** joint investigations; **presenting** their findings at a conference; etc. To decide whether to hold that presentation you may watch my video♦ with its slides(OL2:958). You can set in motion transformative change(OL2:1037§A) in holding politicians and judges accountable, and sue for recognition as The Best and the Brightest.

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

\* [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest\\_Jud\\_Advocates.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf) >all prefixes:# up to OL:393 OL2:1059

♦ [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_judges\\_abuse\\_video.mp4](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_video.mp4)



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

21. If you are interested in bringing Judges Above the Law down to the level where The Law is Equal for All so that they are held accountable and liable to compensate the victims of their abuse, you may want to support Judicial Discipline Reform. It:
  - a. produced the study\*<sup>†</sup> of judges and their judiciaries([supra ¶2](#));
  - b. conducts professional law research and writing, and strategic thinking(<sup>†</sup>>[OL2:445§B, 475§D](#)); and offers for publication one(e.g., [OL2:760, 781, 1051](#)) or a series([719§C](#)) of articles; and
  - c. runs the website at <http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org>, which has impressed its numberless visitors so positively that 30,532 have become subscribers as of March 7, 2020 (<sup>†</sup>>[OL2:Appendix 3](#)). Its business plan proposes to capitalize and expand this impression.
22. Judicial Discipline Reform has a business plan([OL2:1024§C, 914](#)) containing a program of activities(<sup>†</sup>>[OL2:987, 1025¶](#)) intended to form a national civic single issue movement for judicial abuse exposure, compensation of victims, and meaningful reform(<sup>†</sup>>[OL2:1032](#)).
23. One of the first steps of its business plan is turning the informational website into a profit center that offers:
  - a. **a clearinghouse** for complaints(<sup>†</sup>>[OL2:792, 918](#)) about judges that anybody can upload for free; and
  - b. **a research center** for fee-paying customers to audit(\*>[OL:274-280, 304-307](#)) many complaints in search of(\*>[jur:131§b, OL:255](#)) the most persuasive type of evidence, i.e., patterns([OL2:760§A](#)), trends([OL2:455§B](#)), and schemes([OL2:614, 929, 457§D](#)) of abuse of power, including the coordinated fraudulent filing by all judges and approval by their peers and colleagues of mandatory annual financial disclosure reports([jur:102§a](#) and <sup>213b</sup>) under the Ethics in Government Act of 1978([jur:65<sup>107d</sup>](#)), which are intentionally misleading to conceal assets, evade taxes, and launder money, such as the money that they grab through their abusive self-enrichment denounced by Sen. Warren in her “plan” for addressing the Federal Judiciary’s unaccountability and holding its judges accountable([OL2:998](#)).

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

at the **GoFundMe** campaign, <https://www.gofundme.com/expose-unaccountable-judges-abuse>;

or send a check to: Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.  
Judicial Discipline Reform  
2165 Bruckner Blvd.  
Bronx, NY 10472-6506

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

*Dare trigger history!*(<sup>†</sup>>[OL2:1003](#))...and you may enter it.