

May 22, 2015

**STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF A PROPOSAL**  
**to the Northwestern Law Center for Practice Engagement and Innovation**  
**for judicial wrongdoing exposure and reform**  
**How a pioneering, innovating entity**  
**can take advantage of a most propitious political time**  
**to expose both judges' unaccountability and**  
**their consequent riskless wrongdoing**  
**that so outrage the national public as to stir it up to turn their unaccountability**  
**and wrongdoing into a decisive issue of the presidential election campaign,**  
**which will make the public realize its power as *We the People*; and**  
**generate a niche market, a source of profit, and a national name**  
**for the pioneers and innovators: *the People's Champions of Justice***  
[http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_university\\_law\\_research.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_university_law_research.pdf)

**Table of Contents**

Proposal to give practical meaning to your "Terrific!" approval of my May 9 email on  
judicial wrongdoing exposure and reform ..... 253

- ¶1a. Presentation at video conference and/or life at the Center ..... 253
- ¶1b. Multidisciplinary course ..... 253
- ¶1c. Further investigation of two unique national stories ..... 254
- ¶1d. Multimedia public presentation or conference..... 254

A. What the center, its director, and his colleagues stand to gain from accepting the  
proposal for judicial wrongdoing exposure and reform ..... 256

- 1. The exposure of judges' wrongdoing will lead to a flood of motions to vacate,  
reopen, recuse, etc. .... 256
- 2. A niche market is created for knowledge, legal assistance & investigations  
concerning judicial wrongdoing and a leading for-profit provider emerges..... 257

B. The multimedia presentation for the public and the presidential candidates can  
catapult the judicial wrongdoing issue into the campaign ..... 258

- 1. Invitation to the multimedia public presentation or conference..... 259
- 2. Investigative query: What did they know and when did they know it?. .... 260

C. Timeliness of extending to judges the accountability and liability of priests, police  
officers, doctors, lawyers, soldiers, and members of congress and the executive ..... 261

D. Judges do not have a status superior to that of other public servants and the rest of  
the public ..... 262

E. Public outrage at the wrongdoing of judges is indispensable for holding them  
accountable and liable to compensate their victims ..... 263

F. An outraged national public asserts itself as masters of all its public servants and

imposes a new *We the People*-government paradigm ..... 263

G. An Emile Zola's *I accuse!*-like denunciation of judges' wrongdoing made at the Center can cause the most judicial and social innovation ..... 264

\*\*\*\*\*

### **A. What the Center, its director, and his colleagues stand to gain from accepting the proposal for judicial wrongdoing exposure and reform**

1. I have proposed to make a presentation(¶1a supra) on judges' wrongdoing exposure and judicial reform(ol:248) to Dean James Lupo, Director of the Northwestern University Law Center for Practice Engagement and Innovation, his colleagues and students, and members of his LinkedIn group, at a video conference and/or upon invitation in person at the Center.
2. Likewise, I have proposed teaching a multidisciplinary course or practicum(¶1b supra); and a research course that further investigates two unique national stories on judicial unaccountability and wrongdoing(¶1c supra); and jointly organizing a multimedia presentation or conference on that topic for the public at large to which all the presidential candidates, their chiefs of staff, and the journalists covering them as special guests(¶1d supra).
3. These activities support squarely the innovative mission of the Law Center(¶1 quote supra), for they were conceived with the intent of creating a similar 'institute of judicial unaccountability reporting and reform advocacy'(jur:130§5).
4. The intended institute would be a "Pioneering" one in that it would enter the as yet unexplored field of judicial unaccountability reporting; similar to Director Lupo's Center, which is innovative since it tries to reform the existing judiciaries with updating and new features. The institute is supposed to run on a competitive and for profit basis(jur:153§§c-g), as highlighted by my study of the Federal Judiciary and its judges(jur:1).
5. The judicial unaccountability reporting contemplated by my study is likely to generate a niche market as well as the opportunity for the institute, or for an entity, such as proposed here for the Center, to capitalize on its association by the public with the events originating that market so that it becomes a leader in that market and further develops its national name. This means that while exposing judges' wrongdoing and advocating judicial reform are activities undertaken for the common good, they need not be done pro bono nor with self-effacing modesty.

#### **1. The exposure of judges' wrongdoing will lead to a flood of motions to vacate, reopen, recuse, etc.**

6. The Code of Conduct for U.S. Judges enjoins federal judges to "avoid even the appearance of impropriety"<sup>123a</sup>.
7. So imagine what would happen if a Supreme Court justice and former federal circuit and district judge(jur:102¶231a.4-6) came under a Watergate-like(ol:200§I) generalized media, never mind official(ol:201§J), investigation(ol:194§E) for having failed to observe that injunction by appearing to have concealed assets, as *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and Politico<sup>107a</sup> suspected Then-Judge, Now-Justice Sotomayor(ol:191§A) of doing. Their suspicion is borne out by the analysis<sup>107c</sup> of the financial statements that she submitted to the Senate Subcommittee on Judicial Nominations<sup>107b</sup>.
8. Concealing assets is a crime committed as part of the crimes of tax evasion, money laundering

<sup>ol:5fn10</sup>, and withholding assets from distribution in divorce, inheritance, and bankruptcy proceedings(<sup>ol:5a/fn15c</sup> >18 U.S.C. §§152, 157).

9. A stream of motions to vacate the orders, rulings, and decisions of J. Sotomayor –or any other justice or judge([jur:102§b](#))– would result from her appearing to be involved in such criminal conduct as well as motions to reopen and retry, or to recuse from, cases in which she sat or is sitting. The motions would rest on the fact that a judge’s integrity is compromised for all aspects of the judge’s conduct, for he who shows contempt for the law by breaking it in self-interest cannot be reasonably expected to make great effort to comply with the strictures of the law on behalf of others.
10. That stream of motions would become a torrent if J. Sotomayor –or a similarly situated justice or judge– resigned from the Supreme Court. The precedent for this resignation is that of Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas on May 14, 1969, after *Life* magazine revealed his financial improprieties, which were not even misdemeanors, but only conduct deemed improper for a justice ([jur:92§d](#)).
11. That torrent of motions would become Mississippi-over-its-banks if the investigation of J. Sotomayor led to that of the Federal Judiciary itself. That would occur if that investigation were extended from her to all her peers who engaged in coordinated([jur:88§§a](#)) “improprieties” by relying on:
  - a. the assistance of peers and
  - b. the condonation([jur:90§§b-c](#)) of peers:
    - 1) those who knew about her and her peers’ improper individual or collective conduct, but kept silent about it; and
    - 2) those who should have known had they proceeded with due diligence because they:
      - a) had supervisory duties and/or
      - b) had an institutional and statutory duty([ol:160§B](#)) to safe-guard the integrity of both the Judiciary and judicial process.
12. Supervisory and dutiful judges could have examined<sup>213b</sup>, among other things, the justice’s and her peers’ annual mandatory financial disclosure reports<sup>107b,d</sup>, which are filed by judges with other judges –and are also available to the public<sup>213a</sup>–; and investigated the complaints against them filed under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act<sup>18a</sup>.
13. By so doing, those judges would have discovered the bankruptcy fraud scheme([jur:66§§2-3](#)) run by federal judges together with other insiders of the legal and bankruptcy systems<sup>169</sup> as a source of assets involved in their asset concealment scheme([jur:102§a](#)) and which they protected through their systematic complaint dismissal scheme([jur:24§b](#)).

## **2. A niche market is created for knowledge, legal assistance & investigations concerning judicial wrongdoing and a leading for-profit provider emerges**

14. My proposal can help the Center become broadly known as the entity that implemented a strategy for exposing, not just a rogue justice, but rather a wrongdoing Federal Judiciary and its judges([ol:193§D](#)). It can do so by promoting the conduct of media and official investigations of such a justice as a Trojan horse into the whole of the Judiciary. Those investigations can prompt ever more journalists, politicians, lawyers and their bars, pro ses, and civic entities advocating

honest judiciaries to call for the resignation of judges who failed to “avoid even the appearance of improprieties” or the impeachment of any wrongdoing judge.

15. Parties and lawyers all over the country will reasonably assume that the Center has the knowledge and expertise necessary to provide them with fee-based assistance in drafting and arguing the motions above mentioned, and investigating and/or disqualifying the judges in their cases who appeared to have engaged in improprieties or engaged in wrongdoing.
16. Also, the public will clamor for judicial reform to prevent, detect, and punish judicial wrongdoing, and compensate its victims. Lending an expert voice to that clamor can give rise to another aspect of the niche market:
  - a. The public can demand that unaccountable and wrongdoing judges and the Federal Judiciary be subjected to constitutional checks and balances, including through the enactment of new statutes proscribing judicial wrongdoing or ‘bad Behaviour’ under Article III, Section 1, of the Constitution<sup>12b</sup>; the detection of wrongdoing through the honest use of supervisory and complaint mechanisms; the enforcement of existing and new statutes through effective prosecution; the punishment of wrongdoing judges and their non-judicial accomplices; and the compensation of their victims.
  - b. The public can petition for constitutional amendments.
  - c. The public can become vocal in its support of the already valid states’ application for a constitutional convention: In March 2014, Michigan became the 34<sup>th</sup> state to apply for such convention, whereby the requirement of Article V of the Constitution that two thirds of the states do so was satisfied.
17. Any of those events can give rise to a novel political and constitutional situation, even to a constitutional crisis over the redistribution of power among the three branches. That would create and drive demand to a leading entity and its experts for ‘innovative’ legal advice and public advocacy on how to jockey for position in order to advance or defend one’s interests for or against effective checks and balances, and a constitutional amendment or convention.
18. The precedent for the above is the intense public attention paid to Accountant and Securities Analyst Harry Markopolos after it became known that he had both figured out that Bernie Madoff was running a gigantic Ponzi scheme, and complained to the authorities repeatedly, including the SEC, for years to no avail. This prompted him to write his account thereof in his book *No One Would Listen*, published by John Wiley & Sons in March 2010, which became a bestseller. Mr. Markopolos was finally listened to by Congress and the rest of the world. Accordingly, many investors who had fallen victim to Madoff flocked to Mr. Markopolos for help in recovering at least some of their invested funds.

## **B. The multimedia presentation for the public and the presidential candidates can catapult the judicial wrongdoing issue into the campaign**

19. My proposed presentation at a video conference and/or the Center and the courses(¶1a-c supra) will bring to the attention of the faculty, students, and as many journalists(ol:199§H) as possible both the already available evidence of judges’ wrongdoing(jur:21§§A,B) and the further investigation(ol:194§E) of two unique national stories on judicial unaccountability and wrongdoing(ol:191§§A,B).
20. Those proposed activities will lay the foundation for the proposed one- or half-day multimedia presentation or conference on judicial wrongdoing exposure and reform. It will be addressed to

the public at large. All the Republican and Democratic presidential candidates and their chiefs of staff will be invited as special guests to cause them to take a stand on the issue and make it a central one of their platforms and a decisive one of the primaries, the nominating conventions, and the presidential election campaign.

21. Moreover, all the journalists(ol:250) that cover the candidates will also be invited: Their reporting on the presentation/conference will have a multiplier effect. Also, they will be presented with a plan for further investigating those two unique national stories(ol:191§§A,B) in their personal and professional interest in earning any or many of the valuable material and moral rewards(ol:3§F) available in light of the precedent: the investigative journalism of the Watergate scandal(jur:4¶¶10-14).
22. The invitation to attend the presentation/conference will highlight one of the most enticing rewards: an untapped constituency consisting of a novel voting bloc for politicians(ol:231§B) and a pool of news consumers to grow journalists' audience(ol:199§2):

...The victims of judges' wrongdoing are found among the 100 million parties to the 50 million new lawsuits filed in state and federal courts annually<sup>4,5</sup>, plus all the victims in pending cases, and those in cases already decided not just wrongly, but rather wrongfully in the judges' interest and that of their peers and cronies.

Victims of judges' wrongdoing can be considered a newly found voting bloc and news audience. They are highly passionate people, for they feel abused and betrayed by the judges. The latter are the very ones who had a duty to uphold the Constitution to ensure that parties before them would benefit from due process and equal protection of the law, but instead trampled those guarantees underfoot and after squeezing the law out of them, gave the parties the residue: *the dregs of justice!*

No wonder the victims are mad. They are also very committed to their quest for justice and vindication. By now they are skeptical about the legal system and distrustful of anybody associated with the judiciary and even the rest of government.

However, you can endeavor to feel their outrage at having been abused by wrongdoing judges. In that vein, you can unambiguously and repeatedly call during this election campaign for nationally tele-vised hearings on judges' wrongdoing, similar to those held by the Senate Watergate Committee and the 9/11 Commission. Those hearings are the prerequisite to establishing judges' liability to compensate their victims as well as the depth of the needed judicial reform.

If you convince the victims of your sincere outrage at judges' wrongdoing and your commitment to exposing it, you will find in them the most committed supporters at the water coolers, and volunteers at your campaign offices, and generous donors, and reliable prospective voters. They will also be insatiable consumers and ever-growing audience of your news and updates on an issue that never fails to elicit an inflamed, persistent reaction from the pit of everybody's soul: *That's not fair!*(ol:240)

Hence the title of the conference at the Center to which we are inviting you together with all the other presidential candidates and the



journalists that cover them:

**Who will be the Champion  
of the Victims of Wrongdoing Judges Above the Law?**

23. That question is bound to resonate with the presidential candidates because in a field as unprecedentedly crowded as the current one, each of them is in desperate need to stand out from the pack as the leader on an issue that captures the heart and opens the wallets of ever more voters and wins them over to their respective camp; otherwise, they will not survive even the early primaries. The candidate that answers “I” may rally behind him or her millions of highly passionate and committed supporters: victims of wrongdoing judges in a personal quest for justice(ol:244).
24. As a result of attending the presentation/conference and realizing that there is a voting bloc and news-avid audience at stake, presidential candidates and journalists alike may climb on the investigative bandwagon driven by a historically devastating query, the one that led to the resignation of President Nixon, thus updated:

What did the presidential candidates  
and their supporters in office,  
including the President(jur:77§5) and senators(jur:78§6), as well as  
Supreme Court justices(jur:71§4) and other federal judges,  
know about judicial wrongdoing, as suspected by  
*The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and Politico<sup>107a</sup>,  
particularly concealment of assets<sup>107c</sup>, and  
when did they know it?

25. This investigative query may cause candidates and journalists to ask three questions pregnant with consequences for the campaign and for government itself: They may:
- a. ask President Obama to render public the three FBI vetting reports(jur:102¶231a.4-6) on Judicial Candidate and Nominee Sotomayor;
  - b. ask J. Sotomayor to request from the President that he release them; and
  - c. ask the same questions with respect to either all judges who appear to have engaged in improprieties, let alone committed wrongdoing, or any and all other justices and judges to determine their individual integrity and that of the Judiciary as an institution.
26. These questions are intended to enable the public to determine whether presidents and senators had received but in self-interest or connivingly disregarded to the detriment of judicial integrity and the public FBI reports that judicial candidates and nominees had failed to “avoid even the appearance of improprieties” even before they had become judges or been elevated to a higher court or office, i.e., from associate to chief justice.
27. If they had, they had no reasonable expectation that those candidates and nominees would upon confirmation not continue engaging in improprieties, let alone committing wrongdoing.
28. On the contrary, the nominating presidents and confirming senators had very reason to expect that the judicial candidates and nominees found by the FBI to have engaged in improprieties would continue so engaged; e.g., a person who has concealed assets must continue concealing them, lest the declaration of such assets incriminate that person in concealment of assets, tax evasion, money laundering, etc.

**C. Timeliness of extending to judges the accountability and liability of priests, police officers, doctors, lawyers, soldiers, and members of Congress and the Executive**

29. The time is ripe for extending to judges the principle of accountability and liability to compensate the victims of one's own wrongdoing by analogy to the application of that principle to priests and the Catholic Church, which has been held liable to pay so far over \$2 billion to the victims of pedophilic priests.
30. That application to them is nowadays as commonplace as to medical personnel and their hospitals; lawyers and their law firms; and police officers and their departments.
31. Indeed, the Chicago City Council voted earlier this month, on May 6, 2015, to compensate the victims of police torture even though the statute of limitations had run on the torture that occurred between 1972 and 1991, and despite the fact that it had already paid around \$100 million in connection with similar police torture incidents.
32. The recent spate of deadly police shootings has given both the public and the government the opportunity to show that they take the accountability and liability of police officers and their departments for granted. Prosecutors in Baltimore brought charges against the six police officers involved in the police custody death of Freddie Gray and all were indicted by a grand jury.
33. Even President Obama recognized the accountability and liability of the U.S. government for the unintentional killing of civilians by American drones in Afghanistan and Iraq, and volunteered to compensate the surviving relatives for their loss.
34. Likewise, civilians employed by the security service provider Blackwater and working under contract for the U.S. Army have been convicted of unjustifiably killing civilians in Iraq and sentenced to long prison terms.
35. Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, are held accountable for wrongdoing, such as evasion of taxes, e.g., Representative Charlie Rangel (D-NY) was censured in the well of the House for failure to pay certain taxes for 17 years; Senator Robert Menendez (D-NJ) is currently under indictment on eight federal bribery counts as well as conspiracy for having received benefits from a friend in exchange for his political influence.
36. Members of Congress are also held accountable for conduct that is not even criminal but that diminishes the public esteem of Congress, e.g., Representative Anthony Weiner (D-NY) was given to understand by fellow representatives that they did not want him in the House anymore and that he should resign, which he did, for texting semi-nude selfies.
37. Congress hold members of the Executive accountable: It held Attorney General Eric Holder accountable for stalling and obfuscating concerning the production of documents that it had requested during its investigation of the Department of Justice Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms' gunrunning Fast and Furious program. For the first time in history, Congress held a sitting member of the president's cabinet in contempt of Congress.
38. The Executive holds its members accountable and liable, as shown by the Department of Justice's investigation of Retired General David Petraeus, Former Commander of the U.S. Army in Iraq and Afghanistan, and subsequently Director of the C.I.A. DoJ brought felony charges against him for the unauthorized leaking of classified information to his biographer and mistress, Paula Broadwell. He pled guilty in federal court to a misdemeanor charge of mishandling classified information. A federal judge sentenced him to two years' probation plus a \$100,000 fine.

39. What is more, even the President of the United States, elected by scores of millions of voters, is liable to suit even while in office, as was President Clinton for his conduct as president in the Monica Lewinsky affair; and as governor of Arkansas in the suit by Paula Jones. He was impeached by the House, but the Senate did not vote to remove him from office.
40. Republican President Nixon resigned on August 8, 1974, upon learning that the House of Representatives was drafting articles of impeachment for his participation in the political espionage, abuse of power, obstruction of justice, and campaign contribution fraud involved in the Watergate scandal; all his White House aides went to jail for their role in Watergate(jur:4¶¶10-14).

#### **D. Judges do not have a status superior to that of other public servants and the rest of the public**

41. Neither the president nor the senators have the power to confer incorruptibility or impunity upon candidates to the other branch, that is, the Judiciary. Judges remain presumptively honest, potentially corrupt and corruptible, public servants.
42. In fact, the Constitution<sup>12b</sup> provides in Article III, Section 1, that they can hold on to office only “during good Behaviour”; and Articles II, Section 4, provides for the impeachment of all “public officers”, without excluding judges.
43. Consequently, judges are accountable for their job performance like any other public or private employee. Like everybody else, they too must be held liable to compensate the victims of their intentional, negligent, and accidental injurious acts.
44. But they are not. Whereas on September 30, 2013, there were 2,217 federal judges, including justices and magistrates, in office<sup>13</sup>, in the last 226 years since the creation of the Federal Judiciary in 1789, only 8 federal judges have been impeached and removed<sup>14</sup>. Once a person is confirmed to a federal judgeship, he or she can do whatever they want in reliance on the historical record that they will suffer no adverse consequence and will certainly not lose their job.
45. In fact, to do whatever they want and get away with it, judges self-immunize against liability (jur:21§a): Circuit and district judges dismiss without any investigation 99.82% of complaints filed against them and deny up to 100% of petitions to review such dismissals(jur:10,11).
46. To the same end, circuit judges dispose of up to 91% of appeals through reasonless summary orders(jur:43§1) or decisions so “perfunctory”<sup>68</sup> and arbitrary that judges, ashamed of public scrutiny, mark them “not for publication” and “not precedential”(jur:43¶¶82), and issue practically all of them unsigned. Those are fiats of judges full of contempt for a system of law like ours, which is based on precedent. They pay lip service to the principle that “Justice should not only be done, but should manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done”<sup>71</sup>, while they hypocritically resort to the secrecy of those summary orders and decisions to deny justice according to law.
47. What right can judges honestly invoke to concoct the judicial immunity doctrine(jur:26§d) in order to arrogate to themselves the power to repeal in effect the constitutional provisions for holding them accountable, and disregard all other statutory and ethical principles of accountability(ol:158)? They can invoke no right at all to do so. It is only by abusing the public power entrusted to them over people’s property, liberty, and all the rights and duties that determine people’s lives that judges hold themselves immune from any form of prosecution. Through such abuse, they act with impunity as Judges Above the Law.



## **E. Public outrage at the wrongdoing of judges is indispensable for holding them accountable and liable to compensate their victims**

48. Judges constitute a class of people similarly situated to the public officers of the other two branches (§D supra). They too are fiduciaries of the public trust and power placed in them. As a result, they too owe a duty of care to the public, in general, and to those with whom they deal, in particular. It follows that an effort to extend to them the otherwise widely applied principle of accountability and liability can reasonably be expected to succeed, especially if the most propitious opportunity (ol:196§F) afforded by this presidential election campaign and other current events is taken advantage of.
49. However, in addition to the considerations of timely and consistent application of the accountability and liability principle, the effort to apply it also to judges must provoke and then be driven by an irrepressible practical force:
50. The key to extending accountability and liability to judges lies in provoking national public outrage. Only an outraged national public can force politicians to cease and desist, lest they be voted out of, or not into, office, from holding judges unaccountable, and not only enact pertinent laws to hold them accountable and liable, but also effectively enforce them.
51. That outrage can only be provoked by the courageous, unmitigated, and credible exposure of judges' wrongdoing by advocates of honest judiciaries. Their exposure must cover:
  - a. the nature, extent, and gravity of judges' wrongdoing (jur:65§§1-4); and
  - b. the abuse of power to gain immunity:
    - 1) by their own hand (jur:21§§1-3); and
    - 2) through their connivance with the politicians who recommended, nominated, and confirmed them and now hold 'their men and women on the bench' unaccountable (jur:77§§5-6).
52. An outraged national public is the indispensable agent for holding judges' accountable and liable. But advocates of honest judiciaries are the necessary launchers of judicial wrongdoing exposure. Politicians and journalists, even opportunistic ones, are the required facilitators of the exposure.

## **F. An outraged national public asserts itself as masters of all its public servants and imposes a new *We the People*-government paradigm**

53. It will be a historic event of the first order (jur:xliv§G) for an outraged national public to succeed in forcing the termination of the undemocratic, undeserved, and injurious privilege of judges, who for hundreds of years have abusively granted themselves immunity from prosecution and liability. If the public succeeds in so doing, a transformation in its self-image will occur: It will realize that it is *We the People*, the sovereign in a democracy, the source of all political power. *The People* are the masters in 'government of, by, and for the people'<sup>172</sup>, entitled to hold all public officers as their public servants, including judicial public servants, accountable to them for their performance of their public duties and liable to compensate the victims of their wrongdoing (ol:192§C).
54. Asserting themselves as masters, *the People* may start by holding their judicial public servants accountable and liable, and end up holding all other public servants likewise.
55. Instead of *the People* leaving it up to politicians to hold judges accountable and liable to the minimum degree necessary for the politicians to appease voters and save at the polls their careers,

*the People* will demand that politicians take the unprecedented step of establishing citizen boards of judicial accountability and discipline(jur:160§8) so that the public itself may be the independent body that takes the initiative to ensure that judges do not abuse their public power, but if they do, are held accountable and liable to compensate those whom they have wronged.

56. Politicians will neither voluntarily nor willingly devolve power to *the People*. Only if *the People* become outraged at their having been abused and betrayed by their public servants will they feel empowered to force upon politicians as well as judges a reconfiguration of the distribution and exercise of political power in our democracy.
57. Hence, it is reasonable to expect that *the People's* success in extending accountability and liability to their judicial public servants will create momentum for profound social change. A new *We the People*-government paradigm will be the demand of the self-assertive civic movement that will emerge from that success: *the People's* Sunrise(ol:201§J) movement.
58. That Sun will Rise over the self-image of people in other countries. Other societal and political innovations began in our country and progressively became the standard for the rest of the world. Likewise, this reformative innovation in the judiciary can be forced first upon the Federal Judiciary and thereafter extended to the rest of government; spread to their state counterparts, and thus set a trend in motion that eventually traverses our frontiers and reaches all other countries.

#### **G. An Emile Zola's *I accuse!*-like denunciation of judges' wrongdoing made at the Center can cause the most judicial and social innovation**

59. Innovation in the judiciary can originate at the Center by Director Lupo and his colleagues and students timely and insightfully at the beginning of a hotly contested presidential campaign taking the proposed lead in judicial wrongdoing exposure.
60. Let them make a denunciation similar to Emile Zola's *I accuse!* denunciation of the bigoted French army officers in the Dreyfus affair(jur:98§2), which brought about historic social change in France and reverberated around the world. The members of the Center and you too, yes, you, the Reader, can utter a similar denunciation: *I accuse!* wrongdoing judges.
61. Your collective denunciation of wrongdoing judges will be a pioneering act of civic courage on behalf of *We the People*; it will also redound to the benefit of all of you. Through it, you can launch a series of events that attract the admiring attention of the national and even international public; creates a niche market that seeks you out as the leading provider of expert advice and advocacy services; and earns you the grateful recognition from those here and those abroad as *the Peoples' Champions of Justice*(ol:201§K).
62. Therefore, I respectfully submit that my proposal for the initial video conference and/or life presentation at the Center; the multidisciplinary course; the further investigation of the two unique national stories; and the multimedia public presentation or conference, should be discussed with a view to adopting it. So I look forward to discussing it with all of you.

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

Watch the interview with Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq., by Alfred Lambremont Webre, JD, MEd, on the issue of exposing judges' wrongdoing and bringing about judicial reform, at:

[http://www.dailymotion.com/video/x2362oh\\_dr-cordero-u-s-judiciary-goes-rogue-99-82-complaints-vs-judges-are-dismissed-u-s-justice-sonia-sotom\\_news](http://www.dailymotion.com/video/x2362oh_dr-cordero-u-s-judiciary-goes-rogue-99-82-complaints-vs-judges-are-dismissed-u-s-justice-sonia-sotom_news) or [Interview](#)

or [Dr. Cordero: U.S. Judiciary goes Rogue - 99.82% complaints vs. Judges are dismissed; U.S. Justice Sonia Sotomayor hides assets with impunity.](#)

May 22, 2015

Professor James A. Lupo  
Director, Northwestern Law Center for  
Practice Engagement and Innovation  
Northwestern University School of Law  
375 East Chicago Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60611-3069

tel. (312) 503-4850  
[j-lupo2@law.northwestern.edu](mailto:j-lupo2@law.northwestern.edu)  
<http://www.law.northwestern.edu/research-faculty/practice-engagement/>

Dear Director Lupo,

I would like to congratulate you on your appointment as director of the Center for Practice Engagement and Innovation. I am very thankful for your invitation of 7 instant to join your LinkedIn group. I accepted it in my email of the 9<sup>th</sup>. You reacted approvingly to my acceptance email's statement on judges' wrongdoing exposure and judicial reform by stating in your email of May 11, "Terrific!" Consequently, I would like to submit to your consideration the following concrete ways of giving practical meaning to your "Terrific!" approval.

**Proposal to give practical meaning to the innovation objective of the Center by pioneering judicial wrongdoing exposure and reform**

1. The following ways of expressing in practice your "Terrific!" approval of my email are supportive of your statement of the Center's mission:

We will bring together diverse voices and perspectives on key topics in legal education and the profession—from outside the Law School and from within... We will listen to all ideas, propose innovation, and implement meaningful change.

<http://www.law.northwestern.edu/research-faculty/practice-engagement/>

- a. You invite the members of the Center and your LinkedIn group to a presentation by me([ol:197§G](#)) at a video conference and/or live at the Center, on the two-pronged approach to exposing judges' wrongdoing ([ol:190¶¶1-7](#)) and advocating judicial reform([ol:201§J](#)). This approach is discussed at [ol:248](#), where it forms part of my study of the Federal Judiciary and its judges, titled:

Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Wrongdoing:  
Pioneering the news and publishing field of judicial unaccountability reporting([jur:1](#))

- b. You invite me to hold a multidisciplinary course or practicum this summer and/or next semester based on:
  - 1) the program of academic activities([ol:115](#));
  - 2) the research proposal([ol:60](#));
  - 3) the proposal for applying advanced Information Technology to develop software for auditing judicial writings through statistical, linguistic, and literary analysis([jur:131§b](#)); and
  - 4) the detailed syllabus for a multidisciplinary academic course ([dcc:1](#)); and

- c. You invite me to teach a research course that further investigates two unique national stories(ol:191§§A,B) on judicial unaccountability and wrongdoing(ol:194§E); and
  - d. We jointly organize and hold a multimedia public presentation or conference on judicial wrongdoing exposure and reform to which all presidential candidates, their chiefs of staff, and the journalists covering them are invited(ddc:11).
2. The article below shows how this proposal is harmonious with “[your] area of research interest [] in exploring the relationships between legal rhetoric, judicial decision-making and social change”; <http://www.law.northwestern.edu/faculty/profiles/jameslupo/>.
  3. The article shows how exposing the outrageous and injurious hypocrisy that separates the Federal Judiciary’s rhetoric about its administration of “Equal Justice Under Law” from its unaccountable judges’ actual decision-making as a means of committing wrongdoing can bring about fundamental social change. Indeed, during the optimal time of this presidential election campaign (ol:196§F), such exposure can so outrage(jur:83§§2,3) the national public as to make it realize and assert its status(ol:192§C):
  4. In our ‘government of, by, and for the people’<sup>172</sup>, the public is *We the People*, the masters of all our public servants, including judicial public servants, which is what judges are. A Tea Party-like(jur:164§9) civic movement can emerge that forces the redistribution of all public power emanating from *the People*. Thereby *the People* empower themselves to hold all their public servants accountable and liable to compensate the victims of their wrongdoing. To prevent, detect, and punish such wrongdoing, they also cause the Judiciary to be reformed through innovative mechanisms and bodies(jur:160§8) whereby *the People* ensure ‘government, not of men and women, but by the rule of law’<sup>ol:5fn6</sup>.
  5. What do the Center and its members stand to gain from contributing to exposing judges’ wrongdoing and advocating judicial reform? The article below begins by answering that question. That gain is also presented as the objective of a business proposal for a recruiter of a team of journalists and lawyers(ol:271).
  6. I offer to present this proposal to you, your colleagues, and guests at a video conference or, upon invitation, in person. In this vein, you may wish to watch the interview with me by Alfred Lambremont Webre, JD, MEd, on the issue of exposing judges’ wrongdoing and bringing about judicial reform, at:  
[http://www.dailymotion.com/video/x2362oh\\_dr-cordero-u-s-judiciary-goes-rogue-99-82-complaints-vs-judges-are-dismissed-u-s-justice-sonia-sotom\\_news](http://www.dailymotion.com/video/x2362oh_dr-cordero-u-s-judiciary-goes-rogue-99-82-complaints-vs-judges-are-dismissed-u-s-justice-sonia-sotom_news)  
or [Dr. Cordero: U.S. Judiciary goes Rogue - 99.82% complaints vs. Judges are dismissed; U.S. Justice Sonia Sotomayor hides assets with impunity.](#)
  7. Therefore, I look forward to discussing with you this proposal to give practical meaning to your “Terrific!” approval of my previous email.

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

Sincerely, s/Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Blank



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

Judicial Discipline Reform

has produced  
the study\* † ♣ of judges and their judiciaries

**Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Abuse of Power:**

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

this article, and a website

Join its 37,379+ subscribers thus: go to

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

<left panel ↓ Register

or

+ New or Users >Add New.

Support its professional law research and writing, and strategic thinking

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)

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 below.

Sincerely,

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

[Judicial Discipline Reform](#)

2165 Bruckner Blvd.

Bronx, NY 10472-6506 tel. (718)827-9521

[Dr.Richard.Cordero\\_Esq@verizon.net](mailto:Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net), [DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org](mailto:DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org),  
[CorderoRic@yahoo.com](mailto:CorderoRic@yahoo.com)

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

**NOTE:** Given the interference with Dr. Cordero's email and e-cloud storage accounts described at \*>ggl:1 et seq. and †>OL2:1114§G, when emailing him, copy the above bloc of his email addresses and paste it in the To: line of your email so as to enhance the chances of your email reaching him at least at one of those addresses.

# Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

[Dr.Richard.Cordero\\_Esq@verizon.net](mailto:Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net)

[DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org](mailto:DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org)

Judicial Discipline Reform

New York City

Exposing  
Judges' Unaccountability  
and  
Consequent Riskless Abuse of Power  
**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

PART I:

[http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest\\_Jud\\_Advocates.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf)  
or

PART II:

[http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Honest\\_Jud\\_Advocates2.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates2.pdf)

PART III:

[http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-Honest\\_Jud\\_Advocates3.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates3.pdf)

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

**Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.**

[Dr.Richard.Cordero\\_Esq@verizon.net](mailto:Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net)

[DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org](mailto:DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org)

Judicial Discipline Reform

New York City

[www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org](http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org)

Volume II

**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](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf)

**Volume I:**

[http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest\\_Jud\\_Advocates.pdf](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](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/jur/DrRCordero_jud_unaccountability_reporting.pdf)

or

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

# Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

[Dr.Richard.Cordero\\_Esq@verizon.net](mailto:Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net)

[DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org](mailto:DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org)

Judicial Discipline Reform

New York City



## Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Abuse of Power 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

PART I:

[http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest\\_Jud\\_Advocates.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf)  
or

PART II:

[http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Honest\\_Jud\\_Advocates2.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates2.pdf)


PART III:

[http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-Honest\\_Jud\\_Advocates3.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates3.pdf)

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

WordPress 5.7 is available! Please update now.

### Users [Add New](#)









 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 it! If you have any questions or feedback, leave us a [message](#).

- Rogier

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

All (37,388) | Administrator (1) | **Subscriber (37,387)**  [Search Users](#)

Bulk actions [Apply](#) Change role to... [Change](#) 37,388 items << < 1 of 1,870 > >>

<input type="checkbox"/>	Username	Name	Email	Role	Posts
<input type="checkbox"/>	 1970mdegcf	—	einarcruickshank1989@e.bengira.com	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	 1Barret1cuple	—	tornado102034@hotmail.com	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	 1ofthmany	—	terree@comcast.net	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	 365betv31h	—	yana.negrebetskaya.95@mail.ru	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	 3aplust63von	—	sam@3aplust63.ru	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	 791064087357326	—	daniellacarroll@mailcatch.com	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	 AaaBEvick	—	a21@play.quakeclub.com	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	 AAAGlennbeish	—	umbainvro@viagraforsale.monster	Subscriber	0



March 5, 2021

**Links to individual files, each containing one of the articles in the three-volume study\* † ♣ of judges and their judiciaries:‡**

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

Many of the articles have also been posted to the website of Judicial Discipline Reform at <http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org>.

Visit the website and join its 37,353+ subscribers to its articles thus:  
homepage <left panel ↓Register or + New or Users >Add New.

**A. Articles available for review, downloadable as individual files**

1. \*>jur:10; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_complaint\\_dismissal\\_statistics.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_complaint_dismissal_statistics.pdf)  
Cf. a. *id.* on the Second Circuit and Then-judge Sonia Sotomayor  
b. OL2:546; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_hearings\\_JGorsuch\\_complainants&parties.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_hearings_JGorsuch_complainants&parties.pdf)  
c. OL2:748; Judge Brett Kavanaugh, Chief Judge Merrick Garland, and their peers and colleagues in the District of Columbia Circuit dismissed 476 complaints against them during the 1oct06-30sep17 11-year period; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero\\_JJ\\_Kavanaugh-Garland\\_exoneration\\_policy.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero_JJ_Kavanaugh-Garland_exoneration_policy.pdf)  
d. OL2:1176; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_JgACBarrett\\_condonation\\_judges\\_power\\_abuse.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_JgACBarrett_condonation_judges_power_abuse.pdf)  
e. OL3:1229; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-JudgeRPratt.pdf> and <https://www.iasd.uscourts.gov/content/senior-district-judge-robert-w-pratt>  
f. OL3:1237 on exposing attorney general designate Judge M. Garland; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_media\\_exposing\\_judges.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_media_exposing_judges.pdf)  
g. Template to be filled out with the complaint statistics on any of the 15 reporting courts: [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_template\\_table\\_complaints\\_v\\_judges.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_template_table_complaints_v_judges.pdf)
2. \*>jur:65; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_abuse\\_by\\_justices.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_abuse_by_justices.pdf)
3. jur:122; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_judicial\\_unaccountability\\_brochures\\_report.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judicial_unaccountability_brochures_report.pdf)
4. jur:130; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_Institute\\_judicial\\_unaccountability\\_reporting.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_Institute_judicial_unaccountability_reporting.pdf)
5. \*>Lsch:13; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_dynamic\\_analysis&strategic\\_thinking.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_dynamic_analysis&strategic_thinking.pdf)
6. \*>DeLano Case Course; dcc; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_Syllabus.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_Syllabus.pdf)
7. \*>Creative writings, cw; [http://judicialdiscipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_creative\\_writings.pdf](http://judicialdiscipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_creative_writings.pdf)
8. \*>OL:42; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_law\\_research\\_proposals.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_law_research_proposals.pdf)

\* [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-Honest\\_Jud\\_Advocates3.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates3.pdf) >from OL3:1144  
\*.../OL/... >all prefixes:# up to OL:393 †.../OL2/... >from OL2:394-1143  
‡ [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_individual\\_files\\_links.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_individual_files_links.pdf)

9. \*>OL:158; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_no\\_judicial\\_immunity.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_no_judicial_immunity.pdf)
10. \*>OL:190; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_institutionalized\\_judges\\_abuse\\_power.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_institutionalized_judges_abuse_power.pdf)
11. \*>OL:274; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_auditing\\_judges.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_auditing_judges.pdf)
12. OL2:433; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_Yahooglegroups.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_Yahooglegroups.pdf)
13. OL2:453; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_judicial\\_accountability\\_presentation.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judicial_accountability_presentation.pdf)
14. OL2:468; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_turning\\_court\\_clerks\\_into\\_informants.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_turning_court_clerks_into_informants.pdf)
15. †>OL2:546; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_complaint\\_dismissal\\_statistics.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_complaint_dismissal_statistics.pdf); see also infra OL2:792; see the supporting official statistical tables of the federal courts at [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/statistics&tables/statistical\\_tables\\_complaints\\_v\\_judges.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/statistics&tables/statistical_tables_complaints_v_judges.pdf)
16. OL2:567; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-The\\_Dissatisfied\\_with\\_Judicial\\_System.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-The_Dissatisfied_with_Judicial_System.pdf)
17. OL2:608, 760; article using official court statistics to demonstrate “**the math of abuse**”: neither judges nor clerks read the majority of briefs, disposing of them through 'dumping forms', which are unresearched, reasonless, arbitrary, ad-hoc fiat-like orders on a 5¢ rubberstamped form; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_judges\\_do\\_not\\_read.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_do_not_read.pdf)
18. OL2:614; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_how\\_fraud\\_scheme\\_works.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_how_fraud_scheme_works.pdf)
19. OL2:773; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Harvard\\_Yale\\_prof\\_students.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Harvard_Yale_prof_students.pdf)
20. OL2:781; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_judges\\_intercepting\\_emails\\_mail.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_intercepting_emails_mail.pdf)
21. OL2:792; 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](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-SupCt_CJ_JGRoberts.pdf)
22. †>OL2:821; Programmatic presentation on forming a national civic movement for judicial abuse of power exposure, redress, and reform; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_programmatic\\_presentation.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_programmatic_presentation.pdf)
23. \*>OL2:879; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_Black\\_Robed\\_Predators\\_documentary.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_Black_Robed_Predators_documentary.pdf)
24. OL2:901; <http://www.judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-LDAD.pdf>
25. OL2:918; File on the complaint's journey –from OL2:792– until its final disposition in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-11Circuit.pdf>
26. OL2:929; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-IT\\_investigate\\_interception.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-IT_investigate_interception.pdf)
27. OL2:932; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-ProfRPosner.pdf>
28. OL2:947; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-media.pdf>
29. OL2:951; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_judges\\_abuse\\_citizens\\_hearings.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_citizens_hearings.pdf)
30. OL2:957; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_judges\\_abuse\\_video.mp4](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_video.mp4)
31. OL2:957; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_judges\\_abuse\\_slides.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_slides.pdf)
32. OL2:971; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Professors\\_students\\_journalists.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Professors_students_journalists.pdf);

[http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Professors\\_students\\_lawyers.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Professors_students_lawyers.pdf)

33. OL2:983; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_introduction\\_video\\_slides\\_judges\\_abuse.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_introduction_video_slides_judges_abuse.pdf)
34. OL2:991; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_on\\_SenEWarren.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_on_SenEWarren.pdf)
35. OL2:997; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_SenEWarren\\_plan\\_judges.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_SenEWarren_plan_judges.pdf)
36. OL2:1003; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-media\\_DARE.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-media_DARE.pdf)
37. OL2:1006; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_pitch-Media.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_pitch-Media.pdf)
38. OL2:1022; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Capital\\_Investors.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Capital_Investors.pdf)
39. OL2:1027; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_SenEWarren\\_plan\\_judges.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_SenEWarren_plan_judges.pdf)
40. OL2:1032; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_international\\_exposure\\_judges\\_abuse.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_international_exposure_judges_abuse.pdf)
41. OL2:1037; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_out\\_of\\_court\\_inform\\_outrage\\_strategy.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_out_of_court_inform_outrage_strategy.pdf)
42. OL2:1040; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-parties\\_invoking\\_impeachment\\_trial.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-parties_invoking_impeachment_trial.pdf)
43. OL2:1045; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Professors\\_Students\\_Journalists.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Professors_Students_Journalists.pdf); [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Professors\\_students\\_lawyers.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Professors_students_lawyers.pdf)
44. \*>OL2:1051; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_judges\\_abuse\\_citizen\\_hearings.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_citizen_hearings.pdf)
45. OL2:1056; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-reporters\\_clerks.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-reporters_clerks.pdf) = [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_sham\\_hearings.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_sham_hearings.pdf)
46. OL2:1066; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_adapting\\_to\\_new\\_legal\\_market.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_adapting_to_new_legal_market.pdf) [sent to LexisNexis]
47. OL2:1073; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_inform\\_outrage\\_be\\_compensated.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_inform_outrage_be_compensated.pdf)
48. \*>OL2:1081; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_judges\\_intercepting\\_emails\\_mail.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_intercepting_emails_mail.pdf) = <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-LexisNexis.pdf>
49. OL2:1084; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Thomson\\_Reuters.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Thomson_Reuters.pdf)
50. OL2:1090; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-SZarestky\\_Above\\_the\\_Law.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-SZarestky_Above_the_Law.pdf)
51. \*>OL2:1093; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Washington\\_Post.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Washington_Post.pdf)
52. OL2:1101; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-judicial\\_abusees&publishers.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-judicial_abusees&publishers.pdf)
53. OL2:1104; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Hiring\\_manager.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Hiring_manager.pdf)
54. OL2:1108; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-International\\_Team.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-International_Team.pdf)
55. OL2:1116; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_research\\_documents&sources.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_research_documents&sources.pdf)
56. OL2:1119; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_judicial\\_abuse\\_forms.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judicial_abuse_forms.pdf)
57. OL2:1125; exposing the Federal Judiciary as a racketeering enterprise; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Reuters\\_judges\\_investigation.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Reuters_judges_investigation.pdf)
58. \*>OL2:1134; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Talkshow\\_hosts\\_coalition.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Talkshow_hosts_coalition.pdf)

59. OL2:1144; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_your\\_story\\_for\\_Reuters.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_your_story_for_Reuters.pdf)
60. OL2:1154; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-American\\_Thinker.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-American_Thinker.pdf)
61. \*>OL2:1164; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Center\\_Public\\_Integrity.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Center_Public_Integrity.pdf);  
[http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_judges\\_abuse\\_of\\_power.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_of_power.pdf)
62. \*>OL2:1168; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_joining\\_forces\\_making\\_allies.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_joining_forces_making_allies.pdf)
63. \*>OL2:1172; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_judges\\_exposure\\_election\\_justice.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_exposure_election_justice.pdf)
64. \*>OL2:1; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_coalition\\_to\\_expose\\_judges.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_coalition_to_expose_judges.pdf)
65. \*>OL2:1176; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_JgACBarrett\\_condonation\\_judges\\_power\\_abuse.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_JgACBarrett_condonation_judges_power_abuse.pdf)
66. \*>OL2:1205; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Reuters\\_Law\\_Firm\\_Council.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Reuters_Law_Firm_Council.pdf)
67. \*>OL2:1213; agenda for video conference; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_preparing\\_video\\_conference.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_preparing_video_conference.pdf)
68. OL2:1219; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-News\\_Directors\\_on\\_judges\\_abuse.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-News_Directors_on_judges_abuse.pdf)
69. OL3:1226; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_emails\\_mail\\_intercepted\\_by\\_judges.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_emails_mail_intercepted_by_judges.pdf)
70. OL3:1229; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-JudgeRPratt.pdf> and  
<https://www.iasd.uscourts.gov/content/senior-district-judge-robert-w-pratt>
71. OL3:1237; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_media\\_exposing\\_judges.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_media_exposing_judges.pdf)
72. OL3:1243; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_talkshow\\_hosts\\_coalition.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_talkshow_hosts_coalition.pdf)
73. OL3:1246; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-CLEs\\_lawyers\\_media.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-CLEs_lawyers_media.pdf)
74. <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-NYCBar.pdf>
75. OL3:1253; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero\\_exposing\\_Judge\\_Garland&judges.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_exposing_Judge_Garland&judges.pdf)
76. OL3:1257; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Guardianship\\_Abuse\\_Symposium.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Guardianship_Abuse_Symposium.pdf);  
[http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-exposing\\_judges\\_power\\_abuse.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-exposing_judges_power_abuse.pdf)

## **B. Subjects of a series of articles based on the study\* †\* of judges and their judiciaries**

77. judges' unaccountability(\*>OL:265) and their riskless abuse of power(\*>jur:5§3; OL:154§3);
78. statistical analysis for the public(†>OL2:455§§B-E, 608§A) and for researchers(jur:131§b);
79. significance of federal circuit judges disposing of 93% of appeals in decisions “on procedural grounds [i.e., the pretext of “lack of jurisdiction”], unsigned, unpublished, by consolidation, without comment”, which are unresearched, reasonless, ad-hoc, arbitrary, fiat-like orders, in practice unappealable(OL2:453);
80. to receive ‘justice services’(OL2:607) parties pay courts filing fees, which constitute consideration, whereby a contract arises between them to be performed by the judges, who know that they will in most cases not even read their briefs(OL2:608§A), so that courts engage in false advertisement, fraud in the inducement, and breach of contract(OL2:609§2);
81. Justiceship Nominee N. Gorsuch said, “An attack on one of our brothers and sisters of the robe

- is an attack on all of us”: judges’ gang mentality and abusive hitting back(OL2:546);
82. fair criticism of judges who fail to “avoid even the appearance of impropriety”(jur:68<sup>123a</sup>);
  83. abuse-enabling clerks(OL2:687), who fear arbitrary removal without recourse(jur:30§1);
  84. law clerks’ vision at the end of their clerking for a judge of the latter’s glowing letter of recommendation(OL2:645§B) to a potential employer morally blinds them to their being used by the judge as executioners of his or her abuse;
  85. judges dismiss 99.82% of complaints against them(jur:10-14; OL2:548), thus arrogating to themselves impunity by abusing their self-disciplining authority(jur:21§a);
  86. escaping the futility of suing judges(OL2:713, 609§1): the out-of-court inform and outrage strategy to stir up the public into holding them accountable and liable to compensation(OL2:581);
  87. how law professors and lawyers act in self-interest to cover up for judges so as to spare themselves and their schools, cases, and firms retaliation(jur:81§1): their system of harmonious interests against the interests of the parties and the public(OL2:635, 593¶15);
  88. turning insiders into Deep Throats(jur:106§C); outsiders into informants(OL2:468); and judges into criers of ‘MeToo! Abusers’(OL2:682¶¶7,8) that issue an *I accuse!*(jur:98§2) denunciation of judges’ abuse: thinking and acting strategically(OL2:635, 593¶15) to expose judges’ abuse by developing allies who want to become Workers of Justice(OL2:687), as opposed to being enforcers of abuse or enablers by endorsement or willful ignorance or blindness;
  89. two unique national stories, not to replace a rogue judge, but to topple an abusive judiciary:
    - a. *Follow the money!* as judges grab(OL2:614), conceal(jur:65<sup>107a,c</sup>), and launder(105<sup>213</sup>) it;
    - b. The Silence of the Judges: their warrantless, 1st Amendment freedom of speech, press, and assembly-violative interception of their critics’ communications(OL2:582§C);
      - 1) made all the more credible by Former CBS Reporter Sharryl Attkisson’s \$35 million suit against the Department of Justice for its illegal intrusion into her computers to spy on her ground-breaking investigation and embarrassing reporting(OL2:612§b);
      - 2) the exposure of such interception can provoke a scandal graver than that resulting from Edward Snowden’s revelations of NSA’s massive illegal collection of only non-personally identifiable metadata(OL2:583§3);
      - 3) the exposure can be bankrolled as discreetly as Peter Thiel, co-founder of PayPal, bankrolled the suit of Hulk Hogan against the tabloid Gawker for invasion of privacy and thereby made it possible to prosecute and win a judgment for more than \$140 million(OL2:528);
      - 4) principles can be asserted and money made by exposing judges’ interception;
  90. launching a Harvey Weinstein-like(jur:4¶¶10-14) generalized media investigation into judges’ abuse of power as their institutionalized modus operandi; conducted also by journalists and me with the benefit of the numerous leads(OL:194§E) that I have gathered;
  91. ***Black Robed Predators***(OL:85) or the making of a documentary as an original video content by a media company or an investigative TV show, with the testimony of judges’ victims, clerks, lawyers, faculty, and students; and crowd funding to attract to its making and viewing the crowd that advocate honest judiciaries and the victims of judges’ abuse of power;



92. promoting the unprecedented to turn judges' abuse of power into a key mid-term elections issue and thereafter insert it in the national debate:
- a. the holding by journalists, newsanchors, media outlets, and law, journalism, business, and IT schools in their own commercial, professional, and public interest as *We the People's* loudspeakers of nationally and statewide televised citizens hearings(OL2:675§2, 580§2) on judges' unaccountability and consequent riskless abuse;
  - b. a forensic investigation by Information Technology experts to determine whether judges intercept the communications of their critics(OL2:633§D, OL2:582§C);
  - c. suits by individual parties and class actions to recover from judges, courts, and judiciaries filing fees paid by parties as consideration for 'justice services'(OL2:607) offered by the judges although the latter knew that it was mathematically(OL2:608§A; 457§D) impossible for them to deliver those services to all filed cases; so the judges committed false advertisement and fraud in the inducement to the formation of service contracts, and thereafter breach of contract by having their court and law clerks perfunctorily dispose of cases by filling out "dumping forms"(OL2:608 ¶ 5);
  - d. suits by clients to recover from their lawyers attorneys' fees charged for prosecuting cases that the lawyers knew or should have known(jur:90§§b, c) the judges did not have the manpower to deliver, or the need or the incentive to deal with personally, whereby the lawyers committed fraud by entering with their clients into illusory contracts that could not obtain the sought-for 'justice services'; and
  - e. suits in the public interest to recover the public funds paid to judges who have failed to earn their salaries by routinely not putting in an honest day's work, e.g., closing their courts before 5:00 p.m., thus committing fraud on the public and inflicting injury in fact on the parties who have been denied justice through its delay(cf. OL2:571¶24a);
93. how parties can join forces to combine and search their documents for communality points (OL:274-280; 304-307) that permit the detection of patterns of abuse by one or more judges, which patterns the parties can use to persuade journalists to investigate their claims of abuse;
94. the development of my website Judicial Discipline Reform at <http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org>, which as of March 4, 2021, had 37,353 subscribers, into:
- a. a **clearinghouse** for complaints against judges uploaded by the public;
  - b. a **research center** for professionals and parties(OL2:575) to search documents for the most persuasive evidence of abuse: patterns of abuse by the same judge presiding over their cases, the judges of the same court, and the judges of a judiciary; and
  - c. the **showroom and shopping portal** of a multidisciplinary academic and business venture (jur:119§§1-4). It can be the precursor of the institute of judicial unaccountability reporting and reform advocacy attached to a top university or established by a consortium of media outlets and academic institutions(jur:130§5);
95. a tour of presentations(OL:197§G) by me sponsored by you on:
- a. judges' abuse(jur:5§3; OL:154 ¶ 3);
  - b. development of software to conduct fraud and forensic accounting(OL:42, 60); and to perform thanks to artificial intelligence a novel type of statistical, linguistic, and literary

analysis of judges' decisions and other writings([jur:131§b](#)) to detect bias and disregard of the requirements of due process and equal protection of the law;

c. promoting the participation of the audience in the investigation([OL:115](#)) into judges' abuse; and their development of local chapters of investigators/researchers that coalesce into a Tea Party-like single issue, civic movement([jur:164§9](#)) for holding judges accountable and liable to their victims: *the People's Sunrise*([OL:201§J](#));

d. announcement of a Continuing Legal Education course, a webinar, a seminar, and a writing contest([\\*>ddc:1](#)), which can turn the audience into clients and followers;

96. a multimedia, multidisciplinary public conference([jur:97§1](#); [\\*>dcc:13§C](#)) on judges' abuses held at a top university([OL2:452](#)) to pioneer the reporting thereon in our country and abroad;

97. the call of the constitutional convention([OL:136§3](#)) that 34 states have petitioned Congress to convene since April 2, 2014, satisfying the amending provisions of the Constitution, Article V.

### **C. Useful external links**

98. U.S. Constitution, Preamble: "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice"; [http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/docs/US\\_Constitution.pdf](http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/docs/US_Constitution.pdf)

99. U.S. Constitution, Article II, Section. 2. The President...shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment. [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/US\\_Constitution.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/US_Constitution.pdf)

100. <https://www.supremecourt.gov/>

101. [https://www.supremecourt.gov/filingandrules/rules\\_guidance.aspx](https://www.supremecourt.gov/filingandrules/rules_guidance.aspx)

102. <https://www.supremecourt.gov/publicinfo/year-end/2020year-endreport.pdf>

103. <https://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml>

104. Cf. Legal Information Institute (LII) of Cornell Law School; <https://www.law.cornell.edu/>

105. <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/18usc.pdf>

106. Cf. 18 U.S.C.; <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18>

107. 18 USC 3057 on duty to report abuse; <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18/3057>

108. Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts(AO); <https://www.uscourts.gov/>

109. Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts; (28 USC §§601-613); <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/28usc.pdf>

110. <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/28usc.pdf>

111. <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports>

112. <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/analysis-reports/directors-annual-report>

113. <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/annual-report-2019>

114. AO's 1997-2019 judicial business reports, containing the statistics on complaints against federal judges in Table S-22; <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/analysis-reports/judicial-business-united-states-courts>

115. <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2019>

116. Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980; (28 USC §§351-364); <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/28usc.pdf>
117. the Rules for Processing Judicial Conduct and Disability Complaints; <https://www.uscourts.gov/judges-judgeships/judicial-conduct-disability>
118. <https://www.iasd.uscourts.gov/content/senior-district-judge-robert-w-pratt>
119. Number of cases filed in state courts annually; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/num\\_state\\_cases\\_07.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/num_state_cases_07.pdf)
120. [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/statistics&tables/num\\_jud\\_officers.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/statistics&tables/num_jud_officers.pdf)
121. Code of Conduct for U.S. Judges; <https://www.uscourts.gov/judges-judgeships/code-conduct-united-states-judges#d>
122. Federal Judicial Center on impeachments; <https://www.fjc.gov/history/judges/impeachments-federal-judges>
123. See(jur:159<sup>280</sup>):
- a. bill S.1873, passed on October 30, 1979, and HR 7974, passed on September 15, 1980, entitled The Judicial Councils Reform and Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980; Congressional Record, September 30, 1980; 28086; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/Jud\\_Councils\\_Reform\\_bill\\_30sep80.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/Jud_Councils_Reform_bill_30sep80.pdf)
  - b The Reform part of the bill included a provision for opening the councils, but was excluded from the version that was adopted; 28 U.S.C. §332(d)(1), [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/28usc331-335\\_Conf\\_Councils.pdf\(jur:75<sup>148</sup>\)](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/28usc331-335_Conf_Councils.pdf(jur:75<sup>148</sup>)).
  - c The Conduct and Disability part of the bill as adopted is at ¶116 supra(jur:24<sup>18a</sup>)
124. <https://www.uscourts.gov/services-forms/fees/court-appeals-miscellaneous-fee-schedule>
- 125.

Blank

Blank

Blank