

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

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

59 Crescent Street, Brooklyn, NY 11208-1515
DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org
tel. (718) 827-9521

November 4, 2006

Richard Hettler, Esq.
612 285-8458
msp3430@hotmail.com

Re: Dr. Cordero withholds from Att. Hettler consent to use and publication of his articles

Dear Att. Hettler,

Please be advised that I have read the article that appears below and that you submitted for my revision, entitled “**TO THE COLUMNISTS OF THE PRESS, COURT TV, CNN, C-SPAN, AND OTHER NATIONAL NETWORKS**”. For the reasons stated in the column to the right below, I do not consent to be associated in any way with that article. Nor do I consent to the incorporation of the one page Executive Summary that I wrote and submitted to you for your approval on Wednesday, November 1, 2006. On the contrary, I am hereby asserting my copyrights to it and withholding my consent to its use in it in part or in whole.

That Executive Summary was intended specifically for the interview with Court TV that Mr. Francis Knize (Frankknee@aol.com, 203 544 9603), whom you know, is trying to set up in order to present the investigative journalism project that he and I have been discussing to its officers and obtain their collaboration for it. The purpose of my Executive Summary was never for it to be incorporated in an article for those addressees that you have listed in its title. Nor did I intend its text to be sent to Mr. Ron Branson. None of those addressees was mentioned in our phone conversations or e-mails. It is with great disappointment that I realize that an initiative well outside the parameters of such communications between Mr. Knize, you, and me as been taken unilaterally. It undermines my trust in the reliability of similar future communications.

Moreover, for the reasons stated in my comments below, I cannot subscribe either to the substance or the presentation of your above-mentioned article, which appears on the left column. Nor do I want to be associated with the views expressed in that article. Indeed, if we were to meet with Court TV, or any other media representative for that matter, and those views were expressed, I would disassociate myself from them unambiguously and emphatically. That would certainly defeat the purpose of the meeting since we would not come across as a team. Consequently, I do not consent to the use of my name as co-author or supporter of that article or any other.

Therefore, please be advised that I am removing from the Executive Summary that I wrote your name just as I am removing from its attached supporting documents the article that you submitted, namely, “Polaroid Acquired With Cash Embezzled Through Our Bankruptcy Courts”, by Richard Hettler, Esq.

I am copying this e-mail to Mr. Knize just as I did the others. He is now free to state in writing whether he wants to meet either with you or me with Court TV or any other entity. If he wants my support for that meeting, he will be able to use my piece of writing as I will resubmit it to him.

Your statement in your e-mail of today that "Unless I hear from either of you by noon tomorrow, I'll assume that no one has a problem with the language or subject matter discussed therein" lacks any support in our relationship. You imply that you can unilaterally set on a Saturday a 24 hour deadline due by Sunday at noon by which Mr. Knize and I must have dropped everything that we are doing in order to respond to you; otherwise, you feel entitled to assume our consent. This is neither a reasonable nor respectful way of dealing with each other. Att. Hettler, you and I know each other for only a week. We are not entitled to assume anything as to whether we agree with each other. As a matter of fact, we do not.

Sincerely,

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

**TO THE COLUMNISTS OF THE PRESS,
COURT TV, CNN, C-SPAN, AND
OTHER NATIONAL NETWORKS**

THE ISSUE:

The divisive and evidence unsupported comments of Justice Sandra Day O'Connor and how her faulted mindset has allowed and will continue to allow hundreds of thousands of citizens of this great nation to lose hundreds of millions of dollars in life estates, their dignity and their liberty. If allowed to continue uncorrected, such will turn the United States into a third world country. O'Connor's draconian and evidence unsupported theories are totally inconsistent with what other revered members of our judiciary are saying about our judicial system and what they are saying is that our state or federal judgship is quickly becoming a safe haven for coordinated wrongdoing which has turned our national courts into a playground of criminals who operate under a cloak of alleged honor.

This article is authored by Richard Hettler of Minneapolis.

Comments of Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq. on the article by Mr. Hettler appearing on the column to the left.

Writing in all capitals is called "Screaming" and is not in good form, not to mention that it makes reading difficult.

This paragraph begins with the conclusion, which at this point is as unsupported as the article that it is attacking.

The article should have begun by restating for the benefit of the reader what Mr. Hettler found objectionable in Justice O'Connor's statements; otherwise, the reader has no idea what the author is commenting upon. For instance, what is it that should not be "allowed to continue uncorrected"? What are her "draconian and evidence unsupported theories"? In any event, how can a theory be "draconian"? The qualification "totally inconsistent" is gratuitous since no clash between any two statements has been shown and thus, the reader is expected to take the author's word for it. It is also extremist and puts the reader on alert that this may not be a balanced piece of writing that will lead logically from some premises to a conclusion.

THE STORY UNFOLDS:

Justice O'Connor wrote most recently for the New York Times on 1 October and again on 2 November to attack Ron Branson, the founder of Jail for Judges. His organization sponsored a recent initiative that placed Amendment E on the South Dakota ballot. This is a proposal to amend the state constitution to enable grand jurors to evaluate the conduct of state judges to ensure their compliance with their oath of office and dispense justice consistent with the state and the federal constitutions.

California already adopted a similar initiative and modified its state constitution accordingly. Because of the larger population in that state, there was a sufficient amount of outrage in that state to give rise to such an initiative.

Why might something like this be necessary? In short, this matter of judicial impropriety has been with us for some time now. Think about it- if you had a legitimate cause of action and took that cause of action to a state or federal court and had your case thrown out without a reason- where would you go? To an appeal?- that used to work, but as time has progressed, the appellate judges who occupy our appellate courts came from the very courts which Jones and Ashcroft now complain leaving us with no viable alternative but to either give up or start a grass roots movement to install control over the courts which is all Branson and others seek to achieve. Only those with first hand knowledge, such as the victims of such judicial oppression, have come forth at this time and the author caution their readers not to construe this writing as some sort of an out of control assault upon the courts as Justice O'Connor would have you believe. Your author is a legal scholar and has validated the information contained in this writing and has consistently applied abundance of caution.

What is the oath of office of South Dakota judges and what examples allow the reader to determine that the judges' conduct on the bench does not comport with it? The same applies to determining what is or is not consistent with the state and the federal constitutions.

How does an evaluation lead to ensuring anything? The whole mechanism of the proposed amendment has been omitted. As a result, the reader has not idea what the author is referring to. Consequently, the reader cannot reach his own conclusion and is not persuaded to believe the author.

"In short" is a way of depriving the reader of the facts that could persuade him to follow the author to his conclusion.

To what "matter of judicial impropriety" is the author referring to? It may have been "for some time" with the author, who cannot pre-sume that it has been with the reader too.

This is not a matter for the reader to "think about it", but rather one for the author to draw a picture of the facts so that the reader can see the same reality that the author has in his head.

Anybody may think that he has a "legitimate cause of action" and that is not sufficient grounds for a case to not to be dismissed, with reason or without it.

Who are Jones and Ashcroft and what complaint have they set forth?

Since the author has not stated what that "grass roots movement" stands for, why would the reader ever want it to "exert control over the courts"?

What "judicial oppression" is the author referring to? Likewise, the reader cannot "construe" anything because the author has not told him what Justice O'Connor wrote.

The reader has no facts, except the author's self-serving assertion that he has "applied abundance of caution"? In any event, to what has

Those who have had their rights taken from them recognize first hand how severely **“broken”** our judicial system is. Unless and until something is done about this, soon we'll have a nation of totally oppressed souls who have had everything taken from them by corrupt judges and various other corrupt officers of the court who know how to manipulate and/or bribe their way into relief under the guardianship of corrupt judges the Branson group and others groups have been consistently reporting. Branson and other groups similarly victimized recognize that judicial independence is an absolute requirement but when such independence turns into organized crime complained of by US Attorney General Ashcroft-what have we? You guessed it- chaos. Add to that the of record comments by Chief Judge Edith Jones of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals- Jones is a heartbeat away from appointment to the US Supreme court as now tells us that the ***American Legal System is Corrupt Beyond Recognition.***-did O'Connor read either of these articles before she espoused as she did for the New York Times? We doubt it and God help us if she did and still wrote the way she did.

There's another problem with O'Connor's statements- as a member of this country's highest court, US Supreme Court requests for certiorari relief come from 50 states and this court cherry picks less than 1% of all the cases which are filed with it- think about what never captures their attention- that is, over 99% of all appealable lawsuits, and the really bad news is that the overwhelmingly number of such suits are never heard on the merits- they're just procedurally estopped. So unless you are

he applied it?

This was the opportunity for the author to show “those with[out] first hand knowledge” and who “have not had their rights taken from them” that the judicial system is broken. To that end, he had to present sufficient facts that would convince a jury who had no previous knowledge of the facts and no preconceived idea of who was right or wrong. The author has not done so, but instead has asked the reader to take his word for it because he is “a legal scholar” and “has consistently applied abundance of caution”. The author has failed to meet his burden of persuasion, which by contrast is a legal standard. Why should the reader keep reading rather than dismiss the case from his mind, particularly in light of this unsubstantiated and extremist statement: “soon we'll have a nation of totally oppressed souls who have had everything taken from them by corrupt judges”?

The author has failed to mention that the nine judges of the Supreme Court could not possibly review and decide on the merits each of the 8,000 cases that on average are filed annually with the Court.

Anna Nicole Smith or another celebrity, you have no chance of having your case heard in this country's court of last resort. So how much credence ought we give O'Connor—probably no credence at all as even her own judges don't agree with her nor does our past chief cop John Ashcroft.

So let's get back to the above-captioned issue; that is, *the devisive and evidence unsupported comments of justice Sandra Day O'Connor and how her faulted mindset has allowed and will continue to allow hundreds of thousands of citizens of this great nation to lose hundreds of millions of dollars in life estates, their dignity and their liberty*. This is a poignant question, for it casts doubt on the integrity of the branch of government that should incarnate respect for the law and high ethical values. What makes it a realistic question worth investigating is the fact that since 1980, judges are charged with the duty to discipline themselves; what is more, complaints by anybody against their conduct must be filed with, and handled by, them. But according to the statistics of the [Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts](#)¹, judges [systematically dismiss](#)² all complaints. As a result, in the last 26 years only three judges out of some 2,133 federal judges, have been impeached, the last one in 1989. Actually, in the whole 217 years since the U.S. Constitution of 1789, [only 7 judges](#)³ have been impeached and convicted...on average one every 31 years!

If that were the time it would take for your CEO to be held accountable by his peers for his conduct toward you and the other people in your office, and in the meantime he could wield power over your life, liberty, and property with no more consequences than the suspension of a decision of his, do you think that he would be tempted to treat you however he wanted? If all complaints of yours ended up in the wastebasket together with

The text incorporated here that was written by Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq., has been taken out of context. I, Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq., do not consent to its use in this article or in any other article where it is indistinguishably fused with the text of any other author. This incorporation, unattributed to boot, exceeds fair use under copyright law.

I, Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq., wrote this text for a different purpose and with a different reader in mind. I neither consent to its use in this article on the left column nor for the addressees to whom this article is being addressed.

those of your colleagues in the office, would you say that they would want to know of your efforts to force your CEO and his peers out of their safe haven to require them to treat you and your colleagues with respect or be liable to all of you? If so, you have an audience of 300 million colleagues waiting to know about your efforts to hold your judicial CEO and his peers accountable for their conduct. Indeed, by law the chief justice of the Supreme Court and the associate justices review with the chief district and appellate judges [twice a year reports](#)⁴ showing that complaints against judges are dismissed systematically, which points to coordination to disregard a duty placed upon them by law. They too have known that in an area such as bankruptcy judges wield enormous power over tens of billions of dollars annually. Power and money, the two most insidious and absolute corruptors in the hands of the same judges that have exempted themselves from any discipline. There is evidence that bankruptcy judges have engaged in a [bankruptcy fraud scheme](#)⁵ with the knowledge and support of district judges, and at least the toleration of circuit judges and the justices of the Supreme Court as well as [the connivance of the FBI and the Department of Justice](#)⁶. That evidence and [leads](#)⁷ is hereby being offered to the media for a joint *Follow the money!* investigative journalism and documentary project with the undersigned. The exposure of coordinated wrongdoing involving criminal conduct throughout the federal judiciary is bound to have a farther reaching impact than finding out that the Watergate Burglary was connected to President Richard Nixon. Unlike the president and his White House aides, federal judges hold office for life or renewable 14-year terms and can only be removed through the historically useless impeachment mechanism. Hence, media's investment of its investigative resources in this project would not be for a momentary scoop, but rather for the development of a

lode of news of intense interest to the public, all members of the Congress dominated by "the culture of corruption", and a president who nominated two justices, including the chief. A deepening institutional crisis would keep asking the question in a self-reinforcing vicious circle: Were and are federal judges fit to decide cases?...only to be aggravated by a [class action](#)s on behalf of those injured by corrupt and complaint-dismissing judges. In addition, the expertise gained from the investigation of federal judges can be reinvested in that of their state counterparts.

Thus, it is the author's firm belief that the members of the press and other media members in receipt of this writing ask themselves how Justice O'Connor could ever have opined as she has given such contravening evidence from this country's chief cop John Ashcroft and Chief Judge Edith Jones, each of whom have obviously experienced the realities of what s going on in this country. In short Justice O'Connor is grossly out of step with what is going on in our courts and views the Branson initiative as some fanatical left wing effort to remove judicial independence from such judges. This isn't at all what Branson and so many colleagues of his complains of- his complaint and those of others who by acclamation join him in these questions is what it takes to have an opportunity for an oppressed individual in this country to have his or her case heard by a court of competent jurisdiction and this is the very essence of this writing.

In short, the American judicial system is, as Chief Judge Edith Jones asserts is hopelessly out of control and this doesn't speak well for the contravening criticism of Justice O'Connor. The inquiring media member is therefore challenged to ask Justice O'Connor to explain her comments in light of the comments made by Ashcroft and Jones where Ashcroft verbally indicts every sitting

bankruptcy judge in this country as a member of a national crime ring and Jones reports that potentially each and every judge under her Houston, Texas based Fifth Circuit is corrupt. Ron Branson is not the problem, nor are the hundreds of thousands who have come to the author to suggest a framework that would ensure due process in our courts, Branson and all of the victims who have come to Hettler are merely symptoms of a “*broken*” system which must be repaired and because it will never be repaired by the actions of our judicial system, that job rests with the actions of our House and Senate Judiciary Committees as it does with the House Subcommittee on the Courts.

The respective chairs; that is US Senator Arlen Specter, US Congressman James Sensenbrenner, and US Congressman Lamar Smith are all eminently aware of what is going on however has chosen not to act thereon because legislation earlier enacted by congress places such judges above the law which of course is the problem. So what alternative have we as a nation- we are nearing anarchy by failing or refusing to act on this judicial runaway train which will turn this nation into a vigilante nation of the oppressed who have given up not only on the courts but on its own government who such victims have entrusted to protect and preserve such peace and harmony in their lives. The choice is clear and congress right now is the only recognized authority to regulate and control actions of its judges consistent with our constitution. We must accept the testimony and recommendations of various judicial reform individuals such as Hettler and Branson so judicial propriety may be once again restored, and all media members must realize that they, and only they, have the collective clout to force congress into convening the necessary number of hearings to shape such new legislation consistent with a democracy which right now is failing miserably.

To what hundreds of thousands is the author referring to?!

As a matter of fact, not even one person has come to Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq., to suggest to him any such frame work.

I, Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq., do not consent to be associated with Mr. Ron Branson or with any other person or entity unless I give therefor my consent in writing.

Author Richard Hettler has already laid the foundation for this during his visit to Washington in April of this year. Hettler was fortunate enough to befriend Congressman Henry Hyde while enroute to Washington-what Hettler described to Hyde was so outrageous, Hyde invited Hettler to his chambers the next day whereupon Hettler met with Hyde liaison and legal counsel who were simply astounded that any of this could ever have been allowed in a civilized society and it was Henry's suggestion that the only solution was to seek congressional redress by and through our national media; ergo, this writing.

Author Hettler respectfully submit this writing to the media with whom he will work to achieve harmony and much overdue judicial reform within our state and federal court systems. Absent such a compelling force by the media at large, the outlook for constitutional due process in our national courts may well fade away. The authors may be reached at the telephone and email addresses as set forth below.

Richard Hettler, Esq., 612 285-8458,
msp3430@hotmail.com

EXHIBITS AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Sandra Day O'Connor article published in the New York Times on 1 October, 2006
2. The Sandra Day O'Connor article published in the New York Times on 2 November, 2006 with a collateral attack upon Jail or Judges Founder Ron Branson and Branson's response thereto.
3. A writing of US Attorney General John D. Ashcroft proclaiming our bankruptcy judges as members of a "*national crime ring*"

I, Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq., do not consent to have my name associated as co-author of this article. I expressly request that the whole of any text that I wrote be removed from it. I am hereby asserting my copyrights to such text.

4. A writing of Edith Jones, Chief Judge of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals synthesizing her presentation to the Harvard School of Law wherein she states that the ***“American Legal System is Corrupt Beyond Recognition”***