

February 20, 2019

U.S. Rep. José E. Serrano (NY 15th District) Anthony.Jordan@mail.house.gov
Att. District Office Director Anthony Jordan and Ramon.Cabral@mail.house.gov tel. (718) 620-0084
Deputy District Office Director Ramon Cabral Evelyn.Castro@mail.house.gov tel. (202) 225-4361
1231 Lafayette Ave, 4th Fl., Bronx, NY 10474 Clara.Wagner-Anderson@mail.house.gov

Dear Director Jordan and Deputy Director Cabral,

This is a follow-up on the meeting of last January 30 that you so kindly held for me to present to you my proposals([†]>OL2:833) to Rep. José Serrano, which can be recapitulated thus:

- a. The proposal on “**monitoring the laws**” –which Rep. Serrano identifies on his website as one of Congress’s three main functions– **concerning judicial conduct**.
- b. The request for a **grant to further my professional research** on the lack of monitoring of judicial conduct by Congress and the Executive, which has resulted in judges’ abuse of power. My research has produced a 2-volume study* [†] of judges and their judiciaries, titled thus:

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

- c. The **application for employment** to assist Rep. Serrano in developing both the monitoring and the defense of those abused by unmonitored judges as a key electoral issue that he can present to Democrats running for president and thereby become a valued strategist.
1. At the end of the meeting, you indicated that you would forward to your D.C. office my handout describing the above proposals, downloadable through: <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero-RepJSerrano.pdf>. The purpose of your forwarding it was to set a date for me to make a presentation to Rep. Serrano, his D.C. staff, and peers of his, including Rep. Jerrold Nadler([†]>OL2:799) and presidential candidates in search of a national issue that can make them stand out from a crowded field. Thus, I would like to know when that presentation can take place.

A. This is the most opportune moment to present in the interest of Rep. Serrano’s political career and for the satisfaction of his constituents

2. Indeed, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez was an unknown. Her only credit was that of having worked as an assistant in Sen. Bernie Sander’s defeated 2016 campaign. Yet, she sensed that her dissatisfaction with politics was shared by many. With neither an organization nor money, she embarked on the most hopeless adventure ever: a challenge to Rep. Joe Crowley, the fourth in the Democratic hierarchy, who was considered a candidate for the House speakership, and who had not been challenged in a primary since 2004. Ocasio-Cortez’s message appealed to the most dissatisfied, who had a motive to participate in the primaries. They launched her political career and terminated Crowley’s. The dissatisfaction of the voters in her 14th district can be assumed to be shared by those in the 15th. Actually, it is shared by people throughout our country, as proved by the dozens of new members of the House, who also began their candidacy as penniless unknown. I still want to assist Rep. Serrano channel the dissatisfaction in his district and the country constructively to his benefit. I am more valuable to him on his side as a strategist, as shown below.

B. The huge untapped voting bloc of The Dissatisfied with the Judicial and Legal System can form a national movement to hold judges accountable and liable

3. More than 50 million new cases are filed in the federal and state courts annually(*>jur:8^{4,5}), to

which must be added the hundreds of millions of cases pending or deemed to have been wrongly or wrongfully decided. The parties to those cases form the huge untapped national voting bloc of The Dissatisfied with the Judicial and Legal System. However, since they come in and out of court separately and many without a lawyer(OL2:455§B), they ignore each other's dissatisfaction. Unaware that they form a bloc, they suffer judges' abuse alone and in silence. A politician aware that the *MeToo!* public is intolerant of any form of abuse can cause them to join forces in a national movement of people of all political stripes that demand compensation for the waste of money(next) that judges inflict upon them. Rep. Serrano can be the one who gives them a voice and leadership.

4. He can promote the formation of the movement by holding a press conference to set off a media investigation of judges' interception of their critics' communications(OL2:781). Acting in their crass interest of covering their abuse and ensuring its flow of benefits to them, judges infringe upon Americans' most cherished rights: "freedom of speech, of the press, and the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances"(OL2:792¶1).

C. The lawsuits against the claim that an emergency justifies building the border wall will focus attention on judges, facilitate informing the public about their abuse of power, and rally an outraged national public behind the exposé

5. Judges will attract national attention now that they have to decide the suits filed by 16 states and counting against President Trump's invocation of emergency powers to build his wall. He expects most suits to be filed in the 9th Circuit because he says its judges are biased against him so that they will rule against him and he will appeal to the Supreme Court. The scene is set for an institutional crisis when he, just as he did before, deprecates the judges that rule against him.

1. Judges' official statistics as the basis for the math of their abuse

6. Judges will concentrate their attention on wall cases and on defending themselves at the further expense of the little attention that they already pay to most cases, thus abusing most parties. This is shown by their official statistics submitted to Congress in the Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts required under 28 U.S.C. §604(*>jur:21¹⁰): 93% of appeals to the federal circuit courts are disposed of in decisions that are "on procedural grounds [e.g., the catchall pretext of "lack of jurisdiction"], unsigned, unpublished, without comment, and by consolidation", called summary orders(†>OL2:457§D). They are unresearched, unreasoned, arbitrary, fiat-like orders contained in forms with a blank for a single operative word to be filled in: "denied" or "affirmed". By denying motions and affirming decisions on appeal clerks, to whom judges are not authorized to delegate judicial power, preserve the status quo while dumping cases out of judges' caseload. This 93% gets pro forma justice; the remaining 7% gets a written opinion.
7. To inflict such an unequal protection of the law by having clerks dump 93% of parties out of court with a 5¢ dumping form bearing a clerk's rubberstamped signature, judges need not read briefs (OL2:760). They thus cause parties to waste the \$1Ks and even \$10Ks that it costs to produce a brief. This waste results from judges' unaccountability and riskless abuse. Informed thereof, the public will be so outraged as to force the resignation(*>jur:92§d) of judges and justices(65§§1-3), even whole courts committing(88§§a-c) abuse as coordinated as their bankruptcy fraud scheme (OL2:614) driven by the most insidious corruptor: *Money!*(jur:27§2). This process of informing, outraging, forming a movement, and enabling a Democratic President to fill those judicial vacancies, thus "packing"(jur:23^{17a}) the judiciary, can be put in by Rep. Serrano(OL2:804). To explain how, I respectfully request the opportunity to present(OL2:821-824) to him and his guests.

Dare trigger history!(*>jur:7§5)...and you may enter it. Sincerely, *Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.*

January 29, 2019

U.S. Rep. José E. Serrano (NY 15th District)¹ Anthony.Jordan@mail.house.gov
Att. District Office Director Anthony Jordan and Ramon.Cabral@mail.house.gov
Deputy District Office Director Ramon Cabral Evelyn.Castro@mail.house.gov
1231 Lafayette Ave, 4th Floor Clara.Wagner-Anderson@mail.house.gov
Bronx, NY 10474 tel. (718) 620-0084; tel. (202) 225-4361

Dear Director Jordan and Deputy Director Cabral,

I would like to confirm my meeting with you scheduled by Ms. Clara Wagner-Anderson for January 30, at 10:30 a.m., in your district office at 1231 Lafayette Avenue, 4th Fl., in The Bronx. In preparation, I would like to summarize hereunder the purpose of the meeting and the key topics that we can discuss based on my previous letters, infra for ease of access, to Rep. José Serrano.

A. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss:

1. The **proposal** on “monitoring the laws” –which Rep. Serrano identifies on his website as one of Congress’s three main functions– concerning judicial conduct, which Rep. J. Nadler will undertake;
2. The request for a **grant** to further my professional research on the lack of monitoring of judicial conduct by Congress and the Executive, which has resulted in judges’ abuse of power. My research has produced a 2-volume study of judges and their judiciaries, titled and downloadable thus:

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

* Volume 1: http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf

† Volume 2: http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf

3. The application for **employment** to assist Rep. Serrano in that monitoring and in defending those abused by unmonitored judges: The Dissatisfied with The Judicial and Legal System. They are parties to the more than 50 million new cases filed in the federal and state courts annually plus the hundreds of millions pending or deemed to have been wrongly or wrongfully decided. They form a huge untapped national voting bloc with no voice or a leader. Rep. Serrano can become theirs, thus gaining a constituency to offer to a presidential candidate and becoming his or her strategist.

B. Key topics contained in my letters and justifying the purpose of the meeting

4. Congress’s failure to monitor through checks and balances on powerful, irremovable judges
5. Self-monitored power breeds self-exoneration and riskless abuse; Rep. Nadler’s investigation
6. Monitoring judges through unprecedented citizen hearings held at universities and media outlets where professors and journalists take the testimony of victims of, and witnesses to, judges’ abuse
7. Investigations into judges’ interception of their critics’ communications and *Follow their money!*
8. First-ever conference on unmonitored judges, at a top university, interdisciplinary, and multimedia
9. Turning a site with 25K subscribers into a clearinghouse and research center: a business opportunity
10. The Dissatisfied attracted to a national movement for the recovery of \$1Ks or \$10Ks that a brief costs to produce but rendered wasteful by judges failing to read it and deciding by dumping form
11. Rep. Serrano’s launching his national Champion of Justice bid at his *I accuse!* press conference

Dare trigger history!(<>jur:7§5)...and you may enter it. Sincerely, Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.*

*http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf >all prefixes:# up to OL:393 OL2:833

¹ This file is also at: <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero-RepJSerrano.pdf>

December 11, 2018

U.S. Rep. José E. Serrano (NY 15th District)
1231 Lafayette Ave, 4th Floor tel. (718) 620-0084; tel. (202) 225-4361
Bronx, NY 10474 Clara.Wagner-Anderson@mail.house.gov

Dear Rep. Serrano,

This is a proposal for you to take the lead in monitoring federal judges or follow Rep. Jerrold Nadler in doing so. He said on ABC “*This Week*” that he was slated to become the chair of the House Judiciary Committee and would open an investigation of Judge Kavanaugh. You can be the leader who broadens the investigation’s scope for your political and the national public’s benefit.

A. Congress’s failure to monitor the most powerful: judges

1. Indeed, on your “Legislative Work” webpage, you wrote, “One of the most important aspects of Congress is developing, making, and monitoring laws”. However, nobody is monitoring the laws that regulate federal judges, such as the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980(the Act; 28 U.S.C. §§351-364; *>jur:24^{18a}). Yet, those judges are so powerful that a single U.S. district judge in Seattle suspended *nationwide* the first Muslim travel ban of President Trump, who had campaigned on issuing it and was supported by more than 62.5 million voters to do so. Three circuit judges upheld the ban and its *nationwide* application.
2. The point is not whether the ban was right, but rather that judges’ power is unlimited. It extends over the property, liberty, and the rights and duties that frame the life of everybody, including yours and your constituents’. Likewise, the fact that you are not a member of the House Judiciary Committee is not determinative of what you can do, for you have recognized that the paramount duty of “monitoring laws” attaches to Congress, not to one single committee, let alone to its chair.
3. When judges can overpower the President, what chance does any one of you have to make a judge wield his or her power within the confines of the rule of law? None, because they fear no monitoring. Far from it, as shown in my 2-volume study, titled and downloadable thus:

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

B. Self-monitored power breeds abuse

4. Judges monitor themselves under the Act given that Congress granted them self-disciplining power. They abuse it, e.g., J. Kavanaugh, Chief Judge Merrick Garland, and their peers and colleagues in the District of Columbia Circuit dismissed 100% of the 478 complaints about them and denied 100% of the petitions for review of those dismissals during his 11-year tenure there. The judges of the other circuits do the same, as shown by their own statistics(†>OL2:795§C) submitted to Congress and the public.
5. If you could not sue the speaker of the House due to her abusively self-granted immunity (*>OL:158) and could only file complaints with her, 100% of which she dismissed, would you fear her risklessly abusing you?
6. If you never again had to run for office after receiving a life-appointment and could neither have your salary reduced nor in practice suffer any adverse consequence, not even be investigated, let alone impeached(*>jur:21§a), would you too abuse your power?
7. Free from congressional monitoring and protected by their own, judges abuse their power for their

benefit and convenience. You can be the one who exposes their abuse(*>OL:154¶3; OL2:457§D), thus attracting the support and attention of a national public with a *MeToo!* attitude expressed in its self-assertive rallying cry: *Enough is enough! We won't take abuse by anybody anymore.*

C. Leading the unprecedented: monitoring through citizen hearings

8. So the proposal to Rep. Nadler(†>OL2:799) is that he investigate J. Kavanaugh based, not on old unprovable sexual abuse allegations, but rather on current official statistics revealing his 100% partiality toward himself and his own at the expense of complainants and the rest of the public.
9. However, the proposal to you is that you do not waste effort and time trying to move Congress to undertake the monitoring that it has evaded for decades. Be the innovative leader who gives rise to the unprecedented: citizen hearings.
10. Called by you at a press conference, these new type of hearings can be conducted by law, journalism, business, and Information Technology (IT) schools and the media to expose judges' abuse. This is realistic: J. Kavanaugh's confirmation was opposed by 2,400+ law professors, 2,000+ 'Moms in the Legal Profession'(†>OL2:768), and hundreds of students, who forced their deans to criticize his qualifications(OL2:801). Media outlets reported on them(OL2:774), e.g., *The New York Times*, *New York Magazine*, *American Law Media*, and the national TV newscasts. They, other outlets, and the schools can hold those hearings on their premises, driven by their institutional and ethical values, competitive pressure, and interest in dispelling the epithet 'The enemy of the people' and instead being regarded as *The People's Loudspeaker*.

1. The witnesses: The Dissatisfied with The Judicial and Legal System, a huge untapped voting bloc in search of a leader

11. Many people are likely to testify at well-advertised and -reported citizen hearings. They are parties to the more than 50 million new cases filed in the federal and state courts annually(*>jur:8^{4,5}), to whom must be added the parties to cases pending or deemed to have been decided wrongly or wrongfully. They form a huge untapped voting bloc: The Dissatisfied with The Judicial and Legal System. That system is run by abusive judges(†>OL2:745) and unaffordable to most people.
12. So, people have to represent themselves. Pro ses file over 51% of appeals to the circuit courts. They are abused from the moment they fill out the case information sheet: Their cases are counted as a third of a case and judges are authorized and expected to treat them accordingly(OL2:455§B).
13. Passionate in their quest for justice, The Dissatisfied need and are ready to follow an innovative and astute politician who gives them an opportunity to voice their grievances and obtain redress. He who does so can become nationally recognized as their leader, the advocate of a key issue for our 'litigious society', and a shaper of a 2020 presidential candidate's platform and stump speech.

D. Judges' interception of their critics' communications

14. You can become that leader and all the faster by being instrumental in exposing an abuse bound to outrage the national public: judges' interception of their critics' communications(†>OL2:781).
15. How would you feel if your communications with the judicially abused and schools and media outlets asked to hold the citizen hearings were prevented by judges abusing their vast expertise in electronic networks, their filing and retrieving hundreds of millions of court documents nationwide?
16. To obtain interception assistance, judges can leverage their power to approve 100%(*>OL:5⁷) of the secret requests of intelligence agencies, e.g. NSA, for secret FISA orders of secret surveillance

(OL:20⁵). The public was outraged upon learning through the Snowden leaks that NSA was unlawfully collecting metadata –e.g., phone numbers, callers and callees’ names, dates and duration of calls- of scores of millions of communications. Yet, NSA did not prevent any communications.

17. Hence, the public will be more deeply outraged, as you will, upon finding out that judges prevent their critics’ communications: A statistical analysis([†]>OL2:781§A) provides probable cause to believe that they do; and independent forensic IT experts can establish it.
18. Such experts established that the Justice Department had illegally roamed the computers of former CBS Reporter Sharryl Attkisson, who is suing it for \$35 million(OL2:720¶m). This shows that bankrolling this exposure offers investors an opportunity to do public good and make money too.

E. Turning an informational website into a clearinghouse and research center: a business opportunity

19. Another money-making opportunity is offered you and investors by my website at <http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org>. Its information is so appreciated that as of this writing it has 24,944 subscribers although they and the rest of our society suffer from information overload. How many times in your life have you subscribed to a site to receive yet more information?
20. There is political wisdom and business savvy in you and investors supporting the business plan (OL2:563) for enhancing my site into both a clearinghouse where people can up- and download complaints about judges, and a research center where they can search for the most convincing evidence of abuse of power: patterns(OL:274-280) –constituted under RICO by two unlawful acts within 10 years(jur:111²⁴⁹) –, trends, and schemes revealing judges’ coordinated abuse(OL2:614). Judges’ 100% complaint dismissal and review petition denial are convincing patterns of abuse.

F. Parties attracted to a national movement for recovering court filing fees and damages for costly briefs never meant to be read

21. Another pattern is judges’ requiring briefs that they have no desire or time to read, as ‘the math of abuse’(OL2:608§A) shows. Parties will be attracted by the call for their nationally demanding the refund of court fees and damages for the expenditure of \$1,000s, and even \$10,000s on briefs(OL2:760§A) that the judges knowingly and intentionally rendered wasteful. The prospect of recovering the money lost to unmonitored judges is an energizing force for organizing past, current, and potential parties to cases, and those outraged by institutionalized abuse of power and in quest for justice.

G. My offer to make a Programmatic Presentation and applications to you

22. The above contains some salient topics of the Programmatic Presentation(OL2:821-824) that I offer to make to you and your peers, supporters, and investors. It will enable you to evaluate my competence and character as a complement to your ascertaining the originality, quality, and heft of my downloadable study*[†]. Also, it will support this application for:
 - a. a grant to further conduct my pioneering research(*>OL:115, 60; *>jur:131§b) and
 - b. employment to help you implement the Program so that you become a national leader and a 2020 candidate top strategist.

23. I respectfully submit that we should meet promptly in light of the advisability of doing so before Rep. Nadler takes the lead and the new Congress convenes and sets its agenda. So I look forward to your *calling* me because an email may be intercepted and not reach me.

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

Sincerely, *Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.*

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

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

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

2165 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6506
DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org
tel. (718)827-9521; follow @DrCorderoEsq

November 15, 2018

U.S. Representative Jerrold Nadler (NY-10th District)
c/o: Ms. Clara Dorfman tel. (212)367-7350; Clara.Dorfman@mail.house.gov
201 Varick Street, Suite 669, New York, NY 10014

Dear Representative Nadler,

I would like to congratulate you for the opportunity that you have now that the Democrats have become the majority in the House to be appointed chairman of its Judiciary Committee.

On ABC "This Week", you said that if you became the Committee chair, you would investigate Judge Kavanaugh. Hence, I reiterate hereby the proposal that I made to you in my previous letter([†]>[OL2:7774](#)) and emails, to wit, not to revisit any unverifiable allegation of a 34-year old sexual abuse, but rather to base your investigation on an indisputably verifiable and current basis, i.e., the statistics that J. Kavanaugh and his peers and colleagues in the District of Columbia Circuit (DCC) compiled on complaints against them filed under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980 (28 U.S.C. §§351-364; ^{*}>[jur:24^{18a}](#)). Their own statistics([infra 795§C](#)) show that they dismissed 100% of the 478 complaints about them and denied 100% of the petitions for review of such dismissals filed during the 1oct06-30sep17 11-year period during which he served on its court of appeals and already reported to Congress and the public as required under 28 U.S.C. §604(h)(2) ([jur:26^{23a}](#)). The grave legal and practical implications of such abuse of their self-disciplining power to evade any discipline are set forth in detail in the accompanying complaint addressed to Supreme Court Chief Justice John Roberts, Jr., just as other 15 complaints about J. Kavanaugh have been.

Your investigation of Judge Kavanaugh based on those official judicial statistics can expose the same abuse of power that pervades the Federal Judiciary: Federal judges dismiss 99.82% of all complaints about them(^{*}>[jur:10-14](#)). Your constituents and those throughout the rest of the country are left at their mercy, for as a matter of fact they are Untouchable Judges Above the Law.

Equally cloaked in impunity were sexual abusers for thousands of years. But then the unforeseeable occurred: *The New York Times* and *The New Yorker* (NYT and TNY) published their exposés on Harvey Weinstein and the VIPs that covered up his sexual abuse for decades. In a matter of days the *MeToo!* movement emerged here and abroad. It has led to a historic societal transformation from sexual abusers resigned themselves to suffering in silence and isolation to a national public that shouts self-assertively: *Enough is enough! We won't take any abuse by anybody anymore.* After receiving almost 700 letters from clerks complaining about abuse by judges, C.J. Roberts referred to the 2nd Circuit for investigation for sexual harassment Former 9th Circuit Chief Judge Alex Kozinski, who thereupon resigned. The Chief Justice admitted in his 2017 Annual Report on the Federal Judiciary to abuse in the Judiciary and set up a group to study it ([OL2:645](#)). However, abuse there continues([OL2:796](#)). All this is precedent for the impact that you can have here and abroad if you take the unprecedented step of holding a press conference to ask *We the People* to exercise their 1st Amendment rights by sending you copies of their 478 complaints about J. Kavanaugh and all other federal judges. Thereby you can launch a generalized media investigation into judges' abuse of power akin to the one into sexual abuse; insert the issue of judges' abuse into the presidential campaign; and set in motion a historic transformation whereby *We the Masters* for the first time ever hold our judicial public servants accountable and liable.

Thus, I respectfully request that you *call* me to invite me to make a presentation on your becoming the national Champion of Justice; and that you consider this letter as a formal application for employment in your investigation of J. Kavanaugh, his DCC peers and colleagues, and others.

Dare trigger history!(^{*}>[jur:7§5](#))...and you may enter it. Sincerely, / Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

[†] http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf >from OL2:394

OL2:799

<http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero-RepJNadler.pdf>

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net
DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

Judicial Discipline Reform
New York City
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

Volume I

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

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

Volume I:

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf
or
<http://1drv.ms/1lkvhB8>
or
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/jur/DrRCordero_jud_unaccountability_reporting.pdf
or
<https://independent.academia.edu/DrRichardCorderoEsq>

Volume II:

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

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net
DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

Judicial Discipline Reform
New York City
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

Volume 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

Volume I:

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf
or
<http://1drv.ms/1lkvhB8>
or
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/jur/DrRCordero_jud_unaccountability_reporting.pdf
or
<https://independent.academia.edu/DrRichardCorderoEsq>

Browser tabs: Watch E, Watch F, host444, À Alger, Watch F, Regarde, AOL AOL Me, AOL [ps163N], Sentime, Andrew, (808 un), Access t, Februar, Watch F, User X, Nightly, Watch F, About C, Watch C

Address bar: <https://www.judicial-discipline-reform.org/wp-admin/users.php>

Navigation: My Site, Reader, Write, Screen Options, Help

Users [Add New](#)

SSL activated! Don't forget to change your settings in Google Analytics and Webmaster tools. [More info](#). See the [settings page](#) for further SSL optimizations.

Hi, you have been using Really Simple SSL 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](#)
- [No thanks](#)

All (25,210) | Administrator (1) | **Subscriber** (25,209)

Bulk Actions Change role to...

25,210 items 1 of 1,261

<input type="checkbox"/>	Username	Name	Email	Role	Posts
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	—	...ra.com	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	10i	—	...t.net	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	36	—	...l.ru	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	791	—	...h.com	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	AA	—	...o.com	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	aa	—	...in.com	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	aa	—	...il.ru	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	aa	—	...o.com	Subscriber	0

September 2, 2018

The official statistics¹ of the U.S. District of Columbia Circuit show that Judge Brett Kavanaugh², Chief Judge Merrick Garland, and their peers recieved 478 complaints³ against judges in their Circuit during the 1oct06/30sep17 11-year period, but systematically abused their disciplinary power to exonerate 100% of them. They have impugned their impartiality by covering up for abusive judges while leaving parties at their mercy. The Senate hearings should be on whether unaccountable federal judges have turned abuse into their modus operandi.

Line	All current and some old tabulating entries, mostly in their current order ⁴	'07 ⁵	'08A ⁶	'08B ⁷	'09A ⁸	'09B	'10 ⁹	'11 ¹⁰	'12 ¹¹	'13 ¹²	'14 ¹³	'15 ¹⁴	'16 ¹⁵	'17 ¹⁶	totals
1.	Complaints Pending on Sep. 30 of preceding year *	6	12	-17	0	2	5	21	7	4	6	15	27	3	
2.	Complaints Concluded	21	14	0	0	35	75	73	48	36	24	34	77	21	
3.	Complaints Filed¹⁸	30	17	20	19	48	93	56	43	42	35	46	61	38	
4.	Complaint Type/Sources of Complaints														
5.	Written/Filed by Complainants	30	17	20		48	93	56	43	42	35	46	61	38	
5a	On Order of/Identified by Circuit Chief Judges	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
6.	Complainants**	-	-												
7.	Prison inmates	-	-	4		9	25	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	
8.	Litigants	-	-	14		38	66	51	42	35	32	47	41	37	
9.	Attorneys	-	-	1		1	1	1	0	2	10	0	18	2	
10.	Public Officials	-	-	0		0	0	0	0	0		0	1	0	
11.	Other	-	-	1		0	1	0	0	17	2	0	9	0	
12.	Judges Complained About **														
13.	Circuit Judges	14	4	5		10	43	22	10	6	5	12	38	17	
14.	District Judges	22	12	14		34	48	32	29	33	27	34	23	20	
15.	Court of International Trade Judges	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16.	Court of Federal Claims Judges	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
17.	Bankruptcy Judges	1	0	0		1	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	
18.	Magistrate Judges	2	1	1		3	1	1	4	3	1	0	0	0	
19.	Tax Court Judges	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	
20.	Nature of Allegations														
21.	Erroneous Decision	-	-	13		18	57	24	15	21	11	19	36	12	
22.	Delayed Decision/Undue Decisional Delay	2	-	1		6	5	0	4	6	0	10	2	4	
23.	Failure to Give Reasons for Decision	-	-	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
24.	Incompetence/Neglect	0	2	-											
25.	Improper Discussions With Party or Counsel	-	-	1		2	11	1	1	1	2	5	4	0	
26.	Hostility Toward Litigant or Attorney	-	-	1		3	11	4	2	4	2	3	4	2	
27.	Prejudice/Bias	13	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
28.	Racial, Religious, or Ethnic Bias	-	-	4		1	1	2	1	1	0	12	3	0	
29.	Personal Bias Against Litigant or Attorney	-	-	5		6	8	4	3	0	2	4	5	7	
30.	Conflict of Interest (Including Refusal to Recuse)	0	0	3		2	1	1	0	1	5	3	1	8	
31.	Failure to Meet Financial Disclosure Requirements	-	-	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
32.	Improper Outside Income	-	-	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
33.	Partisan Political Activity or Statement	-	-	3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
34.	Acceptance of a Bribe	-	-	0		1	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	
35.	Bribery/Corruption	1	0	-											

36.	Data of the Judicial Council, _____ Cir., filed with AO	'07	'08 A	'08 B	'09 A	'09 B	'10	'11	'12	'13	'14	'15	'16	'17	totals
37.	Effort to Obtain Favor for Friend or Relative	-	-	0	-	1	8	1	0	2	1	2	0	0	
38.	Solicitation of Funds for Organization	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
39.	Retaliation Against Complainant, Witness, or Others Involved in the Process	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	
40.	Violation of Other Standards	-	-	1	-	-	-	0	0	0	-	1	0	0	
41.	Other/Other Misconduct	0		1		27	43	36	24	17	22	19	44	18	
42.	Demeanor	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
43.	Abuse of Judicial Power	9	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
44.	Disability			0		0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	
45.	Mental	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
46.	Physical	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
47.	ACTIONS REGARDING THE COMPLAINTS														
48.	Concluded/Terminated by Complainant or Subject Judge/Withdrawn	21	-	1	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
49.	Complaint Withdrawn with Consent of Chief Circuit Judge	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
50.	Withdrawal of Petition for Review	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
51.	Actions by Chief Circuit Judge														
52.	Matters Returned from Judicial Council/or Judicial Conference Committee	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
53.	Complaint Dismissed* in Whole or in Part³	18 ²⁰	3	13	0	48	67	75	40	39	34	24	82	35	478
54.	Not in Conformity With Statute/Not Misconduct or Disability	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	
55.	Directly Related to Decision or Procedural Ruling/ Merits Related	12	3	10	0	22	45	46	25	25	25	15	39	15	
56.	Frivolous	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
57.	Lacked Factual Foundation/Allegations Lack Sufficient Evidence	-	0	5	0	37	42	47	30	35	28	16	68	33	
58.	Allegations Incapable of Being Established	-	-	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
59.	Filed in Wrong Circuit	-	-	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
60.	Otherwise Not Appropriate	-	-	1		2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	
61.	Complaints Concluded in Whole or in Part			0		0	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	
62.	Informal Resolution Before Complaint Filed	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
63.	Voluntary Corrective Action Taken	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
64.	Action No Longer Necessary Because of Intervening Event	2	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	
65.	Appropriate Action Already Taken	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
66.	Complaint Withdrawn	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
67.	Subtotal														
68.	Special Investigative Committee Appointed/ Complaint Referred to Special Committee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1		0	0	0	
69.	Actions by Special Committees												0	0	
70.	Matter Returned from Judicial Council	--		0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
71.	New Matter Referred to Chief Judge	-		0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
72.	Action by Judicial Council/Jud. Council Proceedings	-													
73.	Matter Returned from Judicial Conference	-		0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

74.	Data of the Judicial Council, 10th Cir., filed with AO	'07	'08 A	'08 B	'09 A	'09 B	'10	'11	'12	'13	'14	'15	'16	'17	totals
75.	Complaint Transferred to/from Another Circuit	-	-	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
76.	Special Committee Reports Submitted to Judicial Council	-	-	0		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		
77.	Received Petition for Review ²¹	-	-	0		8	17	36	18	15	18	18	28	12-	
78.	Withdrawn	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
79.	Action on Petition for Review														
80.	Dismissed Complaint ²² /Petition Denied	3	11	8	0	8	18	37	17	16	13	24	28	8	
81.	Matter Returned to Chief Circuit Judge	-	-	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
82.	Matter Returned to Chief Circuit Judge for Appointment of Special Committee	-	-	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
83.	Ordered Other Appropriate Action /Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
84.	Received Special Committee Report/Special Committee Reports Submitted to Judicial Council	-	-	0		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
85.	Withdrawn	-	-												
86.	Remedial Action Taken/Action on Special Committee Report	-	-	0								0	0	0	
87.	Complaint Dismissed	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
88.	Not Misconduct or Disability			0		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
89.	Merits Related			0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
90.	Allegations Lack Sufficient Evidence	-	-	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
91.	Otherwise Not Appropriate	-	-	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
92.	Corrective Action Taken or Intervening Events	-	-	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
93.	Referred Complaint to Judicial Conference	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
94.	Remedial Action Taken	-	-	0		0									
95.	Privately Censured	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
96.	Publicly Censured	0	0	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
97.	Censure or Reprimand	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
98.	Suspension of Case Assignments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
99.	Directed Chief District J. to Take Action (Magistrates only)/Action Against Magistrate Judge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100.	Removal of Bankruptcy Judge	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
101.	Request of Voluntary Retirement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
102.	Certification of Disability of Circuit or District Judge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
103.	Additional Investigation Warranted	-	-	-	-	0									0
104.	Returned to Special Committee	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
105.	Retained by Judicial Council	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
106.	Actions by Chief Justice	-	-	-	-		0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	
107.	Transferred to Judicial Council	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	1	-	0	0	-	
108.	Received from Judicial Council			-	-	0	0	0	0		-	0	1	0	
109.	Complaints Concluded/Terminated by Final Action														
110.	During 12-month Period Ending Sep. 30 of reported year	21	14	-	0	35	75	73	48	36	24	34	77	21	
111.	Complaints Pending on Sep. 30 [end of reported year]	15	15	6	0	15	23	4	2	10	17	27	11	20	
	Data of the Judicial Council, _____ Cir., filed with AO	'07	'08 A	'08 B	'09 A	'09 B	'10	'11	'12	'13	'14	'15	'16	'17	totals

[The following notes are in the official statistical Table S-22; see infra, endnote 1.]

- ◆ Each complaint may involve multiple allegations. Each complaint may have multiple reasons for dismissal.
- ◆◆ Number of complainants may not equal total number of filings because each complaint may have multiple complainants.
- ◆‡² Revised

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

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

Endnotes by Dr. Cordero

‡ See the equivalent table of complaints concerning Then-Judge Sonia Sotomayor of the 2nd Circuit(*>jur:11); Then-Judge Neil Gorsuch of the 10th Circuit([†]>OL2:548); and all circuits (jur:10 12-14; 21§a).09B]0

These table are supported by Dr. Cordero’s study of judges and their judiciaries, titled and downloadable thus:

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

Visit the website at, and subscribe to its series of articles thus:
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org > + New or Users >Add New

¹ a. This table is based on Table S-22 in the Annual Report, 28 U.S.C. §604(a)(3), submitted to Congress as a public document by the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts (AO), §§601-613. The Report must include the statistics on complaints filed against judges and action taken; §604(h)(2). On AO, see also http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf >jur:21fn10.

b. Each of the District of Columbia and the 11 numbered regional federal judicial circuits and the two national courts, i.e., the Court for International Trade and the Federal Claims Court, must file its statistics on complaints against its judges with AO for inclusion in the statistical tables of its Annual Report. The tables for the fiscal years 1oct96-30sep17 have been collected in the file at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero_tables_complaints_v_judges.pdf. So, readers can conveniently download that file and prepare similar tables for each of the other circuits and any period of years. To that end, that file contains a table template that readers can fill out.

c. The above table for the District of Columbia Circuit is representative of the other circuits’ systematic dismissal of complaints against their respective judges and their judicial councils’ systematic denial of petitions for review of those dismissals. That constitutes the foundation for the assertion that the judges have proceeded to abuse the self-discipline power granted to them under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act(28usc351-364 at *>jur:24§b) to exempt themselves from discipline, placing themselves beyond investigation and above any liability. They hold themselves unaccountable by arrogating to themselves the power to abrogate in practice that Act of Congress. By so doing, they harm the complainants, who are left with no relief from the harmful conduct of the complained-about judge and exposed to his or her retaliation. Likewise, they harm the rest of the public, who is left with judges who know that as a matter of fact they can rely on the protection of their peers to abuse their power and disregard due process and the equal protection of the law, for they are in effect Judges Above the Law.



Statistics & Reports

This section of uscourts.gov provides statistical data and analysis on the business of the federal Judiciary. Specific publications address the work of the appellate, district, and bankruptcy courts; the probation and pretrial services systems; and other components of the U.S. courts.



Analysis & Reports >

- BAPCPA Report
- Civil Justice Reform Act Report
- Federal Court Management Statistics
- Federal Judicial Caseload Statistics
- Judicial Facts and Figures
- Judicial Business
- Statistical Tables for the Federal Judiciary
- Wiretap Reports
- Delayed Notice Search Warrant



Caseload Statistics Data Tables >



Publications >

- Civil Litigation Management Manual
- Courtroom Technology Manual
- Dodd Frank Act Report
- Federal Court System in the U.S.
- Federal Probation Journal
- Journalist's Guide to the Federal Courts
- Judiciary Conferences That Cost More Than \$100,000
- Long Range Plan for Information Technology
- Long Range Plan for the Federal Courts



Email Updates

Court Locator

Careers

News

Listen to this page

Search uscourts.gov



About Federal Courts

Judges & Judgeships

Services & Forms

Court Records

Statistics & Reports

Rules & Policies

Statistics & Reports

Analysis & Reports

BAPCPA Report

Civil Justice Reform Act Report

Federal Court Management Statistics

★ Federal Judicial Caseload Statistics

Judicial Facts and Figures

Judicial Business

Statistical Tables for the Federal Judiciary

Wiretap Reports

Delayed-Notice Search Warrant

FISA Report

Director's Annual Report

Federal Judicial Caseload Statistics 2017

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 604(a)(2)^a, each year the Administrative Office of the United States Courts is required to provide a report of statistical information on the caseload of the federal courts for the 12-month period ending March 31.

This report presents data on the work of the appellate, district, and bankruptcy courts and on the probation and pretrial services systems. Below is a summary of key findings provided for the year ending March 31, 2017.

- In the U.S. courts of appeals, filings rose 10 percent.
- The bankruptcy appellate panels reported that filings rose 1 percent.
- Filings in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit rose 11 percent.
- In the U.S. district courts, filings of civil cases rose 6 percent, while filings for defendants charged with crimes dropped 5 percent.
- The U.S. bankruptcy courts received 5 percent fewer petitions.
- The number of persons under supervision by the federal probation system on March 31, 2017, was 1 percent lower than the total reported one year earlier.
- The number of pretrial services cases activated in the past 12 months decreased 4 percent.

U.S. Courts of Appeals

Filings in the 12 regional courts of appeals rose 10 percent to 58,951 (up 5,303 appeals). Most of this increase stemmed from higher filings of original proceedings and miscellaneous applications, which offset decreases in criminal appeals, appeals of administrative agency decisions, and bankruptcy appeals. Civil appeals remained nearly unchanged.

Civil appeals grew by 5 cases to 28,071.

- U.S. prisoner petitions rose 18 percent.

Caseload Statistics 2017

Caseload Statistics 2017

Caseload Statistics 2017 Charts

Caseload Statistics 2017 Tables

Judicial Caseload Indicators

Share This Page



Blank

Blank