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
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

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

February 13, 2017

Mr. Stephen Miller
Senior Policy Advisor to President Donald Trump
The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. Miller,

You stated at morning shows on Sunday, February 12, as seen in an NBC clip, that "we have a judiciary that has taken far too much power and become in many cases a supreme branch of government". The President tweeted approvingly, "Congratulations Stephen Miller- on representing me this morning on the various Sunday morning shows. Great job!"

This is a proposal[1], based on my study of judges[2], for you to advise the President on how he can curb the power of the Federal Judiciary by showing that its judges connive with the politicians who recommend, endorse, nominate, and confirm them, and thereafter are too afraid of judicial retaliation to exercise constitutional checks and balances on them, so they hold the judges unaccountable. Life-tenured, federal judges are the most established of "the swamp of corruption of the Establishment": In the last 228 years since the creation of the Federal Judiciary in 1789, the number of its judges impeached and removed is 8!(*>jur:21§a) Held unaccountable, assured of irremovability in practice, and powerful enough to suspend an executive order of a president elected by the people, federal judges abuse for their own convenience or gain their enormous power over people's property, liberty, and all the rights and duties that determine their lives.

From now on, the judges will use their power to show the President how true the words of his Justiceship Nominee J. Neil Gorsuch are: "An attack on one of our brothers and sisters of the robe is an attack on all of us". The Supreme Court can make that point by upholding unanimously the decision of the 9th Circuit judges who upheld the immigration ban suspension of the disparagingly referred to as "the so-called judge", which is what would obtain if the Court cast a 4 to 4 vote and wasted the opportunity to send a daring message, '*Don't you ever mess with us!*'

The President can cower or be true to his statement, "When I'm hit, I hit back 10 times more strongly". He can hit back, not by claiming that judges' decisions are wrong –an unwinnable battle– but by exposing their wrongdoing, including criminal activity. That process can be launched by either him at a press conference or you at discreet meetings with journalists presenting the two unique national stories of P. Obama-Justice Sotomayor and Federal Judiciary-NSA(next↓). Their investigation can expose, among other things, widespread concealment of assets –of which Then-Judge Sotomayor was suspected by *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and Politico(*>jur:65[107a,c]), and money laundering between judges' hidden and declared accounts with the NSA's IT assistance. This can topple Sen. Chuck Schumer, who shepherded J. Sotomayor through her confirmation, learned of her concealment through the FBI vetting reports on her -which P. Trump can order released(next↓↓)- yet lied to the people by vouching for her integrity.

At his inauguration, the President stated that a new era began "starting right here, and right now". No act of his would usher in a new era so decisively as his successful support of the petition for a constitutional convention made by 34 states to Congress since April 2014. No act would fulfill his inaugural promise to "transfer power from Washington, D.C., to the people" as empowering *the People* to adopt their constitution(†>ol2:513). To show how he can do so and limit 'the power of the supreme branch', I[3] respectfully request a meeting with you and your peers.

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

ENDNOTES

1. This letter, the previous ones to Candidate and President-elect Donald Trump, and their supporting materials, including templates for any party to a lawsuit and anybody else to submit complaints against judges and audit their decisions in search of points of commonality that can reveal patterns and trends of wrongdoing, are found in the file at:

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/*OL2*/16-5-21DrRCordero-DJTrump.pdf

2. The study of judges' performance in fact rather than as the rules prescribe that they should perform runs to more than 1,000 pages and is contained in two volumes, where the materials corresponding to the (blue or black text references) herein are found:

* Vol. 1: http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/*OL*/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf >all prefixes:page# up to ol:393

† Vol. 2: http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/*OL2*/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf >from ol2:394

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

Visit the website at, and subscribe to its series of articles and letters thus:

www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org >+ New or Users >Add New

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

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

January 29, 2017

The Two Unique National Stories of President Obama-Justice Sotomayor and Federal Judiciary-NSA

that through journalistic and official investigations can inform the public of judges' wrongdoing and so outrage it as to stir it up to demand that Congress heed the states' call for a constitutional convention where *We the People* can give ourselves

a new constitution

in which we are the masters who hold all our judicial public servants accountable and liable for their wrongdoing

G. The President Obama-Justice Sotomayor story and the *Follow the money!* investigation

What did President Barak Obama(*>jur:77§5),
Sen. Chuck Schumer and Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand(jur:78§6), and federal judges(jur:105fn213b)
know about the concealment of assets by
his first Supreme Court nominee, Then-Judge, Now-Justice Sotomayor(jur:65§§1-3)
–suspected by *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and Politico(jur:65fn107a)
of concealing assets,
which entails the crimes(*>ol:5fn10) of tax evasion(jur:65fn107c) and money laundering–
and when did they know it?

41. This story can be pursued through the *Follow the money!* investigation(jur:102§a; ol:194§E).

42. Its investigation can determine whether they covered up for Then-Judge Sotomayor and lied(ol:64§C) to the American public by vouching for her honesty because President Obama wanted to ingratiate himself with the people petitioning him to nominate to the Supreme Court another woman and the first Hispanic to replace Retiring Justice Souter and from whom he expected in exchange support for the passage of the Obamacare bill in Congress.

43. The investigation includes a call on President Donald Trump to release unredacted all FBI reports on the vetting of J. Sotomayor as federal district, circuit, and Supreme Court nominee, as well as on J. Sotomayor herself to request that she ask him to release those reports.

44. The release of those FBI vetting reports can set a precedent for the vetting of judges and other candidates for office.

45. The investigation can reveal how routine(jur:21§1), grave(jur:27§2), and widespread(jur:28§3) wrongdoing(ol:154¶3) by federal judges is(jur:71§4); and the circumstances(ol:190¶¶1-7) of

unaccountability, secrecy, coordination, and risklessness that enable their wrongdoing(jur:5§3).

46. It can expose wrongdoing so outrageous as to force justices and judges to resign(jur:92§d), or be impeached and removed, for having violated their own Code of Conduct, which enjoins them both to "avoid even the appearance of impropriety"(jur:68fn123a) and "uphold the integrity of the judiciary".

47. 'Showing the appearance of impropriety', not the commission of a crime, thus becomes the standard for the investigation and the publication of articles. Responsible, unbiased, and ambitious journalists can easily meet it.

48. Only in a criminal case in court is it required that the jury apply the most exacting standard of 'proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt' to reach its verdict. But even there the introduction of each piece of evidence by the prosecutor is not subject to that standard; and the jury can base its verdict on circumstantial evidence, the totality of circumstances, and reasonable inferences drawn from them.

49. The *Follow the money!* investigation is a journalistic activity; it is not a prosecutorial effort to obtain a conviction. By 'showing the appearance of impropriety' by a justice or a judge it can bring about his or her resignation. That is how the investigation of Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas by *Life* magazine provoked such public outrage at his improprieties that he resigned on May 14, 1969(jur:92§d).

50. Judicial resignations will open the door for the Federal Judiciary to be '*packed*'(jur:23fn17a) with people transparently found capable of rendering honest services and worthy of being entrusted with the power to dispose of our property, liberty, and all the rights and duties that shape our lives.

H. The Federal Judiciary-NSA story and the *Follow it wirelessly!* investigation

To what extent do established, life-tenured federal judges
abuse their vast computer network and expertise
–which handle hundreds of millions of case files(*>Lsch:11¶9b.ii)–
either alone or with the quid pro quo assistance of the NSA
(National Security Agency)
–up to 100% of whose secret requests for secret orders of surveillance
are rubberstamped(ol:5fn7) by the federal judges of the secret court established under
the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act(50 U.S.C. §§1801-1811; ol:20fn5)–:

a) to conceal assets –a crime under 26 U.S.C. §§7201, 7206(ol:5fn10), unlike surveillance– by electronically transferring them between declared and hidden accounts(ol:1) in a money laundering operation intended to wash money of the taint of its illegal source; and

b) to cover up their interception of the communications –also a crime under 18 U.S.C. §2511(ol:5a/fn13, 14)– of critics of judges to prevent them from joining forces to expose the judges' wrongdoing?

51. This story can be pursued through the *Follow it wirelessly!* investigation(jur:105§b; ol:194§E).

52. At stake in it is contents-based interception, that is, activity aimed at finding out what the

participants in the communication said to each other so that the interceptor may determine whether to interfere with, or prevent, that and future communications.

53. Contents-based interception constitutes a deprivation of the 1st Amendment rights to 'freedom of speech, of the press, to assemble peacefully, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances'(jur:130¶276b).

54. A statistical analysis(ol:19§Dfn2) of a large number of communications critical of judges and a pattern of oddities(†>ol2:395, 405) give probable cause to believe that contents-based interception is going on(ol2:425).

55. It is reasonable to assume that the people who have the most to lose due to such criticism and the most to gain by interfering with it, namely, judges, are the ones conducting or who have instigated others to conduct on their behalf such interception.

56. The revelation of contents-based interception will provoke graver outrage than that resulting from Edward Snowden's leaked documents revealing the NSA's illegal dragnet collection of only contents-free metadata of scores of millions of communications, that is, only telephone numbers, names of callers and callees, calls' time, duration, frequency, and location, etc.

57. Public outrage will be driven to its paroxysm if it is shown that judges are behind the contents-based interception, not in "the national security interest", but rather in the crass self-interest of preventing the exposure of their wrongdoing and preserving the flow to them of illegal or improper material, professional, and social benefits(ol:173¶93).

I. Judges' wrongdoing and abuse of power with the connivance of politicians warrants *the People* giving themselves a new constitution

58. Routine, widespread, and grave wrongdoing and abuse of power will constitute evidence that honest service by judges cannot be obtained either by giving them self-disciplining power under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980(jur:21§1), which judges have abused by self-exempting from liability(jur:24§§b, c), nor by Congress and the president exercising constitutional checks and balances on the Judiciary, a function that they have failed to perform in the self-interest of avoiding retaliation from judges(jur:23fn17a).

59. As a result, judges harm litigants and the rest of the public by wrongfully and abusively disposing of their property, their liberty, and all the rights and duties that shape their lives. Connivingly, politicians have condoned and covered up their harmful conduct.

60. Consequently, *the People* are justified in demanding that a constitutional convention be called where they can give themselves a new constitution in which they assert their status as the sovereign source of all political power and as such, the masters in "government of, by, and for the people"(jur:82fn172) who hire public servants, including judicial public servants, and hold them accountable(jur:158§§6-8) and liable to compensate the victims of their wrongdoing.

Dr. Cordero offers to make a presentation to you and your colleagues here in New York City or at a video conference or elsewhere on a paid trip, on these two unique national stories and his inform and outrage strategy, set forth in the email above and on his website‡, for the Women's March to "move forward" to a new constitution.

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

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

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
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

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

November 11, 2016

President-elect Donald J. Trump
Donald J. Trump for President, Inc.
725 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Dear President-elect Trump,

Congratulations on your election. This is an application[1] for a position in your administration. I want to contribute my knowledge and experience as a doctor of law and researcher-writer attorney to what according to you follows in importance only to a president's declaration of war, a Supreme Court nomination, and the corresponding need for 'draining' the Judiciary.

My commitment to your success and capacity to assist you are revealed by the letters (infra↓) that I researched and wrote you and your top officers. They are based on my study of the Judiciary's performance in practice rather than as prescribed, **Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Wrongdoing: Pioneering the news and publishing field of judicial unaccountability reporting**.[2] Those letters and study show that I possess a capacity that can be of significant benefit to your honoring your pledge to 'drain the swamp of corruption of Washington insiders', the Establishment, and replace their failed policies: I think strategically. I use knowledgeable and practical judgment to understand the harmonious and conflicting interests of the people in a system and craft plans to strengthen alliances and weaken foes(↓498§§B, G).

Indeed, you will begin your presidency in a country so disunited that more people voted against you than for you. Bad omen. You need to lower the obstacles to your every move that will be raised by that majority of people, including the anti-Trump movement who are demonstrating in the streets to the chant of "Not my president". They are the most vocal and determined of demonstrators: young people. They are asking for the Electoral College to elect the winner of the popular vote, Sec. Clinton. While they have little chance of persuading it to do so, they have the stamina to keep their protest alive, perhaps led by Sen. Sanders, for the next 18 months until the mid-term campaign begins. Worse, they can mount a demonstration that mars your inagural speech and the taking of the oath before the on-site and the national and international TV public and media. This would diminish your authority and prestige here and abroad and set a demeaning contrast to the spirit of celebration and hope that suffused P. Obama's inagurations.(↓444¶1)

Between now and then you can start to win them over by taking action that switches their attention from your negatives to the positives that they begin to receive. Neither building the wall nor dismantling Obamacare can do so. But draining the swamp can start now and impress a huge (311¶1) bloc of people by showing that the system of justice that you accused of being rigged in favor of Sec. Clinton is rigged against *We the People*(437¶4): Judges are held unaccountable by the politicians who put them on the bench. Their connivance(488¶¶3-6) allows judges to abusively(437¶¶4-5) deprive people of their property, liberty, and rights(453). How would you feel if the College deprived you of your presidency, but a Comey-like officer opened an investigation that revealed the electors' disqualifying corruption? You would praise and root for that officer (363¶¶4-6,8). At a press conference(489¶¶10-11), you can denounce politicians/judges' connivance; and ask the public to submit their judicial complaints(311¶2; 362¶4) and the media to investigate two unique national stories(440, 480¶¶2-3) to plumb the judicial swamp as the prerequisite to your justiceship nomination. "The appearance of impropriety" will cause outrage(461§G) and resignations and enable you to 'pack the courts'and reshape the system(422¶¶1,3,4; 488¶¶5-8). To present how to do so(483) and discuss this application, I[3] respectfully request a meeting.

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

November 25, 2016

Federal judges with life-tenure are the Establishment by definition
Will President-elect Trump drain the judicial swamp or let it fester on the advice of the Establishment insiders that he is bringing into the White House and his cabinet and to avoid judges' retaliation against his 70 pending business lawsuits, thus leaving exposed to judges' continued abuse The Dissatisfied With The Establishment, who elected him, and the rest of *We the People*?

1. President-elect Trump has stated that what follows in importance a president's declaration of war is a Supreme Court nomination.
2. Indeed, until the Court upholds the constitutionality of a law, it is little more than a set of wishful guidelines envisaged by the 535 members of Congress and the president and expressed in black ink on white paper. Where would Obamacare be today if the Court had held it unconstitutional? In a footnote in the chronicles of the Obama presidency.
3. P-e Trump also campaigned on the promise "to drain the swamp of corruption of Washington insiders". The latter constitute the Establishment. He accused Sec. Clinton of being its representative so that if she won the presidential election, she would protect the swamp and its corruption would continue festering. It stills festers although in 2006, Democratic Representative Nancy Pelosi, before becoming Speaker of the House, famously declared that "Washington is dominated by the culture of corruption" and vowed "to drain the swamp"(*>jur:23fn16). She miserably failed to do so because she was part of the Establishment.
4. By contrast, P-e Trump is an outsider. He is not tied, and does not owe his election, to Establishment members. Far from it, those who got him elected are precisely The Dissatisfied With The Establishment. However, in light of his nomination of Washington insiders for his White House and cabinet, how concerned should The Dissatisfied be about his becoming domesticated on those insiders' advice to the Washington ways so as to become used to the continued festering of the swamp, in general, and its most harmful portion, the judicial swamp, in particular?

A. The abused powers that generate the judicial swamp

> "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely". Lord Acton, Letter to Bishop Mandell Creighton, April 3, 1887.

5. The status of unaccountability is at the source of the capacity to turn power into absolute power that ends up forming a swamp of corruption.

1. Judges' power to stay established: life-appointment and irremovability in practice

6. Federal judges are appointed for life. Worse yet, they are irremovable in effect: While 2,293 federal judges were in office on 30sep15, in the last 227 years since the creation of the Federal Judiciary in 1789, the number of them impeached and removed is 8!(jur:21§1).
7. Several justices have been on the Supreme Court for around 25 years, such as JJ. Thomas (29), Kennedy (28), Ginsburg (23), and Breyer (22). J. Scalia was in office for 30 years. That does not

count at all the years that they spent in the circuit and district courts.

8. For instance, while J. Sotomayor has been on the Supreme Court only since 2009, she has been in the Federal Judiciary since 1992, when she was appointed a federal district court, followed by her appointment in 1998 to the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Hence, she has already been in the judicial Establishment for 24 years.

9. It is a fact that the Federal Judiciary is the quintessential Establishment. Its judges are established in power forever no matter the quality or quantity of their performance or conduct.

2. The power of connivance between appointing-politicians and their appointed judges

10. Federal judges are recommended, endorsed, nominated, and confirmed by politicians. For the latter, judges are "our men and women on the bench". They stand in an appointer-appointee relation(†>ol2:488¶¶3-6). Politicians hold judges unaccountable in the expectation that they will hold the laws of their legislative agenda constitutional(jur:23fn17a) and not retaliate(Lsch:17§C) against the thousands of lawsuits that the government files every year.

11. Neither of the other two branches dare check that judges "shall hold their Office during good Behaviour" only, as provided for under Article III, Section 1, of the Constitution(jur:22fn12). The relation of power between these branches is out of balance, but only due to pragmatic considerations, not because the Constitution holds the Judiciary superior to the other branches. Far from it. Nevertheless, the result is that judges neither fear nor respect politicians.

3. Judges' vast power of the office

12. Judges act as a standing constitutional convention, for they give content to the mere labels of the Constitution(jur:22fn12b), such as "freedom of speech, freedom of the press", "due process", "equal protection of the law". They even read into it new rights never imagined hundreds of years ago by a rural, religious, and mostly illiterate society and even diametrically opposite to its beliefs.

13. Judges interpret the meaning and scope of application of every law. By exercising that power in its many forms(ol:267§4), they dispose of the property, liberty, life, and all the rights and duties that shape what people can and cannot do from before their birth, throughout their lives, and after their death(jur:25fn25, 26). They abuse their power by the way they make decisions: The analysis (ol2:453) of their official statistics shows that the 12 federal regional circuit courts dispose of 93% of appeals in decisions "on procedural grounds, by consolidation, unpublished, unsigned, without comment". They are so perfunctory that the majority are issued on a 5¢ summary order form and/or marked "not precedential", mere ad hoc, arbitrary, reasonless fiats of the judicial swamp. There can be no doubt that individually and collectively judges wield the broadest, farthest-reaching, and most substantial power of any public officer, including the most corruptive: the power 'to tell what is good and evil' in the contemplation of the law, that is, what is legal and illegal.

4. Judges' power to grab benefits

14. Judges abuse their power to grab the social, material, and personal benefits within their reach(ol:173¶93) and for sheer convenience. The opportunity to use power to grab can hardly be passed up under the influence of the most insidious corruptor: *money!, lots of money!* In the calendar year 2010, the bankruptcy judges alone ruled on the $373 billion at stake in only personal bankruptcies(jur:27§2). The only ones watching with power to do anything about its disposition were the circuit judges who had appointed them and they and the district judges who

could remove them(jur:43fn61a). With them as their overseers, bankruptcy judges could do just about anything, except being ungrateful(jur:42fn60). In addition, there is all the money subject to judges' decisions in probate matters, contracts, alimony, mergers and acquisition, taxes, etc.

5. Judges' power to grow well-connected

15. The arguments that militate in support of the two-term limit for holding the presidency, and of P-e Trump's promise to push for legislation limiting the number of terms for members of Congress apply to judges too: The longer a person serves in public office, the more entitled they feel and the more their public office becomes their personal one. That feeling of entitlement is exacerbated for federal judges, who do not have to run for reelection and need not fear in reality being removed. They and their public office become one and the same.

16. Moreover, as public officers deal with ever more people, they become ever more powerful through the IOUs that they have collected from people who needed their help; and the more indebted they become to others whose help they needed to get their way. Hence, to an ever greater extent they move from doing the public's business to 'dealing for their own account'.

6. Judges' power of camaraderie

17. To be in good standing with the other judges, a judge only needs to engage in knowing indifference and willful ignorance or blindness, which are forms of culpably looking the other way(jur:88§§a-c) and carrying on as if nothing had happened or will happen.

> 'Keep your mouth shut about what I and the other judges did or are about to do, and you can enjoy our friendship.'
>
> 'I will protect you today against this complaint and tomorrow you will protect me or my friends when we are the target of a complaint'.

18. That is how judges implicitly or explicitly ensure for decades their social acceptance and their self-preservation through reciprocal protection. They know from the historical record that nobody will charge them with accessorial liability after the fact that they kept quiet about or covered up, and before the fact of the next wrongful act that they encouraged others to do with their promise of passive silence or active cover-up.

19. By contrast, a judge who dared expose another judge's wrongdoing would be deemed by all the other judges an unreliable traitor and cast out their social circle and activities as a pariah.

20. Such interdependent security(Lsch:16§1) gives rise to the judicial class mentality. It is similar to that found among police officers, doctors, priests, sports teams, sororities and fraternities, etc. It trades integrity for the benefits of membership. The more time judges spend in the Judiciary, the more they transition from peers to colleagues, to members, to friends, and to co-conspirators (ol:166§§C, D). So instead of administering justice to *We the People*, they run their swamp as a private enterprise to make it ever more profitable, efficient, and secure for themselves.

7. Judges' power to self-discipline

21. In its Article III, the Constitution only creates the Supreme Court. All lower courts thereunder are created by Congress, which also creates tribunal-like administrative agencies under Art. II, Sec. 8; and appoints judges directly or by delegation under Art. II, Sec. 2. The Constitution does not grant judges, not even those of the Supreme Court, the power to determine themselves what constitutes "good Behaviour" during which they can "hold their Offices".

22. Yet, politicians have relinquished that significant 'check and balance' to the judges by allowing them to exercise the power of self-disciplining(jur:21§1). With the connivance of politicians, judges abuse that power by dismissing 99.82%(jur:10-14) of complaints against them filed by parties to cases and any other members of *the People*, as well as denying up to 100% of petitions to review those dismissals(jur:24§§b-d). The relation of political protectors-judicial protégés is anathema to the objective analysis of complaints against judges and the fair and impartial treatment of complainants. That is why judges have no inhibitions about abusing their self-disciplining power to arrogate to themselves self-exemption from liability.

23. Complainants have no other source of relief. They are left to bob with their complained about harm in the middle of the swamp.

8. Judges' power to show contempt for *We the People* and our representatives

24. *We the People*, the masters in "government of, by, and for the people"(jur:82fn172), hired judges as our public servants to deliver the service of administering justice according to the rule of law. But judges need not serve *the People* to stay established in office. Voters neither elect nor reelect federal judges. Judges stay even when they disserve *the People*. There is no downside to disservice, for they can neither be demoted nor have their salary reduced. To enjoy their lifelong stay on the bench, they only need to serve their constituency: each other. If they stand together, nobody can bring them down...unless their swamp is drained through exposure, as proposed below.

9. The power to retaliate

25. Judges' power to retaliate is not limited to declaring the pieces of a president's or party's legislative agenda unconstitutional. Judges have a panoply of ways to engage in chicanery: They can sign search and seizure warrants broader than they should be, narrow them or refuse to sign them; grant, deny or impose punitive, bail; admit or exclude evidence, evidentiary and expert witnesses, and their testimony; uphold or overrule objections and raise others on their own; cause docket dates to be moved forward or backward; lose, misplace, and find documents; grant or deny hearings and leave to appeal; ignore, or grant more or less than, the relief requested; enter or disregard a verdict; grant a reduction or increase in the amount of compensation; etc.(Lsch:17§C)

26. Judges' power to retaliate has an important limit: They cannot retaliate simultaneously against a large number of professional and citizen journalists participating in a concerted effort to drain their swamp through investigation and exposure, especially if the effort was launched by the president to deliver on a campaign promise. Massive retaliation would unmask their actions as coordinated abuse of power to conceal their liability for, and preserve, their swamp benefits.

B. Judges' unaccountability is the key corruptive component of their swamp

27. Unaccountability is the attribute that distinguishes judges individually as public officers and collectively as a class, the judicial class, a privileged one. Their privilege is at once the source and the result of their powers, which they leverage to preserve and exploit their privilege by adopting a black robe first mentality and letting it guide their professional and personal "Behaviour".

28. Judges' privilege is the product of corruptive components:

    a. a sense of entitlement to their office for life;

    b. the assurance of being held unaccountable by others and the capacity to assure themselves

their self-exemption from discipline, never mind liability to the people that they harm by their wrongdoing, which give rise to a sense and the reality of impunity; and

c. the most corruptive of all powers: the power to decide what is lawful or unlawful and thereby make anything either right or wrong...or simply go away.

29. People are not merely elevated to the federal bench. Because they are allowed, and manage, to do from there whatever they want without being worried about its adverse consequences regardless of the nature and quality of their behavior and performance, they are given access to a status that no person is entitled to receive or grab in 'government, not of men and women, but by the rule of law'(ol:5fn6): Public Servants Above their Masters -*We the People*- and their Law.

30. Conferring a federal judgeship amounts to issuing a license to engage in wrongdoing for profit as a member of an independent, sovereign corrupt organization. Since P-e Trump wants to drain the Establishment swamp, he must begin by draining the one that dominates it: the judicial swamp.

C. P-e Trump owes his loyalty, not to the judges of the swamp, but rather to The Dissatisfied With The Establishment who elected him

31. No federal judge has ever been nominated by P-e Trump. None of them owes him any loyalty. Instead, he owes his loyalty to the people who elected him, The Dissatisfied With The Establishment, and to the promises that he made them, such as the promise to drain the Establishment swamp. The Dissatisfied encompass the dissatisfied with the judicial and legal systems. They form a huge untapped voting bloc.

32. In fact, every year, more than 100 million parties take others or are taken to court in the more than 50 million cases filed in state and federal courts(jur:8fn4,5). To them must be added the scores of millions of parties to cases pending or deemed to have been decided wrongly or wrongfully and the additional scores of millions of affected related persons: their families, friends, peers, etc. But they are as unaware of forming a voting bloc as the Dissatisfied were until Election 2016.

33. The majority of them have been hurt profoundly, for nothing can so deeply offend people and commit them to fighting back with passion and unwavering determination as to feel that they were abused to be taken advantage of. When the abusers are none other than the public officers hired to afford them due process and the equal protection of the law, that feeling is aggravated by a sense of betrayal. Thus, if P-e Trump undertakes to deliver on his promise to drain the judicial swamp, he can count with the passionate support of all those dissatisfied with the judiciary.

D. P-e Trump, as the president for everybody's benefit, can begin to unite the nation by draining the judicial swamp that harms *We the People*

34. Our country is deeply divided. In fact, 2 million more people voted for Sec. Clinton than for Candidate Trump, which means that she won the popular vote. That comforts the anti-Trump movement as it demonstrates in the streets to the chant of "Not my president". It is animated by the most vigorous protesters: young people. They can mount demonstrations in Washington and the rest of the country on the inauguration day that can mar P-e Trump's speech and his taking of the oath of office in front of the on-site audience and the national and international TV public and media. That would diminish his authority and prestige here and abroad and set a demeaning contrast to the spirit of celebration and hope that suffused P. Obama's inaugurations.(ol2:444¶1)

35. So, he must unite our country and win over as many of those who voted for Sec. Clinton, the other candidates, and nobody because they disliked all of them. He must take action that switches

their attention from the negatives about him to the positives that he can bring them. Neither building the wall nor repealing Obamacare can begin now, let alone unite the country. But he can from well before Inauguration Day, start draining the Establishment's judicial swamp.

E. P-e Trump's first drainage step: a press conference to call on the public and the media to expose the corruptive judicial powers and the resulting swamp

36. P-e Trump can call a press conference(ol2:489¶¶10-11) to declare that the system of justice that he accused of being rigged in favor of Sec. Clinton is actually rigged against *We the People*(ol2:437¶4), constituting a key portion of the Establishment swamp, so that as a prerequisite to nominating J. Scalia's successor and ushering in a fair and impartial system, the depth of its corruption must be plumbed. He can thus become *the People*'s Champion of Justice. To that end, he can:

    a. make an Emile Zola-like *I accuse!*(jur:98§2) denunciation of politicians/judges' connivance;

    b. ask the public to submit their judicial complaints(ol:311¶2; 362¶4) and the decisions of the judges in their cases(ol:274, 304) to his website for the public to examine them in search of the most persuasive evidence: commonalities pointing to patterns of wrongdoing;

    c. call on professional and citizen journalists to investigate the two unique national stories (ol2:440, 480¶¶2-3) of President Obama-Justice Sotomayor and Federal Judiciary-NSA.

        1) Judges are required by their own Code of Conduct to "avoid even the appearance of impropriety"(jur:68fn123a). Therefore, journalists only have to show, rather than prove, that judges appear to engage in improprieties, never mind criminal conduct, such as concealing assets to evade taxes and launder them of the taint of unlawful origin(jur:65fn107a,c). Such showing will cause outrage so intense in the public(ol2:461§G) as to provoke resignations among judges(jur:92§d);

    d) announce nationally televised hearings on judges' wrongdoing to determine the needed reform(jur:158§6-7); (jur:xlv§G on millenial impossibles that are part of today's reality);

    e) demand that Congress convene the constitutional convention that 34 states have formally called, thus satisfying the constitutional requirement of Article V for amending the Constitution, and advocate the adoption of term-limits for judges and the establishment of citizen boards of judicial accountability and liability to compensate judges' victims(jur:160§8);

    f) encourage top universities to join forces with the national media and journalism schools, advocates of honest judiciaries, and groups of victims of wrongdoing judges to:

        1) organize a national conference on judges' unaccountability and riskless wrongdoing (jur:97§1), and statistical, linguistic, and literary auditing techniques(jur:131§b);

        2) publish print and/or digital journals on judicial unaccountability and wrongdoing (jur:97§1) with articles for scholarly and general audiences;

        3) devise and disseminate templates for the public to report judicial wrongdoing as one of the sources together with other techniques(ol:42, 60) for compiling the Annual Report on Judicial Unaccountability and Wrongdoing in America(jur:126§3);

        4) create an institute(jur:130§5) of judicial accountability and reform advocacy.

37. You can contribute to the drainage of the judicial swamp by sharing and posting this article widely. I offer to make a presentation of it in person or by video conference upon request(ol:202).

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

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

2167 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6500
tel. +1(718)827-9521; follow @DrCorderoEsq
Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

August 19, 2015

Mr. Donald J. Trump
Donald J. Trump for President, Inc.
725 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Dear Mr. Trump,

1. This is a proposal for you to boldly raise an issue that can allow you to dominate again the presidential race discussion and draw support from a huge untapped voting bloc: unaccountable judges' riskless wrongdoing(*>ol:224§A) and the consequent dissatisfied users of the legal and judicial systems. The dissatisfied are among the 100 million parties to the 50 million cases[4,5] filed in all courts annually, plus the parties to the scores of millions of pending cases and cases deemed wrongly or wrongfully decided. In the last 226 years since the creation of the Federal Judiciary in 1789, the number of its judges –2,217 were in office on 30sep13[13]– impeached and removed is 8!(jur:21§1) Without fearing for their job or salary[12], federal judges abuse their power for their and their class's benefit(ol:173¶93). Hence, the dissatisfied yearn for a champion.

2. The most resentful people are those dissatisfied users who feel abused by judges duty-bound to administer Equal Justice Under Law. For them, it is personal. They will be the most committed supporters of a candidate who credibly promises to do them justice and hold judges accountable. You can tap their voting bloc by asking them to submit to your website for public comparison and wrongdoing pattern searching(ol:274) their complaints on a template(ol:306) or those that they filed with chief circuit judges, who dismiss 99.82% of them(jur:10,11; 24§§b-d).

3. Through that issue, you can also ensure valuable media coverage, especially by journalists pursuing a scoop(jur:4¶¶10-14): At the root of judges' wrongdoing lies connivance between the president who nominates people to the Judiciary, and the senators –including some candidates– who confirm them; thereafter they allow 'their' judges to hold all their meetings(jur:27§e) behind closed doors; never to appear at press conferences; and to keep complaints secret.

4. Secrecy is one of THE CIRCUMSTANCES ENABLING JUDGES' WRONGDOING(ol:190¶¶1-7). The media will keep investigating and associating them with your judges issue if you break two unique national stories(ol:191§§A,B): The President Obama-Justice Sotomayor story was first pursued by *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and Politico[107a], which suspected Then-Judge Sotomayor of concealing assets. The Federal Judiciary-NSA story points to judges' securing a crass class interest: Federal judges approve up to 100%[ol:5fn7] of NSA's secret requests for secret orders of surveillance; and in exchange NSA helps transfer assets between illegal sources(jur:65§§1-3) and money laundering accounts; and intercept communications among critics of wrongdoing judges(ggl:1 et seq.).

5. Based on these stories, you can ask a question capable of dominating Campaign 2016: What did the President(jur:77§5), Sen. Schumer(78§6), and the justices[23b] and judges know(71§4) about J. Sotomayor's asset concealment[107a] and tax evasion[107c] and other judges'[213] coordinated(86§§4-c) wrongdoing; and when(75§d) did they know it?; and demand that the FBI vetting reports on her be released. Judges are most vulnerable to the exposure of their failure to "avoid even the appearance of impropriety"[123a]. The resulting resignations(jur:92§d) will open vacancies that will allow the next president to "pack"[17a] the Supreme and lower courts.

6. I respectfully request you too the opportunity to present to you and your aides this proposal for using the judges' wrongdoing issue to make a candidate the Champion of the Dissatisfied, a huge untapped voting bloc, and of a new America of public accountability to *We the People*.

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
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org
2165 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6506
tel. (718)827-9521; follow @DrCorderoEsq
Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

June 20, 2015

Auditing Judges

Exposing judges' wrongdoing by finding commonalities in their disregard of the facts and the law that reveal patterns of wrongdoing that denies due process and equal protection of the law

When pro ses start thinking strategically, take their hands into action for justice, and by taking advantage of the presidential election campaign develop into a civic movement that hold judges and all other public servants accountable and liable to their victims

A. Anecdotic allegations v. pattern evidence of judges' wrongdoing

1. A party to a lawsuit cannot merely allege in court that the judge is biased or is engaged in other wrongdoing and thereby cause a judge to recuse herself or have her disqualified. The party must provide evidence of his allegations; otherwise, the allegation will be dismissed as impressionistic and anecdotic, and the party will be disparaged by being labeled 'a disgruntled loser'.

2. The most convincing way of making such allegations is by identifying in one's case an instance of conduct, an event, statement, position, person, name, address, date, number, quantity, etc., that is the same as, or similar to, another in the same case or in several of them, or better yet, in a statistically representative sample of related cases, e.g., those presided over by the same judge or in the same court or jurisdiction: These are commonalities. When connected, they form a pattern of wrongdoing(ol:154¶3). It is like finding in a judge's conduct and written or oral statements dots with a common color or shade that when connected reveal a figure: the face of a wrongdoing judge(jur:10:Nature of…). Pattern evidence is the picture in, "A picture is worth a thousand words" of mere allegations of parties, never mind pro ses. That is what auditing a judge means.

3. So a party can either:

   a. whine about allegations without evidence, which are unconvincing and self-defeating; or

   b. think and proceed strategically(Lsch:14§3; ol:52§C; ol:8§E; jur:xliv¶C) to expose the judge's disregard of facts and the law, bias, conflict of interests, etc.; obtain relief now; and for the wrong done to the party by the judge as well as by the judiciary that failed to supervise and discipline her obtain perhaps even compensation from both in future.

4. A party that chooses the latter, strategic course of action can:

   a. gather raw data, e.g., judges' calendars, rulings, and decisions or even the whole record of cases to glean her statements from transcripts, dockets, party contact information; and

   b. examine them and compare notes with other parties in search of commonalities that reveal patterns of wrongdoing that deny parties due process and equal protection of the law in violation of the state and the U.S. constitutions, the laws thereunder, court rules, etc.;

   c. use such pattern evidence in an appeal to the highest state court and thereafter to the U.S. Supreme Court, where it hardly ever reaches because most pro ses do not know how and cannot afford to appeal, so that a case that does make it there can become a test case; and

   d. additionally produce concrete, verifiable evidence of wrongdoing(jur:5§3) reasonably calculated to attract the attention of journalists(ol:197§1) in search of a scoop(ol:199§H)

and so outrage the public(ol:193§D) as to stir it up to force politicians to call for judges to be held accountable and investigated at nationally televised hearings (ol:273¶¶5-7).

5. Exposing judges in court with convincing evidence does not mean obtaining relief from the presiding judges. Relief can come through its publicity effect on outsiders(ol:271): The all-too many presidential candidates that have entered the 2016 Campaign are in dire need to be among the limited number of them who will be invited to the candidates' debates, and survive the early primaries. Whether honestly or opportunistically, they can choose to become the champions of the huge(ol:272¶4) untapped voting bloc of people dissatisfied with the legal system, especially those among them most passionately committed to exposing wrongdoing judges: their victims.

6. Patterns can be expressed in percentages of all cases of a given type, e.g., how many times a commonality pointing to bias was detected, such as how many times a judge dismissed a case brought by a pro as compared to similar cases brought by a represented party where she denied a motion to dismiss. Patterns can be represented in charts(jur:9); tables(jur:10,11,15,16); and classic graphs of X,Y coordinates(jur:12-14). There are many forms of visually representing sets of values, e.g., side by side columns to compare percentages; bell curves for normal distributions; pie charts for shares of a whole, time lines that indicate fluctuations over time as well as trends; intersecting circles for shared characteristics, etc. These are statistical concepts that go from the very simple, which parties may be using without knowing it to represent the ups and downs of their income and their home budget, to the more sophisticated.

7. The above describes how the pursuit of an unconventional, strategic course of action in court by go-getters can provide support for, and lead to, an out-of-court strategy(ol:236) for exposing judges' wrongdoing and bringing about judicial reform at a politically favorable juncture.

1. The use of statistics in court was introduced by Then-Attorney Brandeis

8. Statistics have been used in courts for a very long time since the first time, one which provides an illustrious precedent: Before Louis Brandeis became a justice of the Supreme Court in 1916, he was an effective litigator advocating progressive causes. He won his cases, not only by arguing the law, but also by writing briefs where he presented socio-economic data and treated it with as much rigor as if it were legal evidence. The best known of such briefs of his was filed in *Muller v. Oregon*, 208 U.S. 412, 28 S.Ct. 324 (1908). There Then-Attorney Brandeis used social and economic studies to argue successfully to the Supreme Court that it should uphold statutes limiting workdays for women to a maximum of 10 hours. His briefs were so innovative and persuasive that they gave rise to a new type of brief: the Brandeis brief. They contributed to ushering in a more just society and thus, to making history. In time, Brandeis became a justice.

9. Programs such as Excel and PowerPoint turn massive amounts of numeric data into color graphs that Brandeis could not dream of and that substantially enhance their understanding(cf. dcc:11).

B. Parties joining forces to audit judges so as to advance their common cause

10. Each party need not work alone to examine the data concerning the judge in his or her case in search of pattern evidence of wrongdoing. Parties who have appeared before the same judge or have an ongoing case before her can join forces to do so. These similarly situated parties can form a group of strategic thinkers and doers, rather than remain as isolated whiners and losers.

11. Parties will not be joining forces to search for pattern evidence so as to form a class that brings an action in court against judges. That is a futile exercise, doomed to fail at the hands of the defendant judges' peers, colleagues, and friends, who will preside over their trials and any appeals,

and protect their own and themselves(ol:158). Rather, it is an exercise in gathering evidence in support of the two-pronged approach(supra ¶4c,d; ol:248) to exposing judges' wrongdoing.

12. The parties must join forces to advance a common cause rather than each one work alongside others only to benefit his or her own personal case. They should realize that it is useless for each of them to take on coordinated(jur:88§§a-c) judges in their turf, the courts, where they arbitrarily handle and make rules as they go, and their staff, who must execute their wrongdoing orders lest they be fired without recourse(jur:30§1). It is foolhardy to take all of them on with the arms of a pro se: ignorance of the law, TV notions of court procedure, lots of self-defeating, disruptive, blinding emotions, and wishful thinking that is no substitute at all for strategic thinking.

C. How a party can go about locating others wronged by the same judge

13. A party looks up the list of cases on the calendars of the judge in its case, which are:

    a. posted on the court's website or the judge's webpages on that site; or

    b. affixed on the wall outside the judge's courtroom every motion hearing and trial day and of which a picture can be taken with a smartphone or tablet.

14. The party extracts from the calendars party names and case docket numbers to find:

    a. briefs

        1) on the court's website to download them;

        2) in the court's research room or law library, where they are in paper form;

        3) through computer research in the legal databases of:

            a) PACER (Public Access to Courts Electronic Records), https://www.pacer.gov/, accessible through any computer;

            b) Westlaw, http://web2.westlaw.com/signon/default.wl?vr=2.0&fn=_top&__lrguid=i1eb21045275b4acf89cde9be245fb745&rs=WLW15.04&bhcp=1, and

            c) Lexis, http://www.lexisnexis.com/en-us/legal-solutions/default.page,

            which are accessible through computers and WIFI at the court and public and law school libraries or a subscription later on bought by a group of parties.

        4) Those briefs have the contact information of similarly situated parties. Most likely they will be persons, not companies. Ordinary cases brought by persons, even if represented, neither hold as much interest for judges nor command as much of their respect for due process as those filed by the likes of Pacific Coast Docks against NY Association of Importers, represented by big law firms and top lawyers ready to appeal and embarrass sloppy and wrongdoing judges(jur:45¶86). Pro ses are trampled. Their cases can be identified by the absence next to their names of an attorney's name. Person cases and pro ses are easy prey for wrongdoing judges; and

    b. their phone numbers.

        1) The phone numbers of parties are not on calendars, but should be on the cover page of their briefs; otherwise, the party names found in the calendars can be used to look up their phone numbers in the phone book or the Internet white pages.

15. The party uses a well-rehearsed brief message to contact those similarly situated parties, e.g.:

a. I have a case before Judge Z and found out that you do too. She has disregarded the facts and the law in my case. If you feel that way as to your case, you, I, and others like us can join forces to expose her by detecting common points of her wrongdoing that reveal a pattern of wrongdoing. That is convincing evidence to be used in a test case to go before our highest state court and as an incentive for journalists and politicians to expose her.

b. You and I can find other parties using the method I used to find you. When there are five of us, we can meet at a party's home to search for common points. I can share with you an article explaining this search(ol:274) and templates(ol:280,282) for organizing our work.

D. Meetings of parties are sessions for division of labor and getting work done

16. Meetings are not social occasions where people who do not want to be alone come together to commiserate. They are not for chatting, so wasteful of time and effort. Sobbing together as they pass the box of Kleenex is not the same as professionally gathering the data, detecting their commonalities, and using them to establish patterns of judges' wrongdoing.

17. Meetings are occasions for working. Everybody should come to the meetings with a laptop, a tablet, or a yellow pad and a smartphone. The best meeting place is where there is a large table where people can sit at in business-like fashion. There should also be power strips to plug in all the electronic devices so that nobody need stop working because their device ran out of battery power. It should be a quiet place. A pool table in the back of a bar on a Saturday night is not conducive to working. The box of Kleenex is for the group members' profuse sweating, but not because the place is hot and stuffy. The invitation to the meeting must set forth the preliminary work that each party should have done in preparation for the meeting; and the agenda of the meeting; at the end of it, the agenda will provide the measure of what the group accomplished.

18. Everybody must bring their documents organized chronologically in a binder or on a pdf, not thrown together in a supermarket plastic bag. Documents yield the most information when they have been scanned into a searchable pdf. Then when a group member proposes key terms to search for a possible point of commonality, such as a name of a lawyer or a clerk or a date, all group members can open the pdf's binocular icon and enter those key terms in the search box to look for that term in all their documents. Rummaging a hundred or hundreds of pages manually and visually every time a term must be searched is time-consuming, exhaustive, and unreliable.

19. Moreover, pdf's can be annotated with electronic sticky notes that do not deface the document and can be searched with the search function. Ideas can be committed to writing, not to memory.

20. The parties should bring their documents preceded by a table listing each one's title, sender, addressee(s), date, and page number, and bearing a note on whatever makes that document relevant; cf. the summarizing title of this article(ol:274). A well-prepared table of documents serves as a summary of a party's case. It can be shared with the group by email in advance so that as the members read it, they can spot a possible point of commonality to search. See below the table of documents template(ol:280); see also this pdf's table of documents(ToC:i) and its bookmarks.

21. Meetings are also opportunities for the parties to realize that they eventually will have to contribute financially to the effort to find commonality points; establish patterns; bring them to the attention of journalists(ol:250) and politicians; appeal to the highest state court and the U.S. Supreme Court; publicize their effort through intense mass-emailing and social media use.

22. The parties who agree to join forces must proceed methodically. They can elect a meeting leader. The latter can organize group work by applying the fundamental principle of any organization, i.e., division of labor in accordance with each person's skills and preferences and the organiza-

tion's needs and objectives. Some members may be more adept at searching for parties' contact information; if so, they may pass on that information to those members who are more articulate and can communicating with others on the phone or in person. Every effort should be made to contact and attract the attorneys of represented parties. Their knowledge of the law is priceless.

1. Tasks of the group of searchers of judicial wrongdoing pattern evidence

23. The initial task of the group is to:

a. identify each instance of apparently disregarded or falsely alleged facts, and the law, court rules or any ethical or professional[123a] provision deemed to have been violated by the judge, clerks, and other insiders[169]; and apparently relevant characteristics of people, which may later on prove to be correlated, e.g., dismissals and form denials are signed on Fridays when the judge leaves early to play golf at his country club with some lawyers;

b. tabulate the data in a table:

1) with a top horizontal row of labels for classifying facts and provisions:

a) facts, e.g., deadline alleged missed, affidavit missing; date manipulated by clerk; ex parte meeting with opposing counsel; unadvertised auction of assets; prevented or cut short examination or cross-examination of witnesses; and

b) provisions and their citations: v. judge appointing spouse, Rules of the NY Chief Judge, 22 NYCRR Part 36.2(c)(3); and

2) in the vertical column on the left are listed the characteristics of people, e.g.:

PARTIES

a) pro se

b) represented by counsel

(1) a solo practitioner

(2) law firm with between 2-10, 11-50, 51+ lawyers

c) parties income range

d) parties educational level

e) area of residence

f) plaintiff or defendant

g) male or female and age

h) kind of party: creditor, debtor, driver, pedestrian, banker, professional, etc.

JUDGES

a) size of law firm where the judge worked before coming to the bench

b) work experience the judge had before coming to the bench:

(1) prosecutor

(2) lawyer at a government agency or legislative branch

(3) lawyer for a company or a public interest entity; etc.

c) gender, age, and years on the bench

d) party affiliation of judge or of appointing officer; etc.

3) square of intersection between the row of headings and the column of characteristics:

a) name of case with docket number and date

b) case decided or pending; etc.

c. Other people

a) law/court clerks, lawyers, auctioneers, accountants, real estate developers, etc.

E. From groping for sense in a fog of data to becoming Champions of Justice

24. Auditing a judge's decision is an investigative exercise. At the beginning, the group will not know what is a commonality point or, if so, whether it has any evidentiary value. Patterns are not even suspected until much later, when sense starts to emerge from the points' relatedness.

25. To perceive meaningful commonalities, the group must apply the two key elements of social intelligence to understand the dynamics between parties, judges, clerks, lawyers, etc.: what makes people tic –power, money, love, hate, safety, fear, job insecurity, etc.– and what makes the world turn around –interpersonal relations, clan mentality, tradition, values, ideals, the economy, politics–. This will allow identifying harmonious and conflicting interests between parties so as to recognize who is an ally and who is a foe(Lsch:14§2; ol:52§C; dcc:8¶11). The effort to find commonalities in cases, parties, and judges can reveal a pattern of bias, conflict of interests, dysfunctionality in the court, turf fighting, schemes among connected people, prejudice, etc.

26. The tabulation is a data organizing exercise. In its initial stage, the group will not know what is statistically relevant: what happens so frequently or infrequently for that judge, other judges, or people generally that it can only have happened intentionally. So it is a commonality point that forms part of a pattern of some form of wrongdoing(Lsch:17§C). This requires that at the outset everything be listed. Later on the data will be sorted out into what is or is not a commonality point showing wrongdoing; see the table of commonalities and patterns template(ol:282).

27. At the end of each meeting, the agenda for what the members should do at home and what they will do at the next meeting should be set. That includes growing the group; getting documents; and networking to be able to present at the right time any incriminating audit results to journalists and presidential candidates(ol:269§2). The meeting will have been a success if the consensus is, not 'that guy is a lot of fun. I wish him well', but rather, 'Our group leader is a slavemaster… but we got a lot done. We're gonna get that judge! I'm coming to the next meeting with my friend'.

28. Working together breeds enthusiasm and optimism. It can coalesce ineffective single parties into a team of achievers with valuable skills that they can teach others in their own and the public interest. The members will be asked to invest effort, time, and resources to grow the group of parties before their and other judges; and to spot insiders who can be persuaded to become confidential informants(jur:106§c). That is how they can become the organizers of their court's questers for justice. As such, they will organize other courts in their city, in other state cities, and in other states. A group that first met in an apartment garage and had to put their computers on a door resting over two trash cans can grow to become a Tea Party-like entity: a national civic movement of people who pursue strategically and relentlessly their conviction that *We the People* are the masters of all public servants, including judicial ones, and are entitled to hold them accountable and liable to their victims. We can become *the People*'s Champions of Justice(ol:235§C).

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

www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

2165 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6506
tel. (718)827-9521; follow @DrCorderoEsq
Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

June 21, 2015

Table of the Documents
Of Each Party to the Group Joining Forces
To Search for Commonality Points in Their Cases
That Reveal Patterns of Judges' Wrongdoing

ordered chronologically with pages numbered sequentially in a pdf file or a binder

a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i
#of first pg. of doc.	Date	Sender and title or relation to party	Sender's institution and address	Addressee and title or relation to party	Addressee's institution and address	Docket or case #	Subject matter and page(s) where referred to	Comments and page of file referred to; & document referred to but not in file

a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i
#of first pg. of doc.	Date	Sender and title or relation to party	Sender's institution and address	Addressee and title or relation to party	Addressee's institution and address	Docket or case #	Subject matter and page(s) where referred to	Comments and page of file referred to; & document referred to but not in file

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.
Judicial Discipline Reform
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

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

2165 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6506
tel. (718)827-9521; follow @DrCorderoEsq
Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

June 21, 2015

CONNECTING THE DOTS TO REVEAL A FIGURE
Searching in Parties' Cases for Audited Judges' Instances of Wrongdoing That Constitute Commonality Points Revealing The Most Probative Evidence of Denial of Due Process and Equal Protection of the Law: PATTERNS OF WRONGDOING

		FACTS LABELS				Description / Citation	PROVISIONS		
a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h		i
1.	PARTIES								
2.									
3.									
4.									
5.									
6.									
7.									
8.									
9.									
10.									

		FACTS LABELS				Description / Citation	PROVISIONS		
a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h		i
11.	**JUDGES**								
12.									
13.									
14.									
15.	**CLERKS**								
16.									
17.									
18.									
19.	**LAWYERS**								
20.									
21.									
22.									
23.									

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
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

2165 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6506
tel. +1(718)827-9521; follow @DrCorderoEsq
Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

January 3, 2016

[Individualized for each of the presidential candidates]

Dear Presidential Candidate,

This is a proposal for you to emerge as the leader who enlightens and reassures the national public when as a result of the terrorist attacks in Paris and San Bernardino some presidential candidates have misled the public into thinking that terrorism is the main death risk that it runs. You can put terrorism in perspective by comparing it with other leading causes of death that have mortality rates indisputably and even surprisingly higher, e.g., hospital infections and lightning.

By thinking strategically, you can use comparative statistics and analysis, as illustrated in the table(ol:365), to reassure and attract the public to your website through crowd fact-checking and posting. To that end, you can reassuringly comment at rallies, debates, and interviews on the need to confront terrorism with a sense of proportion so as not to be unduly impressed by the day to day events or even exploited by demagoguery for political gain at the expense of the public peace of mind. Then you can unfold a paper and read its title aloud: Facts against Fear: a table comparing terrorism with other causes of death in America. That table will be only the first of many on a wide spectrum of subjects and serve as a template for the presentation of verifiable data.

So you can invite the public to contribute to researching the incomplete entries of the table and submit their findings to your website for verification. You can announce that the most prolific submitters of verifiable and enlightening statistics and analysis[1] will be publicly recognized and invited to become members of your campaign's virtual teams of enlighters. Their task will be to turn your website into the most trusted and visited source of presidential election information and the most reliable fact-checking entity. Their mission will be to provide the truth-in-fact foundation for your motto: An enlightening leader leads an enlightened people[2]. You can portray the table(s) as your means of running a campaign based on facts, as opposed to fearmongering and hyperbole. This will illustrate how you as president will run a transparent, honest administration based on facts actively shared with, and verifiable by, *We the People*. The public that is attracted to your website to post and check facts will also find there information about your platform, phone banks, and rallies, and have the opportunity to donate to your campaign.

The above proposal further illustrates the potential of strategic thinking, which already gave rise to another proposal(ol:311): You can draw electoral support from the huge[3] untapped voting bloc of people dissatisfied with the judicial and legal systems. Their dissatisfaction derives from judges' self-disciplining authority, their abuse of it by systematically dismissing complaints against them[4], and their secretive functioning[5]. By so doing, they are able to disregard the facts and the law applicable to cases to gain benefits risklessly. You can tap the bloc's support[6] by presenting at a press conference and rallies the evidence[7] thereof contained in my study **Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Wrongdoing**[8]. You can invite the public to post on your website its judicial complaints so that it can analyze them for coordinated wrongdoing patterns[9], attracting Republicans and Democrats alike; and to join you in calling for nationally televised hearings (to be known as *your* hearings) on judges' wrongdoing, and journalistic and official investigations even as your teams of enlighters conduct their own(ol:194§E). Judges who give "even the appearance of impropriety"[10] can be led to resign[11]. As president, you can nominate their replacements to secure your legislative agenda's constitutionality[12]. By leading *We the People*'s "petition for a redress of grievances"[13], you can emerge as their Champion of Justice[14].

I offer to make a presentation[15] to you and your officers at a video conference or in person.

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

Sincerely, s/Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Endnotes

1. You can post the accompanying table(ol:365) and ask people to use it as a template when submitting their research findings. The latter will be subject to an initial phase of vetting by the public. Findings that surmount such vetting will be posted as your campaign's official facts.

2. After presenting to your audience the Facts Against Fear table, you can ask it and the rest of the American public poignant rhetorical questions to cause them to perform a balancing test:

   a. Given the comparative statistics already presented, would you prefer to take your chances with falling victim to terrorism or becoming a victim of any of the other causes of death in America whose chance of occurrence is 10s, 100s, or 1,000s of times higher?

   b. When a member of your family, a relative, a friend, a neighbor, a workmate or fellow American dies in a car accident, a house fire, a drive-by shooting, or by food poisoning, do you say that their deaths do not count because they did not die a victim of terrorism?

   c. The federal government spends more than it collects in taxes, which explains why its borrowing limit has to be raised so often; otherwise, it would run out of funds and have to close down. Imagine that the government manages to gather $5 billion to reduce the mortality of one of the causes of death in America. If you could vote on how to allocate that money, would you vote to allocate it to fight terrorism or to combat any of the other causes of death with significantly higher mortality rates, such as cancer or car crashes?

3. In the federal and state courts, 50 million new cases are filed annually (jur:8fn4, 5). They involve at least 100 million parties, each of which may consist of two, ten, a hundred persons or the thousands of members of a class. In addition, every case affects the parties' relatives, employees, suppliers, clients, similarly situated people, etc. To those cases must be added the scores of millions pending and those deemed by parties to have been wrongfully decided by judges who risklessly took their property, liberty, and the rights and duties that determine their lives.

4. Official statistics cited in my study(jur:21§1) show that federal judges dismiss 99.82% of complaints against their peers and deny up to 100% of petitions to review such dismissals(jur:10-14).

   In the last 227 years since the creation of the Federal Judiciary in 1789, the number of its judges –2,217 were in office on 30sep13(jur:22fn13)– impeached and removed is 8! So they not only are appointed for life "during good Behaviour", but also know based on that historical record that they are in effect irremovable. Impeachment is a useless mechanism for judicial integrity. They also rely on the constitutional provision that prohibits diminishing their salary(jur:22fn12).

   They dispose of around 75% of appeals to the circuit courts with reasonless summary orders, and of up to an additional 15% with decisions so "perfunctory" that they mark them "not for publication" and "not precedential", turning them into arbitrary, ad hoc fiats of raw unaccountable power. They are in practice secret because hardly findable, but if found, they are useless since they do not establish a precedent; hence not worth looking for. They are anathema to a legal system based on precedent as a means of keeping judicial power in check and predictable.

   If you were in their position, would you be irresistibly tempted to abuse your power for your benefit and that of your peers, other insiders, and your protectors since to do so was riskless?

5. The Federal Judiciary and its judges are most secretive(jur:27§e), holding all their policy-making, administrative, adjudicative, and disciplinary meetings behind closed doors. Wrongdoing festers

in secrecy, which makes it infectious. This requires 'the best disinfectant, sunlight', as Justice Brandeis put it(jur:158¶350b). Today, the sun of information and knowledge shines through the Internet. A presidential candidate can out of principle or opportunism use his or her website, in addition to stump speeches and access to journalists, to shine light on judicial wrongdoing and cause an outraged national public to follow his or her bright lead to Equal Justice Under Law.

6. People feel offended by judges who took advantage of their ignorance of the law, inability to afford lawyers, lack of access to the media, and impotence before judges who abused them because they could get away with it. For them, vindicating their position is a driving personal matter. They make for passionate supporters of one who can help them in their quest for justice.

7. Official statistics from the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and official reports, and statements from justices and judges are presented and their implications analyzed at jur:21§§1-3. Those sections contain the most compelling general evidence of judges' wrongdoing. For evidence concerning specific justices, see jur:65§§1-4. For the enabling circumstances of wrongdoing, i.e., unaccountability, secrecy, coordination, and risklessness, see ol:191¶6.

8. jur:1; subtitled: **Pioneering the news and publishing field of judicial unaccountability reporting**

9. Judges can be unfair, partial, and dismissive of the rule of law because doing so does not constitute in practice a breach of their oath of office and dereliction of duty that carry adverse consequences; rather, it is merely an option. Hence, they do wrong individually, and worse yet, engage in wrongdoing coordinated among themselves(jur:86§§4-c) and with other insiders of the judicial and legal systems. Among the latter are the politicians who recommended, endorsed, nominated, confirmed, appointed, and co-opted them into their party list, and who protect them as '*their* men and women on the bench'. Coordination renders their wrongdoing more secure, routine, susceptible of extension into more areas, apt to develop the complexity of schemes, e.g., a bankruptcy fraud scheme and concealment of assets(jur:65§§1-3), and thus more profitable.

10. Their Code of Conduct enjoins them to "avoid even the appearance of impropriety"(jur:68fn123).

11. Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas failed to meet this standard and was led to resign on May 14, 1969, even though he had been nominated to the chief justiceship by P. Johnson(jur:92§d).

12. Packing the courts due to vacancies is different from what P. Roosevelt tried to do(jur:23fn17a).

13. Only a national figure with ample access to journalists can lead an enlightened and outraged(ol:333§G) national public in successfully exercising its 1st Amendment right to "assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances"(jur:130¶b) against judges who self-exempt from any responsibility, e.g., by invoking their unconstitutional doctrine of judicial immunity.

14. This requires strategic thinking: being perceptive, nimble, and astute to quickly detect even slight developments, such as the above proposals, and react promptly to change one's plan of action as required to turn those developments into opportunities to advance one's interests.

15. I offer to present also to groups interested in a multidisciplinary academic(jur:128§4) and business(jur:119§1) venture to research the nature, extent, and gravity of judges' wrongdoing and strategically expose it to outrage the national public and cause it to assert its status as *We the People*, the masters of 'government, not of men and women, but by the rule of law', where none of their public servants, such as judges, is above the law, and instead all are accountable to *the People* and liable to compensate the victims of their wrongdoing. Private, electoral, journalistic, and official diagnostic exposure must precede judicial reform(jur:158§§6-8) treatment.

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.
Judicial Discipline Reform
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

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

2165 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6506
tel. (718)827-9521; follow @DrCorderoEsq
Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

January 11, 2016

FACTS AGAINST FEAR

Placing the risk of death by terrorism in perspective by comparing it with other causes of death in America

so that an enlightening leader can lead an enlightened *People*[1]

(Template for submitting verifiable data on a wide spectrum of subjects)

1.	A	B	C	D
2.	**Cause of death**	**Number of deaths** (annually unless a period is indicated)	**Ranking**	**Title of source of information, author, year, and Internet link** (collected at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero_Facts_v_Fear_sources)
3.	All deaths in the U.S. in 2013	2,596,993/821.5 death rate per 100,000 population	1	CDC[2], National Vital Statistics System: Mortality Data; http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/deaths.htm
4.	Cancer, estimate for 2015	589,430		President Obama is right that guns kill more Americans than terrorism. So do lots of other things, By Philip Bump; The Fix, *The Washington Post*; August 27, 2015; https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-

[1] This table accompanies the letter(* >ol:362) of Dr. Cordero to a presidential candidate that lays out proposals based on strategic thinking for inviting the public to contribute, through crowd fact-checking and posting to the candidate's website, to running a campaign based on facts. The invitation to post facts to, and the opportunity to find them in, that website will attract the public to it, where it will incidentally be able to learn about the candidate's platform and events, such as rallies and interviews, and donate to the campaign. Dr. Cordero offers to present at a video conference or in person to the candidate and campaign officers as well as other groups, especially those interested in judicial reform(ol:350), the proposals' strategy, content, and implementation, including the way to use this table as a template for a wide spectrum of other issues. Cf. similar tables at ol:280; 306; jur:10-11; 15-16; 31; graphs jur:12-14; jur:122§2.

[2] Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 1600 Clifton Road Atlanta, GA 30329-4027, 800-CDC-INFO (800-232-4636) TTY: (888) 232-6348; and in particular, its National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), 3311 Toledo Rd, Hyattsville, MD 20782-20641; (800) 232-4636; Division of Vital Statistics, National Vital Statistics System (NVSS), http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/vitalstats.htm; Mortality Tables, http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/deaths.htm

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

ol:365

1.	A	B	C	D
2.	**Cause of death**	**Number of deaths** (annually unless a period is indicated)	**Ranking**	**Title of source of information, author, year, and Internet link** (collected at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero_Facts_v_Fear_sources)
				fix/wp/2015/08/27/obama-is-right-that-guns-kill-more-americans-than-terrorism-so-do-lots-of-things/
5.	Deaths from healthcare-associated infections (HAIs)	99,000[3]		Preventing Healthcare-Associated Infections [HAIs], CDC; http://www.cdc.gov/washington/~cdcatWork/pdf/infections.pdf
6.	Deaths from healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) in 2013	75,000[4]		Healthcare-associated Infections (HAIs), Data and Statistics, CDC; as of October 25, 2015; http://www.cdc.gov/HAI/surveillance/
7.	Car accidents in 2013	32,719		President Obama is right that…(source supra)
8.	Death by firearms on U.S. soil, including homicide, accident and suicide from 2001 to 2013	406,496/31,269 annually		American deaths in terrorism vs. gun violence in one graph, By Julia Jones and Eve Bower, CNN; October 2, 2015[5]; http://www.cnn.com/2015/10/02/us/oregon-shooting-terrorism-gun-violence/
9.	Firearm suicides in 2013	21,175		President Obama is right that…(source supra)

[3] "HAIs affect 5 to 10 percent of hospitalized patients in the U.S. per year. Approximately 1.7 million HAIs occur in U.S. hospitals each year, resulting in 99,000 deaths."

[4] "[O]n any given day, about 1 in 25 hospital patients has at least one healthcare-associated infection. There were an estimated 722,000 HAIs in U.S acute care hospitals in 2011. About 75,000 hospital patients with HAIs died during their hospitalizations. More than half of all HAIs occurred outside of the intensive care unit."

[5] "Using numbers from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, we found that from 2001 to 2013, 406,496 people died by firearms on U.S. soil. (2013 is the most recent year CDC data for deaths by firearms is available.) This data covered all manners of death, including homicide, accident and suicide. According to the U.S. State Department, the number of U.S. citizens killed overseas as a result of incidents of terrorism from 2001 to 2013 was 350. In addition, we compiled all terrorism incidents inside the U.S. and found that between 2001 and 2013, there were 3,030 people killed in domestic acts of terrorism. This brings the total to 3,380."

1.	A	B	C	D
2.	**Cause of death**	**Number of deaths** (annually unless a period is indicated)	**Ranking**	**Title of source of information, author, year, and Internet link** (collected at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero_Facts_v_Fear_sources)
10.	Falls	17,000+		Human Shark Bait: Shark bait facts, National Geographic; 2013; http://natgeotv.com/ca/human-shark-bait/facts
11.	Victims of gun violence, including mass shootings, officer involved incidents, home invasion, accidental shootings, in the U.S. to 27dec15	13,095		Gun Violence Archive 2015 Toll of Gun Violence, Gun Violence Archive; 27dec15; http://www.gunviolencearchive.org/
12.	Firearm homicides in 2013	11,208		President Obama is right that…(source supra)
13.	Death by lightning strike	37+		Human Shark Bait: (source supra)
14.	American killed in acts of terrorism on U.S. soil and abroad on average between 2002 and 2013, excluding the 3,008.1= (3,380 –(27 +4.1 +2,977)) who died in 2001	372/31 annually		American deaths in terrorism (source supra)
15.	U.S. citizens killed abroad in acts of terrorism from 2001 to 2013[6]	350/27 annually		American deaths in terrorism (source supra)
16.	Victims of terrorism on U.S. soil in 2014	18		President Obama is right that[7]…(source supra)
17.	Victims of terrorism on U.S. soil between 1970 and 2014, including 9/11 victims excluding the 2,977 that died on	3,521/80 annually 544/12.36[8]		President Obama is right that…(source supra)

[6] Of the 17,891 Deaths from Terrorism [worldwide] Last Year [2014], 19 Were American. Let Iraqis Fight ISIS, by H. A. Goodman; The Blog, Huff Post Politics; December 26, 2015; http://www.huffingtonpost.com/h-a-goodman/of-the-17891-deaths-from_b_5818082.html

[7] "The Global Terrorism Database [http://www.start.umd.edu/gtd/search/Results.aspx?country=217] at the University of Maryland estimates that 18 people died in terror attacks in the United States last year — of 3,521 total between 1970 and 2014. By comparison, the nonprofit Gun Violence Archive [http://www.gunviolencearchive.org/] figures that 9,948 people have been killed by gun violence *so far in 2015 alone*."

[8] The difference between the 4.1 annual average number of victims of terrorism on U.S. soil that can be computed based

1.	A	B	C	D
2.	**Cause of death**	**Number of deaths** (annually unless a period is indicated)	**Ranking**	**Title of source of information, author, year, and Internet link** (collected at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero_Facts_v_Fear_sources)
	9/11, http://www.cnn.com/2013/07/27/us/september-11-anniversary-fast-facts/			
18.	U.S. citizens killed on U.S. soil and abroad in acts of terrorism from 2001 to 2013; on U.S. soil alone; excluding the 2,977 that died on 9/11, http://www.cnn.com/2013/07/27/us/september-11-anniversary-fast-facts/	3,380/260 annually 3,030/233 annually 53/4.1		American deaths in terrorism (source supra)
19.	Death by shark attack	.5		Human Shark Bait: (source supra)
20.	School shootings			
21.	Drive-by shootings of gang-unrelated bystander			
22.	Gang killings			
23.	Accidental gun discharge			
24.	Cop shooting			
25.	Home invasion deaths			
26.	Death by spouse or			

on the CNN article American deaths in terrorism vs. gun violence in one graph, and the 12.36 number based on *The Washington Post* article President Obama is right that guns kill more Americans than terrorism, can be explained by definitional divergencies, alluded to by the latter article in its statement "How "terrorism" is defined can be tricky, as we've noted in the past".

1.	A	B	C	D
2.	**Cause of death**	**Number of deaths** (annually unless a period is indicated)	**Ranking**	**Title of source of information, author, year, and Internet link** (collected at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero_Facts_v_Fear_sources)
	significant other			
27.	Heart attacks			
28.	Breast cancer			
29.	In-hospital wrong medication or dosage			
30.	Cancer of the colon			
31.	Death from cancer-causing sun tanning, e.g., melanoma			
32.	Death by drug overdose			
33.	Mechanical and tire vehicle defects			
34.	Fishermen's deaths			
35.	Construction workers' accidents			
36.	Distracted walking			
37.	Football deaths			
38.	Death by hurricanes			
39.	Accidental deaths at home			
40.	Death by tornadoes			

See also the following sources of statistical data:

1. Terrorism Deaths, Injuries and Kidnappings of Private U.S. Citizens Overseas in 2013, U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Counterterrorism, Country Reports on Terrorism 2013, Report; http://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/crt/2013/224833.htm

a. U.S. citizens overseas killed as a result of incidents of terrorism: 16
b. U.S. citizens overseas injured as a result of incidents of terrorism: 7
c. U.S. citizens overseas kidnapped as a result of incidents of terrorism: 12

2. Country Reports on Terrorism, U.S. Department of State, http://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/crt/; Country Reports on Terrorism 2014; http://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/crt/2014/index.htm:
3. National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START), A Department of Homeland Security Science and Technology Center of Excellence, Based at the University of Maryland, 8400 Baltimore Ave, Suite 250 • College Park, MD 20740 • 301.405.6600; www.start.umd.edu. "Since 2001, START has maintained the Global Terrorism Database (GTD), an unclassified event database compiled from information in open-source reports of terrorist attacks"; www.state.gov/documents/organization/210288.pdf
4. Office of the Director of National Intelligence, National Counterterrorism Center and its Worldwide Incidents Tracking System (WITS); http://www.nctc.gov/overview.html

   22 USC §2656f requires the Dept. of State to include in its annual report on terrorism "to the extent practicable, complete statistical information on the number of individuals, including United States citizens and dual nationals, killed, injured, or kidnapped by each terrorist group during the preceding calendar year"; http://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml
5. National Association for Public Health Statistics and Information Systems; http://www.naphsis.org/
6. President Office of Management and Budget (OMB); https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/gils_gil-home
7. National Death Index, http://www.naphsis.org/nchs/ndi.htm; Vital Statistics of the United States, http://www.naphsis.org/nchs/products/vsus.htm
8. Related Sites for Mortality Data: http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/mortality_related.htm; http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/mortality_tables.htm
9. *Health, United States*, the annual report on the health status of the Nation; http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/hus.htm
10. NCHS Data Online Query System; http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/ahcd.htm; Statistics Branch at 301-458-4600; email SSchappert@cdc.gov for questions on DOQS or public use data
11. National Safety Council, Annual Injury Report; http://www.nsc.org/pages/home.aspx
12. CDC Work-Related Injury Statistics Query System; http://wwwn.cdc.gov/wisards/workrisqs/workrisqs_estimates.aspx
13. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Databases, Tables & Calculators by Subject; http://www.bls.gov/data/

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
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org
2165 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6506
tel. (718)827-9521; follow @DrCorderoEsq
Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

April 28, 2016

Do you suspect that communications from and to you have been intercepted? If you have had experiences similar to those described below, this is a call to join forces to exercise our First Amendment right to

"freedom of speech, of the press; the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances"*>jur:130fn268

A. Probable cause to believe that communications about exposing judges' wrongdoing have been intercepted

1. I am a lawyer, a doctor of law, and a researcher of court statistics, reports, statements, etc.(*>jur:iii/fn.ii), which I have cited hundreds of times in my 880+-page study of federal judges and the Federal Judiciary –the models for their state counterparts– titled and downloadable as follows:

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

2. I have proposed the pinpoint, profit-making(*>ol:326§F) investigation of judges' wrongdoing through a unique national query(ol:191§A) based, among other things(ol:194§E), on the articles in *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and Politico(jur:65fn107a,c) that suspected the first nominee of President Obama to the Supreme Court, Then-Judge, Now-Justice Sotomayor, of concealing assets. Such concealment is undertaken to evade taxes and keep the illegal origin of taxable assets hidden; it is a crime(ol:5fn10). The evidence(jur:65§§1-3) shows that her asset concealment is enabled by, and only part of, wrongdoing coordinated among federal judges and between them and insiders of the judicial and legal systems(jur:81fn169). Thus, her investigation would be a Trojan horse that would reveal wrongdoing so routine, widespread, and coordinated as to constitute the judges' and the Judiciary's institutionalized modus operandi(ol:190¶¶1-7).

3. I have sent that proposal to over ten thousand people, yahoogroups, and pertinent websites. Given the evidence in the study of how widespread dissatisfaction with the judicial and legal systems is, and a current public mood dominated by the Dissatisfied with the Establishment, one could reasonably expect many recipients to contact me to express interest in my proposal. Yet, only a handful has done so. Neither under the circumstances, statistical analysis, nor related events is this a normal reaction. This article argues that under those three considerations, there is probable cause to believe that the communications that I sent or that were sent to me were intercepted and their delivery was prevented. It calls on victims of judges' wrongdoing and on advocates of honest judiciaries to join forces to expose such wrongdoing by implementing a strategy that takes advantage of the public mood and the presidential campaign that feeds off it.

B. Interception and secrecy as the government's modus operandi

4. Interception and disclosure of wire, oral, or electronic communications, and the intentional access to a protected computer without authorization are acts prohibited as federal crimes and punishable with up to 20 years in prison under Title 18 U.S. Code §§1030 and 2511(ol:5a/fn13, 14).

1. NSA and judges can issue companies secret orders of interception

5. The documents of the National Security Agency (NSA) leaked by Edward Snowden(ol:17) have revealed that the NSA, which reports to the President daily, broke the law to intercept the communications of private and public parties, including 35 heads of state and government, with German Chancellor Angela Merkel and Brazil President Dilma Rousseff among them as well as

U.N. Secretary Ban Ki-moon. This supports probable cause to believe that the government is once more intercepting communications, such as mine, to safeguard its own interests.

6. The NSA has an interest in intercepting communications calling for the exposure of judges' wrongdoing: It depends on judges, such as those of the secret federal court set up under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act(ol:20fn5 >50 U.S.C. §§1801-1811), to have its secret requests for secret orders of surveillance rubberstamped, up to 100% in a year(ol:5afn7).

2. Microsoft sued the government over its orders' permanent secrecy

7. In mid-April 2016, Microsoft sued the federal government over secret requests, such as those by the NSA, for secret orders of surveillance that those who must execute them, such as Microsoft and other Internet Service Providers, must keep secret forever. It is arguing that such permanent secrecy even after the abatement of the emergency that warrants the order's request and execution without due process notice and opportunity to defend to the surveillance target defendant prevents any control on the government and, as a result, leads to government abuse of power.

8. Secrecy is the petri dish for corruption(jur:49§4), for it places wrongdoing beyond public condemnation, rendering it private, blameless, acceptable to those in on it, whom it renders unaccountable and whose wrongdoing it turns into riskless acts to gain irresistible, wrongful benefits, inevitably leading to their performance through abuse of power(jur:88§§a-c). "Sunlight is the best disinfectant", as Justice Brandeis put it: information is needed to rid the government of corruption.

3. Unauthorized access to CBS Reporter Sharyl Attkisson's computers

9. CBS Reporter Sharyl Attkisson revealed the fiasco of the Fast and Furious gunrunning operation of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms of the Department of Justice (DoJ), which sold weapons, including military assault rifles, intended to be followed all the way to druglords in Mexico. But the Bureau lost track of them; one was used to murder an American border patrol.

10. DoJ Attorney General Eric Holder tried to cover up Fast and Furious by refusing to comply with congressional subpoenas for documents, submitting them with whole pages redacted so that they no longer made sense. As a result, he became the first sitting member of the cabinet in American history to be held in contempt of Congress. Having lost the trust of Congress, he had to resign.

11. Likewise and much to the chagrin of the Obama administration, Reporter Attkisson reported on the Benghazi attacks, where the American ambassador to Libya and three other American officers were killed by Islamic militants while the Secretary of State was Hillary Clinton.

12. Rep. Attkisson(ol:215) had three independent computer experts examine her home and work computers. They attested to their having been hacked and roamed through. She, represented by Judicial Watch, has sued DoJ for information concerning the hacking of her computers (ol:216fn2); and reportedly has demanded $35,000,000 in compensation.

4. The government sued Apple to get backdoor access to an iPhone

13. In order to gain access to the messages on the phone of one of the terrorists that committed the massacre at San Bernardino, California, the federal government sued Apple to force it to crack on its behalf the encryption system that protects the privacy of messages on its iPhones. Apple refused to comply, arguing that the public interest in the privacy of emails trumped the interest of the government in particular cases and that cracking the encryption would set a dangerous precedent, give the American government as well as foreign ones a backdoor access to all messages on all iPhones, and lead to abuse of power. After the government managed to crack the

encryption with the help of another company, it withdrew its suit.

14. Instead of just after a crime, how far ahead of any crime or even suspicion of it will the government enter through that backdoor to read all contents of iPhones…and eventually of all phones and computers? Power is by nature expansive; it will only stop its advance if opposed by an equal power or is pushed back by a stronger one(jur:81¶174). Such can be the power of *We the People*, the sovereign source of all public power, when informed by the free flow of communications.

C. Statistical considerations: the normal distribution of a series of values and the abnormal number and contents of replies

15. Probable cause to believe that there has been interception of my communications derives from the statistical abnormality(ol:19fn2 >ws:46§V) of my non-receipt of replies from the thousands of people to whom I wrote(cf. *>Lsch:1), except for some five replies, and the statistical oddity that all those replies were negative, expressing the repliers' lack of interest in my proposal.

16. Normally, the reactions of the subjects to whom an attitudinal questionnaire is submitted –like the people to whom I sent my proposal– line up on a continuum from an extreme of very few 'not liked any bit of it' rising toward the most numerous 'balanced bunch' and descending toward the other extreme of very few 'liked every bit of it'. When the series of values measuring the intensity of their reaction and the number of those so reacting are plotted on an X,Y graph, they produce the bell-shaped curve called a normal distribution of values(ol:19fn2 >ws:59¶124).

17. Instead, the replies that I received produced a flat floor line with a hiccup at the end. But there is neither a logical nor a psychological cause to believe that normally only people who disliked a proposal would be motivated enough to bother to write to let the proponent know that they disliked and rejected it rather than outright delete the email or shred the letter of proposal. Only the interception by an outside agent who managed to gain access to all the replies, examined them, and prevented the delivery of those that liked and accepted the proposal can explain that abnormal one-sided delivery to me of only replies that disliked and rejected my proposal.

D. Interception by companies' suspending email and cloud storage accounts

18. Probable cause to believe in interception is found in the sudden, unexplained, arbitrary suspension between October and December 2014 of my email and cloud storage accounts by Dropbox, Google, and Microsoft. It is utterly improbable that these three, at the time independent, companies acted independently and only coincidentally to suspend my accounts. Their doing so was contrary to their commercial interest in advertising themselves through the accounts that people open with them, which bear the companies' names in the domains of the accounts, e.g., https://www.dropbox.com/s/rqw00v30ex3kbho/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf?dl=0, Dr.Richard.Cordero.Esq@gmail.com, and Ric.Cordero@hotmail.com(*>ggl:1 et al.).

1. One of the 5% most viewed Linkedin profiles loses most of its contents

19. A company's commercial interest in encouraging Internet traffic with its name attached to it is shown by Linkedin's congratulating me for my profile being among the 5% most viewed among its more than 200 million profiles(*>a&p:25-27). So how is it possible that last week, I checked my profile and noticed that my photo and most of its information about me were not there? I had to repost them. Do you see them at www.linkedin.com/pub/dr-richard-cordero-esq/4b/8ba/50/?

2. Microsoft prevents again the signing in to an email account

20. After Microsoft suspended my Hotmail account, I created this other Microsoft account: Dr.Richard.Cordero.Esq@outlook.com. But since last week, my attempts to sign in have been met with the following notice, which you will likely receive if you go to www.microsoft.com and try to sign in as RicCordero@verizon.net. So I can neither access the emails sent to my Outlook account nor upload to my Microsoft DriveOne cloud storage account the updated versions of my study of judges and their judiciaries.

Sign in
Something went wrong and we can't sign you in
right now. Please try again later.
Microsoft

3. The dramatic drop in the number of daily subscribers to my blog

21. I built a new website using WordPress in September 2015 and started to post my articles there; www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org. Although I did not advertise it, readers found it and I began receiving at Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net automatically generated email notices of their having subscribed to it.

22. At the beginning, it was only a handful a day. But the phenomenon of referential chain reaction increments that occurs throughout cyberspace must also have occurred with respect to my blog-like website: One reader who liked my articles referred them to two or more other readers, who did the same, thus giving rise to an exponential growth rate. As a result, by Monday, April 11, there was a daily average of 53 new subscribers with an upward trend. But thereafter the daily average plummeted. In fact, only 8 readers subscribed last Sunday, April 17, although normally the highest number of readers subscribe on Saturdays and Sundays.

23. One cannot reasonably assume that for the third(ol:19fn2; ggl:1) time and only coincidentally companies, this time Microsoft and Verizon, have caused a negative flow of emails to me, whether in their content or number, concerning my proposal for exposing judges' wrongdoing. Rather, such flow is probably caused by interception of emails to and from me. But since such interception only hurts those companies' commercial interest in self-advertisement, it occurs either without their participation or by them upon orders of a third party. The latter can reasonably be assumed to be those who have the most to lose from judicial wrongdoing exposure: judges (cf. jur:71§4); the politicians who recommended, endorsed, nominated, and confirmed them(cf. jur:77§§5-6) and now protect them as '*our* men and women on the bench'; and others who benefit from maintaining a good relation with judges in exchange for favorable rulings.

E. Another query for investigation during Election 2016 of judges' wrongdoing

24. Based on these and other instances of actual, attempted, and probable government interception and access, I have posed the following query(ol:192§4) for professional investigation:

> To what extent do federal judges abuse their vast computer network and expertise –which handle hundreds of millions of case files(Lsch:11¶9b.ii) through PACER, Public Access to Court Electronic Records– either alone or with the quid pro quo assistance of the NSA to:
>
> 1) conceal assets –a crime under 26 U.S.C. §§7201, 7206(ol:5fn10), unlike surveillance– by electronically transferring them between declared and hidden accounts(ol:1; ¶2 supra),
> 2) cover up judges' wrongdoing(ol:154¶3) by intercepting the communications –also a crime under 18 U.S.C. §2511(ol:20¶¶11-12)– of their exposers; and
> 3) prevent exposers from communicating to join forces, thus infringing upon their rights "to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances"(jur:22fn12b; ol:371)?

1. From collection of metadata to unconstitutional interception based on contents and undertaken in the interest of covering up wrongdoing

25. The findings of the investigators of that query can have a farther-reaching impact than Snowden's revelations. His leaked documents pointed only to illegal dragnet collection of communications metadata of scores of millions of people, such as their telephone numbers, call duration, date, etc., but not the contents of the intercepted communications. Even so the public was outraged by the breach without warrants of communications privacy, its scope, abuse potential, etc.

26. The public would be more intensely outraged if verifiable findings pointed to the government committing communications interception based on their contents, which constitutes breach of privacy as well as abridgement of freedom of speech and the press. Public outrage would reach its paroxysm if the interception were spurred by the unjustifiable motive, not to protect any alleged 'national security interest', but rather to advance judges' crass interest in covering up their wrongdoing and the government's in avoiding judges' retaliation by executing their implicit threat "If you let them take any of us down, *we bring you with us!*"(jur:22§31; ol:266¶13).

27. Such findings can lead to a test case representative of many other cases of government content-based interception of the communications of advocates of honest judiciaries, victims of wrongdoing judges, and journalists critical of public officers. They can support discovery through a suit under the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. §552, 552a, to ascertain the identity of those who sought and those who implemented interception orders, the latter's text, target, justification, objective, etc. An outraged public could impact the elections significantly.

2. Strategy for launching the investigation and informing the public

28. To launch the investigation, I offer to make presentations(ol:197§G) at video conferences and in person, generally, to IT experts, journalists, lawyers, students and their professors, business people, and other potential members of a multidisciplinary academic and business venture (jur:128 §4) and advocates and victims, and, particularly, to any or all presidential candidates.

29. They and their top officers, e.g., their respective chief of staff and campaign strategist, can be interested in drawing support(ol:311, 362) from the huge(ol:311¶1) untapped voting bloc of the dissatisfied with the judicial and legal systems, part of the Dissatisfied with the Establishment(¶3 supra). Since the candidates are covered by the national media and the public pays attention to them, they are in the best position to denounce(jur:98§2) contents-based interception and judges' wrongdoing. They can cause their campaign research teams, and encourage the media, to conduct pinpoint, profit-making investigations of the unique national queries of J. Sotomayor(¶2) and the Federal Judiciary-NSA. After exposure of the nature, extent, and gravity of the wrongdoing, informed discussion and adoption of judicial reform measures(jur:158§§6-8) can begin.

30. If you have had an experience similar to those described above, please email me to all my addresses[†]. Kindly use the headings of this article as those of a template, providing information under applicable ones. If necessary, add headings. If you want a presentation for you and others, let me know. You can also network with your acquaintances so that they may network me with campaign officers for me to make a presentation on how their candidate can attract that huge untapped voting bloc and eventually nominate replacements for wrongdoing judges(ol:312¶10).

31. If we think and proceed strategically(Lsch:14§3; ol:52§C; ol:8§E), we can earn material and moral rewards(ol:3§F), including the highest one: to be nationally recognized as *We the People*'s Champions of Justice(ol:201§§J,K). Time is of the essence. So I look forward to hearing from you.

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

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
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org
2165 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6506
tel. (718)827-9521; follow @DrCorderoEsq
Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

May 21, 2016

Mr. Donald J. Trump
Donald J. Trump for President, Inc.
725 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Dear Mr. Trump,

1. This is a proposal for you to nominate to the Supreme Court, not just one of your 11 candidates, but rather many justices and judges, thus packing(*>jur:23fn17) the Federal Judiciary with jurists handpicked to uphold your legislative agenda's constitutionality for a generation. Where would Obamacare, the Civil Rights Act of President Johnson, or the Social Security Act of President Roosevelt be if they had been declared unconstitutional? Laws are but ink on paper until they are upheld by the lower courts and the Supreme Court. To ensure that the courts do not undo what you were voted in to accomplish, you can appeal to the electorate to which you have given a voice and that represent your base constituency: The Dissatisfied With The Establishment.

2. Among them is a huge(supra ol:311¶1) untapped voting bloc of people dissatisfied with the judicial and legal systems because judges are held unaccountable(jur:21§1) by the Establishment politicians who recommended, endorsed, nominated, confirmed them to, and protect them on, the Judiciary as '*our* men and women on the bench', so they risklessly engage in wrongdoing(*>ol:154§1) since there is no downside to doing wrong, only an upside: They get anything they want.

3. This is illustrated by *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and Politico(jur:65fn107a), which suspected Then-Judge, Now-Justice Sotomayor of concealing assets(65§§1-3); the analysis(fn107c) of her statements to the Senate bear this out. She was President Obama's first justiceship nominee, shepherded through the confirmation process in the Senate by both Sen. Chuck Schumer, whom Retiring Sen. Harry Reid has named to succeed him as Senate Democratic leader, and the other Democratic senator from New York, Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand(jur:77§§5-6).

4. You can take on judges safely, for they have no immunity(ol:158) under the Constitution, where Nobody Is Above the Law, and are most vulnerable to news pointing to their failure to abide by the injunction in their own Code of Conduct(jur:68fn123a) "to avoid even the appearance of impropriety". Journalists can easily meet that standard of showing, which forced Justice Abe Fortas, nominated by P. Johnson for the chief justiceship, to resign on 14may69(jur:92§d). You would nominate replacements for justices and judges forced to resign by an outraged public or removed. Your denunciation(jur:98§2) of judges' wrongdoing would be a masterstroke, allowing you to:

    a. inform the public on verifiable research(jur:21§§A-B) of the nature, extent, and gravity of judges' wrongdoing, provoking national outrage over Unequal Judges Under No Law, to:

        1) set in motion a Watergate-like generalized media investigation, cost-effectively pinpointed on two unique national stories(ol:191§§A,B) that galvanize public attention;

        2) set again the subject of the national debate because you are the one who senses and can 'treat' the pulse of *We the People*, the masters also of judicial public servants;

        3) announce the presentation of the findings of your own investigation at the Republican Convention so that you fire up the public with inspiring expectation of Justice; and

        4) turn the Convention into a reality show that irresistibly attracts every Republican, Democrat, Independent, and all victims of wrongdoing judges and advocates of honest judiciaries, whereby you become *the People*'s Champion of Justice;

b. demand nationally televised hearings on judges' wrongdoing, akin to those held by the 9/11 Commission and the Senate Watergate Committee. The latter led to the unthinkable, the resignation of President Nixon on 8aug74, and the imprisonment of *all* his White House aides(jur:4¶¶10-14). These can become known as 'the Trump hearings' on wrongdoing judges; and lead to the unimaginable, the resignation of all the justices for participating in, or condoning their peers', wrongdoing to the detriment of all parties, for judges who show contempt for the law by breaking it for their own benefit cannot be reasonably expected to respect it and submit themselves to the constraints of due process and equal protection when applying it to any party. You can taint with suspicion of a cover-up any presidential candidate and other Establishment politicians who oppose these hearings;

c. tarnish P. Obama, the Democratic Senate leadership, and the Democratic brand itself, and embarrass them, Justice Sotomayor, and her current(jur:71§4) and former peers by your requesting that they release the secret FBI vetting reports on Nominee Sotomayor for the district, circuit, and supreme courts, and those of the other justices and peers(jur:105fn213); and call their bluff by offering to publish your IRS returns if they release those reports;

d. burnish your credentials as the only candidate who, as the only Establishment outsider, could have taken on federal judges, and who can take on any center of entrenched power, any domestic lobby, and even foreign entities so as to bring relief to, as your Campaign Manager, Mr. Lewandowski, put it, the people "tired of the way things are";

e. open your website(supra ol:311) to *We the People* so that it becomes:

   1) the place for people to submit their complaints against judges and their conniving and coerced helpers(supra ol2:395), and search them for patterns of wrongdoing;

   2) the precursor of judicial reform(jur:158§§6-8), which can be your legacy even if you do not win the presidency, with boards of citizens for receiving and processing complaints against judges and holding them liable as an outgrowth of your website; and

   3) the center with innovative, interactive, and competitive features for people to give and receive vital information about your campaign, their lives, terrorism, etc.,(supra ol:362), and to gratefully donate to your campaign, which desperately needs money;

f. earn $100s of millions' worth of free media coverage as the media conduct their, and report on your own, investigation(ol:194§E) of J. Sotomayor as a Trojan horse into the circumstances of secrecy, unaccountability, coordination, and risklessness enabling(ol:190¶1-7) judges' wrongdoing to be so routine, widespread, and grave as to be the judges' institutionalized modus operandi for expediency and illegal benefits(jur:49§4); judicial power, money(jur:27§2), and in practice unreviewable cases(jur:28§3) are their means, motive, and opportunity for doing wrong; scandal sells copy and attracts ever more media outlets;

g. emerge as the untarnished outsider, who can do without the endorsement of Establishment politicians while forcing them to choose between going down with their party, abandoned by ever more people outraged by the scandal tainting it, or joining you in building a movement of the Dissatisfied with the Establishment and its Judicial and Legal Systems; and

h. allow you to point to the need for the constitutional convention called for by 34 states (jur:136§3) so that you become the Architect of the New American Governance System.

I respectfully request an opportunity to present this and supporting strategies to you and your staff.

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
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org
2165 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6506
tel. (718)827-9521; follow @DrCorderoEsq
Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

June 7, 2016

Mr. Donald J. Trump
Donald J. Trump for President, Inc.
725 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Dear Mr. Trump,

1. On May 23, I delivered at the reception of Trump Tower a letter(†>ol2:422) for you with materials proposing that you denounce federal judges' unaccountability and consequent riskless wrongdoing, and reap benefits from so doing, i.e., attracting the attention and support of the huge (id.>ol:311¶1) untapped voting bloc of all the people who are dissatisfied with the judicial and legal systems. They form part of the dominant sector of the electorate to whom you have given a voice and who represent your key constituency: The Dissatisfied With The Establishment.

2. Your criticism of the exercise of discretionary power by Judge Gonzalo Curiel, who presides over the Trump University case, offers the opportunity to denounce judges' unaccountability that enables wrongdoing and abuse of discretion(*>jur:5§3): You can argue that judges have granted themselves absolute immunity from prosecution, thus elevating themselves above the law; and are held unaccountable in practice by the Establishment politicians who recommended, endorsed, nominated, and confirmed them to the Federal Judiciary and protect them there as '*their* men and women on the bench'. So the judges are in practice irremovable: In the last 227 years since the creation of their Judiciary in 1789, the number of impeached and removed federal judges –2,217 were in office on 30sep13– is 8!(jur:22fn13, 14) As a consequence, they do wrong risklessly(jur:65§§1-3) and even exercise their discretion abusively: Those who can do the most –impeachable wrongdoing– can do the lesser –reversible discretion-abusing decisions–.

3. You need not prove that Judge Curiel himself has engaged in wrongdoing, not even that he has abused his discretionary power, for which you would have to meet the exacting requirement of proving that his decisions were grossly unsound, unreasonable, illegal, or unsupported by the evidence. Convincing appellate judges in any case that a peer in the court below and friend of theirs for years, who knows of their own wrongdoing and abuse, abused his discretion is an uphill battle; it is rendered in this case all but impossible because the appellate judges as well as all the other judges have closed ranks as a class behind one of their own under attack.

4. Instead, you only need to show the appearance(jur:68fn123a), rather than prove based on evidence, that the Federal Judiciary and its judges, of whom J. Curiel is one, engage in wrongdoing involving illegal activity so routinely, extensively, and in such coordinated fashion that they have turned wrongdoing into their institutionalized modus operandi; abuse of discretion is only part of the mindset that develops in people who know that they can get away with anything they want. The wrongdoers' mindset has been fostered by policy adopted by the Supreme Court itself. In *Pierson v. Ray*(jur:26fn25), it stated that judges' "immunity applies even when the judge is accused of acting maliciously and corruptly". In *Stump v. Sparkman*(26fn26), the Court even assured judges that "A judge will not be deprived of immunity because the action he took was in error, was done maliciously, or was in excess of his authority". Such assurance has created the mindset of impunity. Once on the bench, forever there no matter what. Unaccountable judges exercise abusively, not merely discretion, but even power over people's property, liberty, and all the rights and duties that determine their lives. They wield absolute power, the kind that 'corrupts absolutely'(27fn28). Abuse of discretion is an institutional uninhibited mental reflex.

5. As a result, federal judges abuse discretion for their own benefit. Indeed(*>Lsch:21§A):

a. Chief circuit judges abuse judges' statutory self-disciplining authority by dismissing 99.82%(jur:10-14) of complaints against their peers; with other judges they deny up to 100% of appeals to review such dismissals(jur:24§b). By judges immunizing themselves from liability for their wrongdoing they deny complainants their 1st Amendment right to "redress of grievances", making them victims with no effective right to complain.

b. Up to 9 of every 10 appeals are disposed of ad-hoc through no-reason summary orders or opinions so "perfunctory"(jur:44fn68) that the judges mark them "nor for publication" "not precedential"(jur:43§1), raw fiats of star-chamber power. They are as difficult to find as if they were secret; and if found, meaningless to litigants and the public, for most often their only operative word is: 'affirmed!' They are blatant abuse of discretion.

c. Circuit judges appoint bankruptcy judges(jur:43fn61a), whose rulings come on appeal before their appointers, who protect them. In Calendar Year 2010, these appointees decided who kept or received the $373 billion at stake in only personal bankruptcies (jur:27§2). *Money! lots of money!* the most insidious corruptor. About 95% of those bankruptcies are filed by individuals; bankrupt, the great majority of them appear pro se and, ignorant of the law, they fall prey to a bankruptcy fraud scheme(jur:42fn60).

d. That scheme was covered up by Then-Judge Sotomayor, e.g., *DeLano*(jur:xxxv, xxxviii), which she presided over. Whether it is one of the sources of assets that *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and Politico(jur:65fn107a,c) suspected her of concealing (65§§1-3) is a query that you can raise at a press conference(jur:xvii) to launch(jur:98§2) a Watergate-like generalized media investigation(ol:194§E) of her and the Judiciary.

6. Not all judges are wrongdoers; but they need not be such to be participants in illegal activity that requires their resignation(jur:92§d) or impeachment. When they keep silent about the wrongs done by their peers, they become accessories after the fact; when they let their peers know that they will look away when the peers do wrong again, they become accessories before the fact(jur:88§§a-c). In both cases, they breach their oath of office(ol:162§§5-6), show dereliction of their collective duty to safeguard institutional integrity, and contribute to denying due process and equal protection of the law to all parties. Thus, the question is properly asked of every judge: What did he or she know about their peers' wrongdoing and when did he or she know it?

7. You can defend your criticism of unaccountable judges by showing that they engage in institutionalized wrongdoing as part of their history, policy, and mindset of impunity, which provides probable cause to believe that judges abuse their discretion. What is more, **a)** you can turn your defense into that of the national public, for 'if judges can treat me unfairly, though I am a presumptive nominee, represented by the best lawyers, and able to appeal to the Supreme Court, how much more abuse do they heap on you?'; then **b)** invite the public to upload their complaints about judges to your site(cf. infra 362), search them for patterns of wrongdoing supportive of motions for disqualification, remand, new trial, etc., and demand hearings on judicial wrongdoing and reform(jur:158§§6-8); **c)** approach the deans of Columbia or NYU law schools to propose a course to research(ol:60, 112-118; jur:131§b) judicial unaccountability and reform as an independent third party working to the highest academic standards(jur:128§4); **d)** pioneer judicial unaccountability reporting as a business venture(jur:119§1); **e)** thus turning your criticism of J. Curiel, which Establishment N. Gingrich called "your worst mistake" and Sen. Collins asked for you to apologize to the judge, into a master strategic thinker's move to pack(infra 422) the Judiciary and emerge as the Champion of Justice of The Dissatisfied With The Establishment.

I respectfully request an opportunity to present this strategy to you and your officers.

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

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.
Judicial Discipline Reform
2165 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6506
tel. (718)827-9521

How Donald Trump can turn his criticism of a federal judge into an opportunity to denounce federal judges' unaccountability, which gives rise to the mindset of impunity that induces judges to engage risklessly in wrongdoing, including illegal, criminal activity, thus providing probable cause to believe that judges, fearing no adverse consequences, also abuse their discretion

An opportunity for Trump to emerge as

The Voice of

The Dissatisfied With The Establishment,

THE CHAMPION OF JUSTICE OF

THE VICTIMS OF WRONGDOING AND ABUSIVE JUDGES, and

THE Architect of the New American Judicial System

by causing the investigation of

two unique national stories of judicial wrongdoing

June 9, 2016

The Two Unique National Stories

A. The P. Obama-J. Sotomayor story and the *Follow the money!* investigation

What did the President(*>jur:77§A), Sen. Schumer & Gillibrand(jur:78§6), and federal judges[213b] know about the concealment of assets by his first Supreme Court nominee, Then-Judge, Now-Justice Sotomayor –suspected by *The New York Times, The Washington Post,* and Politico[jur:65fn107a] of concealing assets, which entails the crimes[ol:5fn10] of tax evasion [107c] and money laundering– but covered up and lied(ol:64§C) about to the public by vouching for her honesty because he wanted to ingratiate himself with those petitioning him to nominate another woman and the first Hispanic to replace Retiring Justice Souter and from whom he expected in exchange support for the passage of the Obamacare bill in Congress; and when did they know it and other wrongdoing?(ol:154¶3)

This story can be pursued through the *Follow the money!* investigation(jur:102§a; ol:1, 66), which includes a call on the President to release unredacted all FBI vetting reports on J. Sotomayor and on her to request that she ask him to release them. That can set a precedent for vetting judges and other candidates for office; and open the door for '*packing*' the Federal Judiciary after judges resign for 'appearance of impropriety'.

B. The Federal Judiciary-NSA story and the *Follow it wirelessly!* investigation

To what extent do federal judges abuse their vast computer network and expertise –which handle hundreds of millions of case files(Lsch:11¶9b.ii)– either alone or with the quid pro quo assistance of the NSA –up to 100% of whose secret requests for secret surveillance orders are rubberstamped[ol:5fn7] by the federal judges of the secret court established under Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act– to:

1) conceal assets –a crime under 26 U.S.C. §§7201, 7206[ol:5fn10], unlike surveillance– by electronically transferring them between declared and hidden accounts(ol:1); and

2) cover up their interception of the communications –also a crime under 18 U.S.C. §2511(ol:20¶¶11-12)– of critics of judges to prevent them from joining forces to expose the judges?, which constitutes a contents-based interception, thus a deprivation of 1st Amendment rights, that would provoke a graver scandal than Edward Snowden's revelation of the NSA's illegal dragnet collection of only contents-free metadata of scores of millions of communications.

See the statistical analysis[ol:19§Dfn2] of a large number of communications critical of judges and a pattern of oddities(ol2:395, 405, 425), pointing to probable cause to believe that they were intercepted.

This story can be pursued through the *Follow it wirelessly!* investigation(jur:105§b; ol:2, 69§C).

Request for an opportunity to present to Mr. Trump and his officers the proposed investigation by the media(ol:194§E) and law school students (ol:60, 112-120; jur:131§b) of these two unique national stories.

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

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
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

2165 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6506
tel. (718)827-9521; follow @DrCorderoEsq
Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

June 24, 2016

Mr. Donald J. Trump
Donald J. Trump for President, Inc.
725 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Dear Mr. Trump,

1. This is a proposal for you to apply a principle that you stated in an interview some 25 years ago to the effect that 'you always think how things can go wrong, because if they go right, they take care of themselves, but if they go wrong, you want to know that you anticipated that event and did everything possible to prevent it and now are better prepared to make things right'.

2. Things can go wrong for your campaign due to lack of money and the dwindling support shown by polls. To run a campaign you may need $1 bll., of which you only have $1.3 mll. Since neither your party nor big donors are opening their pockets, you can either pay the difference from yours or implement this proposal for innovatively addressing both problems: At the end of a long primary season, people are weary of stretched-out hands requesting money. So you can offer them your ears and invite them at rallies and in emails to voice their complaints on your website. Complainants form that part of the electorate that you have identified and are your base: The Dissatisfied With The Establishment. The most dissatisfied are those who, like you recently, feel they were treated unfairly by judges, not to mention those who feel they had their rights, duties, and property mishandled: the dissatisfied with the judicial and legal systems. They constitute a huge untapped voting bloc: More than 100 million people are parties to over 50 million cases filed in the federal and state courts annually(*>jur:8fn4,5); to them must be added the parties to the scores of millions of pending cases and cases deemed wrongly or wrongfully decided; plus the millions of closely related people who have also become dissatisfied: family, friends, peers, supporters, employees, etc. All are passionate in their quest for vindication and justice.

3. They will be receptive to your invitation to your website both to fill out a standardized case description form(infra ol:281) and to post their court papers so that anybody may search them for the most probative evidence, i.e., a pattern of wrongdoing(ol:274), unlike a suspect claim of abuse in only one's case. Thereby you would apply the marketing psychology principle that when people feel they have been given to, e.g., attention and hope of help, they feel grateful and prone to give back, e.g., money, volunteered work, and word of mouth support. While on your site, they will be more responsive to your donation pitch. They may donate small amounts, similar to those that The Hopeful Young gave Sen. Sanders, which added up to scores of millions, even surpassing the big donations to Sec. Clinton. You can thus grow your support, for those who post to your site will identify themselves and those closely related to them as potential voters for you, whom you can enter into your database, keep giving to(ol:362), and mobilize on Election Day.

4. Although you sue often, you are not afraid of criticizing judges. You can cause them to resign or be removed by denouncing(ol2:437) their unaccountability and riskless wrongdoing(ol: 311), thus launching media and official investigations of the Federal Judiciary in two unique national cases(ol2:439-440; jur:xxxv-xxxxviii) and provoking an institutional crisis that leads to reform, which becomes your legacy even if you lose: the supremacy of *We the People* in a new American governance system(ol2:423¶¶gh). If you win, you can nominate replacement judges supportive of your legislative agenda(ol2:422). To detail this proposal and explain how you can investigate(*>ol:194§E) the stories I respectfully request a meeting with you and your officers.

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

* Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf

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

December 27, 2016

Providing a rationale for a law school to hear a presentation on offering a course on, and consider creating an institute of, judicial accountability reporting and reform advocacy

Table of Contents

****

A. The importance of pro ses and the rest of the national public for law schools to attract students and for the latter to find and keep a job

1. There can be no law school without students and there will be no students if there are no prospects of finding a job after graduation. Law jobs for students are dependent on how many people and entities want to pay to receive services from lawyers. Their number has been dwindling for years and so has law school enrollment while the number of graduates who cannot find a law job has increased and even prompted a group to file a class action against some schools.

2. The largest segment of those requiring legal services is composed of those who can neither afford a lawyer nor have the capacity to appear pro se. To them are added those who dare commence a suit however ineptly they may write a complaint and everything else. In fact, pro ses file 51% of all appeals to the 12 federal regional circuit courts(Table B-9 ↓ol2:462c; *>jur:21fn10c; jur:28fn35, 29fn38, 43fn64). This percentage has an upward trend. It is likely to be sur-passed in the state courts by more people with less education, lower income, and less disposable money to pay attorney's fees appearing pro se in cases of state law that affects their daily lives, e.g., family, probate, zoning. A potential client drops out of the legal market whenever a person re-presents himself or herself, whether because he or she cannot afford attorney's fees or distrusts lawyers for abusing their superior knowledge to behave themselves unethically and even rapaciously. This puts the viability of law schools and the salary that their deans and professors earn at risk.

3. Pro ses, however, are not even the largest market that law schools and their students can aim for to secure their future. Pro ses form part of the huge untapped voting bloc of the dissatisfied with the judicial and legal markets(cover letter 2nd ¶), who in turn belong to a demographics of whose existence and mood everyone who has followed the presidential campaign is aware of: the dominant component of our society, the Dissatisfied With The Establishment, the ones who have so unexpectedly and passionately supported Establishment Outsider Donald Trump(ol:311, 362; †>ol2:422, 437, 444) and Establishment Critic Sen. Bernie Sanders(ol:311, 362, 377).

4. However, this proposal will have its most persuasive effect on lawyers, especially those who are aware that it was a lawyer by the name Brandeis who introduced the use of statistics alongside legal arguments in briefs to the Supreme Court and did it so effectively that he gave rise to a new type of brief: the Brandeis brief, the best known of which is the one he filed in *Muller v. Oregon*, 208 U.S. 412, 28 S.Ct. 324 (1908), a case that he also won. Subsequently, he became a justice of the Court(ol:275 §1). That is precisely why even corporate superlawyers can be keenly interested in the grave implications of the official court statistics analyzed below: They point to coordinated judicial wrongdoing. But instead of their objecting to it in the traditional way of making allegations resting on opinion and impressions, statistics will provide them with an objective, verifiable, and convincing foundation for taking legal action, such as filing a motion for recusal, disqualification, reversal and remand for new trial, etc. It is top lawyers who are in the best position to perform cost-benefit analysis based on statistics; otherwise, they and their wealthy clients can afford the most innovative forms of statistical, linguistic, and literary analysis that the proposed institute will develop(jur:131§b; ol:42, 60) together with other techniques for auditing judges' decisions (ol:274; 304) and cultivating Deep Throats or confidential informants(ol2:468).

5. Knowledge is Power. This is a proposal for law schools and their students to pioneer new forms of meeting the traditional legal needs of, and offer new courses of action to, pro ses, the dissatisfied that dominate the legal market and the national public, and lawyers. It uses a new kind of knowledge: that gained through the analysis of the official statistics of the federal courts and of the way their judges operate. That knowledge will empower schools and students to attract those market segments' attention and generate a demand for the new legal services that they will offer.

6. Given the economic stress of law schools and the dim hiring prospects faced by their students, a presentation that sounds reasonably calculated to meet those challenges with a concrete, feasible, and promising proposal should at least pique the curiosity of, and be considered carefully by, deans and other law school members who are responsible for the continued existence of their institution and for helping students attain their most basic goal: work as lawyers upon graduation. This presentation begins by explaining in lay terms to pro ses to illustrate how to approach them. Then it transitions to a discussion of statistics and their implications accessible to all lawyers.

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

January 3, 2017

Official Statistics of the Federal Courts: their analysis points to its judges' arbitrary handling of caseloads that denies due process and equal protection of the laws

B. A case filed by a pro se in a federal court is weighted as a third of a case

7. When you file a case in a federal district court, you have to file a Case Information Sheet. It asks, among other things, whether you are represented, that is, a lawyer is appearing on your behalf, or you are pro se, meaning that you are appearing 'for yourself'. Checking the "pro se" box in that Sheet has consequences at the brief in-take office of the clerk of court that are funereal without the solemnity: Your case was dead on arrival and is sent right away to potter's field.

8. In the Federal Judiciary, pro se cases are weighted as a third of a case(jur:43fn65a >page 40). By comparison, "a death-penalty habeas corpus case is assigned a weight of 12.89"(jur:43¶81). As a result of such weighting, a pro se case is given some 39 times less attention than a death penalty case regardless of the pro se case's nature, what is at stake in it, and whether the complaint was written by joe the plumber or a law professor. If any attention is given it, it is pro forma.

9. Your brief is likely not to be read at all…that is the whole purpose of the Case Information Sheet: to tell the court on half of one side of one page what the case is all about and what relief the party is requesting so that if the court does not want to grant it, why bother reading the brief? But you still had to pay the filing fee of $400, while a party that filed an application for a writ of habeas corpus only had to pay $5. Is this why it is said "Justice is blind"?

C. Justice is blind, but the judge sees the incompetence of pro se pleadings

10. A federal district judge has hundreds of weighted cases. In fact, "a judicial emergency [is not declared until there is a] vacancy in a district court where weighted filings are in excess of 600 per judgeship"(jur36fn57). The judge is expected not to waste her time with a pro se case, which is most likely poorly written by an emotional plaintiff who ran to court thinking all he had to do to complain was to tell his story of injustice, but had no clue whether the law gave him a cause of action against the defendant and, if it did, had no notion of the elements of the action that he must prove and the admissible evidence that he must introduce to prove each.

11. If you did not understand a word of the above, why would you expect the judge to think that you understood, never mind complied with, the myriad rules, subrules, and their details in the hundreds of pages of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure(FRCP; ol:5a/fn15e), the Federal Rules of Evidence(id.), and the applicable law contained somewhere in the hundreds of volumes of the U.S. Code (ol:5a/fn15a) as interpreted in court decisions among millions written by judges?

1. A pro se is likely not to have any idea what subject matter jurisdiction is and how its absence can doom his case

12. Worse yet, you have to show something of which you, as a non-lawyer pro se, are presumed not to have the faintest idea: subject matter jurisdiction(FRCivP 12(b)(1); ol:5b/fn15e). This means that you have to show that the federal court has the authority conferred upon it by statute as interpreted by case law to entertain your type of case and use its judicial power to adjudicate the controversy that opposes you to the defendant. You cannot run to federal court and ask it to

intervene in a matter governed only by state law, such as family, wills, real estate, and zoning.

13. Nor is it enough for you to allege that the state judge and a host of other state officials engaged in what you, in your law-untrained opinion and your emotional state of mind as a party, a parent, an heir, or a resident in the neighborhood, consider to be corruption(jur:86§4).

14. The issue of subject matter jurisdiction is so important that it cannot be waived: Defendant cannot confer upon the court authority to hear your type of case by merely failing to object to it in its answer or motion to dismiss. Even in the middle of trial, D can move to dis-miss the case, thus terminating it, due to the court's lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The court can do so on its own motion upon realizing that it does not have authority to deal with the type of matter presented to it. In fact, when judges do not feel like dealing with a case, they take the easy way out by claiming that they do not have subject matter jurisdiction. Cf. In the 2015 Fiscal Year – FY15=1oct14-30sep15–, of the 4,990 appeals terminated by federal circuit judges on proce-dural grounds, 69% (3,423) were terminated due to "jurisdictional defects" (Table B-5A, aic:14b). Judges and their staff terminated 36% of all appeals in FY15 on procedural grounds.

15. Plaintiff's only remedy is to go up on appeal to argue a highly technical issue of law. Do you have any idea how to argue that the court has subject matter jurisdiction based on common law, a statutory provision, notions of federalism, and the 14th Amendment clause on "the equal protection of the laws" after analogizing your type of case to another type that was held to fall within the court's jurisdiction?

16. You may hate lawyers as deceitful, uncaring, money grabbers. Yet, it is logical to assume that people who graduated from high school, went to college for four years, and attended law school for three know something about the law that people who did not go there ignore. The same applies to those who successfully conducted doctoral research, analysis, and writing. How do you think that the judge will react if you tell her that you consider the above statement arrogant and elitist?

2. From the outset, a pro se brief is likely to reveal itself as a soap opera's sob story with no awareness of the other side of the story

17. Just because paper holds everything one writes on it, the writing on it by a pro se does not pro-duce a brief of law. To begin with, a pro se is likely to have failed to number his paragraphs and neglected to group them under headings strictly corresponding to the required 'parts of the brief'.

18. Ignoring how to state a case, the pro se is likely to plunge in his opening paragraph into a rambling rant full of legally irrelevant allegations and assumptions passed off as facts and truths that "everybody knows". He will show his incapacity to put himself in the position of the oppos-ing party to see the latter's side of the story from its perspective; therefore, he will be unable to do what lawyers do to gain a better understanding of their case: argue against themselves. A pro se is unlikely to have even identified the legal arguments of the adverse party, ignoring them as if they did not even exist. Have you noticed that although this article is critical of judges from its title, it also takes their point of view to present their arguments fairly and convincingly?

19. Why would the judge expect the rest of the complaint or other pleading to be any better? She knows from experience that pro ses hardly ever cite cases as precedential support for what they allege and do not lay out arguments of law, but instead intone articles of faith and cries of pain caused by an intuitive sense of justice denied. He is likely to have stated a case so inadequately that it will be considered incapable of surviving a Rule 12(b)(6) motion for dismissal for "failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted" by a court(FRCP, ol:5a/fn15e).

3. The court commits fraud by charging a pro se the filing fee without disclosing that it is a burial fee to dump the case

20. Your pro se brief reaches the judge tainted by the presumption of irrelevancy, inadmissibility, and incompetence. She will give it the perfunctory attention that the official weighting of the case enables her to give it. The weighting works as a self-fulfilling expectation: Because your pro se case is weighted as merely a third of a case, the judge will presume it to be worthless and do a quick job of disposing of it, a chore likely relegated to her law clerk so that the judge can spare herself having to read your brief. Of the 18,969 appeals terminated in FY15 on procedural grounds, 73% (13,814) were terminated by the staff (Table B-5A, aic:14b; jur:22fn10c). As a pro se, you do not stand a chance of getting a due process fair hearing or reading. You are DoA.

21. But you were treated "equal" to a represented party in that you had to pay the same $400 filing fee in the district court. The court failed to disclose on the Case Information Sheet before demanding and receiving from you that fee that as a result of your checking the "pro se" box, the court would unduly process your case into a coffin and send it to the potter's field for those who had committed pro se status. Instead, it put up the pretense that if you paid the fee, a judge would be assigned to your case who would fairly and impartially handle it on the merits according to law. Since the district courts know that they will handle a pro se case, not as equal, but rather as inferior, to a represented case, those courts commit fraud on the public, in general, and the district court where you filed your case defrauded you, in particular.

22. If this is the treatment that a pro se gets when he pays the $400 filing fee, how is he treated when in addition he files *in forma pauperis* and pays no fee so that the judges and clerks feel that they are doing him a favor to take in his case at all, rather than that they are bound to do him justice?

D. The federal courts of appeals defraud appellants by disposing of 93% of appeals in decisions "on procedural grounds, by consolidation, unsigned, unpublished, and without comment", such as reasonless summary orders

23. Table B-12(aic:14d) presents official statistics on the caseload of the federal courts of appeals and its management by their judges and staff published in the Annual Report of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts(jur:21fn10). A return on investment analysis of it shows whether a rational human being, a homo economicus, should file in a court or gamble in Las Vegas.

24. In FY15, 53,213 cases were terminated (Table B-5; aic:14a) in the 12 regional appeals courts; in only 64% (34,244) their termination was on the merits, not on procedural grounds. Only 7.1% (3,794) of all appeals were terminated in merit decisions of sufficient quality for the judges to dare sign and publish them. You have only 1 chance in 14 of getting a decision that means anything so that none of the judges on the three-judge appellate panel would be embarrassed by giving the public access to it with her name as the author or a concurrent. Of the 31,622 written decisions –excluding consolidated appeals–, 87% (27,507) were so meaningless or arbitrary that they were not published; 89% (30,450) were so defective that they were unpublished and/or unsigned.

25. In fact, even among the decisions classified as "reasoned" but whose reasoning was so inconsequential or inconsistent with the law –hence, "perfunctory"(jur:44fn68)– that none of the judges on the panels would sign them, 98.4% (17,794) were also not published, mere scribbles that put 'reason' to shame so that they should not be seen by anybody but the respective parties.

26. Yet, you could have done worse than getting one of these decisions that pretended to be "reasoned", for 13% (4,099) were not only unsigned and unpublished, they were also "without com-

ment". Those decisions are a crass means for reasonless, arbitrary(jur:44fn67), ad-hoc termination by fiat of star chamber judges who do not deign explain themselves. To issue an "unsigned without comment" decision there is no need to even take a look at your brief. It suffices to rubberstamp it "affirmed!" so that the whole responsibility for what happened in your case is laid on the lower court judge appealed from. Had the appellate judges reversed her, they would have had to read the briefs and write an opinion so that the reversed judge would not commit the same reversible error on remand. But that entails work, and doing it would defeat the sweeping-case-load-off-the-desk function of that means for pro forma and perfunctory termination of appeals.

27. Yet, you could have done worse: 7.7% (2,622) of the appeals allegedly ended "on the merits" were "disposed by consolidation". Since no judge deemed your appeal, with its unique set of parties, facts, issues, amount in controversy, aggravating and attenuating circumstances, etc., deserving of disposition in an individual decision, your appeal was most likely unceremoniously dumped with those of other appellants into the mass grave for the 88% (27,827) of "unsigned, unpublished, and without comment" decisions. What an undignified, contemptuous "equality" accorded by judges to the appeals of so many different appellants in quest for justice by due process!

28. That figure of 88% shows that such fate was not reserved for pro ses, most of whom are uneducated and write substandard, amateurish briefs. Pro ses filed 51% of appeals(Table B-9, aic:14c). Even if all pro ses had their appeals terminated by "unsigned, unpublished, and without comment" opinions, that would leave 37% of appeals by parties who spent a lot of money to have attorneys represent them and write presumably competent briefs, but nevertheless got treated just as perfunctorily and were denied their due process right to be 'heard' in their written briefs.

1. "Not precedential" defines summary orders and is stamped on any opinion to escape the strictures of due process

29. Circa 75% of appeals are terminated by summary orders(jur:44§66). They are stamped "not precedential": They have no reasoning invokable to influence the disposition of future cases and need not have respected the precedent set by past ones. They are anathema to a common law system based on precedent to ensure predictability, prevent surprise, and curb abuse by judges making off the cuff decisions on the spur of the moment or to serve an expedient, even personal, wrongful interest in the case at hand. They make a mockery of "equal protection of the laws", for their function is to be unequal to the rule of the law already applied or to be applied. They are an abusive exercise of appellate judges' power to sweep their caseload off their desktops. So they skip reasoning and reduce the disposition to the only operative word that fills the blank on a 5¢ form, which almost always is: 'The decision of the court below is Affirmed' or 'The relief requested is Denied'. That is all you get for your $505 appeal filing fee. By stamping "not precedential" on any decision, even a "reasoned" one, judges can use it to the same end as a summary order: to dash off a lazy, off the top of their head note with no legal research. That is fraud. In Las Vegas, your odds of winning are higher and since the casinos regulated, they are accountable.

2. Fraud by judges offering honest appellate services in exchange for a fee that they knowingly will not render; and breach of contract

30. The appeals courts knew that before you filed your appeal you had spent $10,000s in legal fees or the equivalent in the effort and time that you invested in writing your brief and the pain and suffering that you endured to figure out whatever it was that you had to do to represent yourself. The courts offered appellate services, which implicitly were to be rendered honestly, if you paid

their $505 filing fee. Your payment of the fee was the giving of consideration that validated your acceptance of their offer. A contract was formed, even if it was one of adhesion. But they failed to deliver on it: They terminated your and the rest 93% of appeals with decisions "on procedural grounds, by consolidation, unsigned, unpublished, without comment" so defective or wrongful that the judges deprived most of them of precedential value. Hence, district judges have no incentive to write meaningful opinions since they know that 93% of appeals from them will be terminated in such perfunctory way. Appeals courts' perfunctoriness sets the example for district courts'. Pro forma affirmance of their decisions makes them unreviewable in effect(jur:28§3, 46§3, 48§2), which breeds perfunctoriness and, by reinforcing its risklessness, wrongdoing too.

31. Anyway, a reversal is no risk, for it has no adverse consequences, neither for the district nor the appellate judges: They have a life-appointment! and are in practice irremovable(jur:21§a) Their salary cannot be diminished regardless of the dismal quality of their work. Criticizing a peer with whom they have to work even after they take senior, semi-retired status is not a smart social move. Live and let live is, lest they become pariahs within their judicial class. Nor can their salary be increased by a good performance bonus. None of them, not even the justices, has any say whatsoever in deciding who should be elevated to a higher court. That is a political decision made by the president on the informal recommendation of politicians of his party. They have little to gain from doing a conscientious job in compliance with the requirements of due process and equal protection of the laws (but see jur:56§§e-g on carrot and stick as compliance tools).

32. So, judges risklessly defraud you of the filing fees and make all your effort, time, and costs go to waste. They frustrate your reasonable expectation for disposition of your case and appeal in written and reasoned decisions that recognized that "Justice should not only be done, but should manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done"(jur:44fn71). They do it knowingly and intentionally, for a settled principle of torts provides that "a person is deemed to intend the reasonable consequences of his or her acts". They intend to commit fraud and breach of contract.

E. Barriers to the Supreme Court: the booklet format, the preference given to a few lawyers, the 1 in 93 review chance, and the cost of representation

33. Review of the decision of an appeals court is sought by petitioning the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari. The first barrier to doing so is the format of both the brief and the record on appeal to be filed. If you do not qualify as indigent to file *in forma pauperis*, you cannot make copies and file them on regular 8.5" x 11" paper(jur:47§1). You must transcribe the record and print it and the brief in the booklet format required by Rule 33(jur:47fn77) of the Rules of the Supreme Court. It can cost $100,000 or more to pay a specialized company to do so and use the required special paper. Given that the Court grants those petitions in its discretion and denies them without explanation, if it does not grant yours, your printing costs together with the filing fee of $300 as well as the expense of researching and writing the brief go to waste. If the Court grants the petition, it can cost more than $1,000,000(jur:48fn83) to take a case all the way to final adjudication there. If it remands to the district court for a new trial, you start all over again.

34. If you cannot download the Rules(jur:47fn77b) and pay attention to, and comply with, their hundreds of minute details, the Court will not even have the opportunity to decide whether to take your case for review: The clerk will not accept your brief for filing. He will send it back for you to correct the mistakes that he listed. You must do so within the time allowed. If you miss the deadline, subsequently you cannot file your case, due to untimeliness (Rule 13.2, 5; 14.5).

35. In the last few years, some 7,250 petitions were filed annually in the Court, but it reviewed an

average of only 78 cases. So your odds of having your case taken for review are roughly 1 in 93(cf. jur:47fn81a). Those odds are substantially worse if you are not represented by one of the "superlawyers", whose cases are decidedly preferred by the Court: 8 superlawyers argued 20% of cases in 2004-2012 9-year period[4]. They command the attorney's fee that the law of offer and demand allows, which only a few, mostly corporate parties, can afford. Superlawyers deliver what the justices demand: knowledgeable and authoritative arguments based on legal precedent and firmly established or proposed principles of law. The justices want clarification about any contention in the briefs that raised questions in their minds. From the bench, they will ask the kind of question that is the most difficult to answer because it requires a firm command of the law: 'What are the legal implications of that contention?'

36. The law is a system of rules of conduct developed over time that intends to ensure predictability and prevent surprise and arbitrariness. Points of law in a case have to fit together and with previous ones for the law to make sense and provide a reliable standard of expected or acceptable conduct. A pro se is unlikely to have the depth and breadth of legal knowledge needed to answer 'the legal implications question'. He or she cannot stand before the justices and wing it. Nor is a pro se likely to have the habit or skill to argue by analogy and distinction, i.e., similar facts should be governed by the same legal principles, which contributes to meeting the over-arching requirement of "equal protection of the laws"; and distinguishable ones by principles that are different or new. A pro se cannot improvise the application of that method of reasoning.

37. So a pro se cannot expect the Chief Justice and the eight Associate Justices of the august Supreme Court sitting on the high bench to hear oral argument before the national press and a select audience of guests, to let him or her babble, ramble, and rant about the facts of the case and his or her heartfelt pain at so much injustice visited upon him or her by the adverse party '*and this is so unfair!*'…but zero legal arguments. The scenario where that happens is cobbled together out of ignorance of, or reckless disregard for, the applicable standards of performance and court decorum. Wishful thinking stands aloof from reality. That is why a lawyer must be admitted to argue before the Court, thus becoming a member of its bar. If you do not have money to pay a lawyer to review your brief before filing it in the Court, you cannot afford to hire a bar member.

38. Having money does not ensure Court review. In the 2014 Term –1oct14-30sep15–, 52,698 appeals were filed in the appeals courts for the 12 regional circuits, but there were only 7,033 filings in the Court(jur:iii[ii.b]), less than 13%, for filings include certiorari petitions from the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit and that for the Armed Forces, and a few cases that can be filed originally in the Court. Only 75 cases were argued to, and disposed of by, the Court in signed opinions(jur:27[30d]) and 8 cases in unsigned decisions: Fewer than 1 appeal out of every 7.5 appeals in the appeals courts petitioned for certiorari, and fewer than 1 out of every 703 was reviewed by the Court, that is 0.14%, fewer than 15 hundredths of 1%(28[34b]). Judicial review in the Supreme Court is not only discretionary with the justices, it is also illusory. Thus, decisions of the courts of appeals are in effect unreviewable(28§3). Since those appellate judges know that the Court is unlikely to review their decisions, they can dispose of 93% perfunctorily and through wrongdoing.

---

[4] a. The Echo Chamber...At America's court of last resort, a handful of lawyers now dominates the docket; Reporters Joan Biskupic, Janet Roberts, and John Shiffman, Reuters Investigates, Thomson Reuters; 8dec14; http://www.reuters.com/investigates/special-report/scotus/

b. Elite circle of lawyers finds repeat success getting cases to the Supreme Court; Gwen Ifill interviews Joan Biskupic, Legal Affairs Editor in Charge, Reuters; PBS NewsHour; 9dec14; http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/elite-circle-lawyers-finds-repeat-success-getting-cases-supreme-court/

F. Exposing judges' wrongdoing by providing knowledge and services that earns money from those who stand to gain from the exposure

39. Obtaining justice from the judges of the Federal Judiciary, the model for their state counterparts, is illusory, with worse odds than gambling and near certain waste. They bait people with an offer of administering justice only to switch it in 93% of cases to a pro forma, perfunctory decision or "no comment" at all that defrauds parties of their filing fee and the public of the honest services for which it hired them as public servants and pays their salary. Their wrongdoing in disposing of cases is so coordinated among themselves and court clerks(jur:30§1) that they have developed it structurally into the sweeping-caseload-off-the-desk fraud scheme. It is one of several schemes (ol:85¶2), the most complex and harmful form of coordinated wrongdoing(ol:91§E).

40. Federal judges do wrong because they know that they are unaccountable: Whereas 2,293 of them were in office on 30sep15, the number of them impeached and removed in the last 227 years since the creation of the Federal Judiciary in 1789 is 8!(jur:22[13,14]). This historic record shows that once a person becomes a member of that Judiciary, he or she can do any wrong without risking any adverse consequences. They do wrong with the assurance of impunity. Those who complain against them have to file their complaints with other judges, who dismiss 99.82%(ol2:454¶4) of them and deny up to 100% of appeals from such dismissals(jur:24§b). This makes it understandable why judges dare wield abusively their decision-making power, in general, and their power to self-administrate, in particular, to deal with their caseload however they want. This includes disregarding the requirements of due process, equal protection of the laws, reasonable expectations, and their end of the bargain of an implied in fact contract for adjudicative services.

41. In disposing of cases, judges engage(jur:88§§a-c) risklessly in wrongdoing(jur:5§3; ol:154¶3) so widespread, routine, and grave that wrongdoing has become functionally their institutionalized modus operandi(jur:49§4). That is the inevitable result of power that goes unchecked: Power is inherently expansive: It will keep extending its reach until a counterpower stops or even beats it back. Exercised unaccountably, 'power grows absolute and corrupts absolutely'(jur:27[28]), rendering those who wield it indifferent to the harm that they cause. To do wrong, judges have the means in their decisional power over people's property, liberty, and the rights and duties that frame their lives; the motive in the benefits that they can gain, and the opportunity in cases(jur:21§§1-3).

42. Judges' counterpower should be Congress and the President through their exercise of constitutional and consuetudinary checks and balances. But out of convenience and connivance, they have abdicated such exercise(jur:23fn17a). The remaining counterpowers are so feeble and disorganized as to be impotent: pro ses, represented parties, victims of judges' wrongdoing, advocates of honest judiciaries, and lawyers afraid of losing their livelihood due to judges' retaliation.

43. But there is another counterpower: the national public. However powerful judges are, they are the most vulnerable public officers to public outrage provoked when they fail to abide by their own injunction to "avoid even the appearance of impropriety"(jur:68[123a]). For 'appearing' to be involved in improprieties, Justice Abe Fortas had first to withdraw his name from the nomination to the chief justiceship and then resign from the Supreme Court on May 14, 1969(jur:92§c).

1. The out-of-court, inform and outrage strategy for judicial wrongdoing exposure and reform: making money by implementing it

44. "The appearance of impropriety" is an easy to meet standard of showing. It is lower than even the lowest standard of proof applied in court, that is, by a preponderance –more than 50%– of the evidence, never mind 'by clear and convincing evidence', let alone 'beyond a reasonable doubt'.

It empowers journalists who meet it. It constitutes a pillar of a concrete, realistic, and feasible strategy for developing through the sale of knowledge and services an effective counterpower to judges' power: the out-of-court(ol:219, 224, 236), inform and outrage strategy(ol:248, 250, 319).

45. This strategy seeks to inform clients, professionals, and members of the media about judges' wrongdoing and so to outrage them and through them the national public as to elicit in ever more informed people their competitive, professional, and personal interest in joining a Watergate-like, generalized media investigation, pinpointedly focused for cost-effectiveness on two unique national stories(ol2:440) of judicial wrongdoing. Their findings will further outrage the national public and stir it to demand that politicians call for and conduct nationally televised hearings on such wrongdoing, akin to those of the Senate Watergate Committee and the 9/11 Commission.

46. Only an outraged national public has the power to generate a situation of fear where politicians give priority to the higher self-preservation instinct of not being voted out of, or not into, office, over their self-serving interest in connivingly covering for the people that they recommended, endorsed, and confirmed to the bench. Unless driven by the overpowering survival interest, politicians will at all cost oppose, never mind approve or initiate, the investigation for wrongdoing of even one judge, for it can provoke his or her fellow judges to close ranks and retaliate (jur:22¶31), e.g., by declaring the politicians' legislative agenda unconstitutional(jur:23[17a]). Similarly, it is not only out of solidarity that judges protect every judge, but also out of self-preservation: The investigation of one judge can lead to discover their own participation in, or condonation of(jur:88§§a-c), that judge's wrongdoing, or worse yet, discover the circumstances of secrecy, unaccountability, coordination, and risklessness(ol:190¶¶1-7) that enable the institutionalized wrongdoing that pervades their judiciary cloaked in their collective black robe.

47. Hence, the strategy seeks to inform about, and expose, not a replaceable individual(jur:50§b) rogue judge, but rather a wrongdoing judicial class. To succeed, the full nature, extent, and gravity of judges' wrongdoing must be exposed as the indispensable prerequisite to deeply outrage the public and convince it that the current system of judicial self-discipline(jur:24fn18a) is an utter failure due to its abuse by judges in connivance with politicians. A public so outraged and convinced will cause unavoidably the judiciary to be reformed in ways that today are inconceivable.

48. Judicial reform intended to effectively detect, deter, and punish judges' wrongdoing must include legislation that forces the judiciary and its judges to give up their secrecy and operate transparently(jur:158§§6-7). Failure to require transparency constitutes a license to engage in wrongdoing unaccountably and risklessly. Transparency will facilitate accountability: Judges must deliberate in public. Citizen boards(jur:160§8) of judicial accountability must be established and given authority to publicly receive and investigate complaints with power of subpoena, search and seizure, and contempt, and hold public hearings, suspend, transfer, and indict. Only citizens so empowered can accomplish the objective: to assert *We the People*'s status as the masters in "government of, by, and for the people" by holding its judicial public servants accountable and liable.

49. A national citizenry outraged at judges' wrongdoing will be enthused by the prospect of this out-of-court judicial reform and willing to donate or pay to realize it. More practical and personal considerations will drive parties to lawsuits to acquire knowledge and receive services to develop their counterpower to judges' power to do wrong and thereby protect or recover property, liberty, or rights and duties. Other people stand to gain reputationally, professionally, and materially by providing such knowledge and services, such as lawyer, and journalists, software developers, fraud accountants, and investors. The latter will find out in the confidential plan below how they can make money by investing in judicial wrongdoing exposure and reform as a business.

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

Table B-5.
U.S. Courts of Appeals—Decisions in Cases Terminated on the Merits, by Circuit and Nature of Proceeding, During the 12-Month Period Ending September 30, 2015

Circuit and Nature of Proceeding	Total Cases Terminated	Terminated on the Merits									
		By Consolidation	Percent of Total Terminated	Total	Affirmed/ Enforced [1]	Dismissed	Reversed	Remanded	Other	Certificate of Appeal-ability	Percent Reversed [2]
Total	**53,213**	**2,622**	**59.4**	**31,622**	**20,493**	**2,691**	**2,553**	**501**	**57**	**5,327**	**8.3**
Criminal	11,214	872	69.3	7,770	5,757	1,359	505	139	10	-	6.5
U.S. Prisoner Petitions	4,684	65	64.9	3,038	857	93	108	18	6	1,956	3.6
Other U.S. Civil	2,681	129	58.0	1,556	1,167	132	208	45	4	-	13.4
Private Prisoner Petitions	9,563	176	61.0	5,832	1,824	319	286	27	5	3,371	4.9
Other Private Civil	11,992	805	51.1	6,125	4,773	402	857	83	10	-	14.0
Bankruptcy	860	85	53.7	462	310	38	108	3	3	-	23.4
Administrative Agency Appeals	7,301	369	39.0	2,850	2,213	202	230	186	19	-	8.1
Original Proceedings and Miscellaneous Applications	4,918	121	81.1	3,989	3,592	146	251	-	-	-	-
DC	**1,134**	**286**	**45.1**	**511**	**383**	**34**	**70**	**19**	**1**	**4**	**14.8**
Criminal	85	15	52.9	45	31	2	5	7	-	-	11.1
U.S. Prisoner Petitions	70	1	51.4	36	25	3	2	1	1	4	5.6
Other U.S. Civil	245	24	64.5	158	122	6	23	7	-	-	14.6
Private Prisoner Petitions	5	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Private Civil	173	20	54.9	95	73	2	20	-	-	-	21.1
Bankruptcy	9	1	-	6	5	1	-	-	-	-	-
Administrative Agency Appeals	454	223	24.9	113	75	17	17	4	-	-	15.0
Original Proceedings and Miscellaneous Applications	93	2	61.3	57	51	3	3	-	-	-	-
1st	**1,589**	**79**	**57.5**	**914**	**714**	**24**	**89**	**10**	**2**	**75**	**10.2**
Criminal	563	44	65.5	369	315	11	39	4	-	-	10.6
U.S. Prisoner Petitions	122	1	67.2	82	21	-	3	-	-	58	3.7
Other U.S. Civil	78	1	59.0	46	41	1	4	-	-	-	8.7
Private Prisoner Petitions	91	1	47.3	43	23	1	2	-	-	17	4.7
Other Private Civil	460	22	46.7	215	183	4	25	3	-	-	11.6
Bankruptcy	29	3	48.3	14	12	1	1	-	-	-	7.1
Administrative Agency Appeals	162	6	50.0	81	60	3	13	3	2	-	16.0
Original Proceedings and Miscellaneous Applications	84	1	76.2	64	59	3	2	-	-	-	-

Table B-5A.
U.S. Courts of Appeals—Cases Terminated by Procedural Judgments, by Circuit and Nature of Proceeding, During the 12-Month Period Ending September 30, 2015

Circuit and Nature of Proceeding	Total Terminated	Terminated on Procedural Grounds											
				By Judge						By Staff			
		Total	By Consolidation	Total	Juris. Defects	FRAP 42 [1]	Default	Cert. of Appealability	Other	Total	FRAP 42 [1]	Default	Other
Total	**53,213**	**18,969**	**166**	**4,990**	**3,423**	**684**	**70**	**156**	**657**	**13,814**	**5,004**	**6,904**	**1,906**
Criminal	11,214	2,572	3	659	336	104	10	-	209	1,910	1,270	535	105
U.S. Prisoner Petitions	4,684	1,581	1	414	322	5	8	66	13	1,166	130	1,007	29
Other U.S. Civil	2,681	996	12	258	191	36	7	-	24	726	305	386	35
Private Prisoner Petitions	9,563	3,555	1	1,135	969	11	27	90	38	2,419	314	2,046	59
Other Private Civil	11,992	5,062	104	1,219	909	246	15	-	49	3,739	2,031	1,625	83
Bankruptcy	860	313	6	100	75	19	-	-	6	207	128	74	5
Administrative Agency Appeals	7,301	4,082	18	1,077	621	263	3	-	190	2,988	826	1,231	931
Original Proceedings and Miscellaneous Applications	4,918	808	21	128	-	-	-	-	128	659	-	-	659
DC	**1,134**	**337**	**11**	**85**	**32**	**12**	**6**	**7**	**28**	**242**	**130**	**80**	**32**
Criminal	85	25	-	2	1	1	-	-	-	23	17	6	-
U.S. Prisoner Petitions	70	33	-	12	5	-	-	7	-	21	3	17	1
Other U.S. Civil	245	63	-	11	7	2	1	-	1	52	24	28	-
Private Prisoner Petitions	5	4	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	3	-
Other Private Civil	173	58	1	17	7	3	3	-	4	40	15	23	2
Bankruptcy	9	2	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Administrative Agency Appeals	454	118	10	21	10	6	2	-	3	88	71	3	14
Original Proceedings and Miscellaneous Applications	93	34	-	19	-	-	-	-	-	19	15	-	15
1st	**1,589**	**596**	**7**	**195**	**124**	**13**	**6**	**17**	**35**	**394**	**269**	**115**	**10**
Criminal	563	150	1	26	17	2	1	-	6	123	98	25	-
U.S. Prisoner Petitions	122	39	-	21	6	1	1	12	1	18	7	9	2
Other U.S. Civil	78	31	2	8	7	1	-	-	-	21	13	8	-
Private Prisoner Petitions	91	47	-	20	12	-	3	5	-	27	13	14	-
Other Private Civil	460	223	4	65	58	4	1	-	2	154	115	38	1
Bankruptcy	29	12	-	4	2	2	-	-		-	8	5	
Administrative Agency Appeals	162	75	-	37	22	3	-	-	12	38	18	18	2
Original Proceedings and Miscellaneous Applications	84	19	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	14	5	-	5

Table B-9.
U.S. Courts of Appeals—Pro Se Cases Commenced and Terminated, by Circuit and Nature of Proceeding, During the 12-Month Period Ending September 30, 2015

Circuit and Nature of Proceeding	Total Cases Commenced	Pro Se at Filing	Total Cases Terminated	Pro Se at Termination
Total	**52,698**	**26,883**	**53,213**	**27,779**
Criminal	11,380	2,636	11,214	3,292
U.S. Prisoner Petitions	4,187	3,732	4,684	4,175
Other U.S. Civil	2,748	1,148	2,681	1,138
Private Prisoner Petitions	9,713	8,674	9,563	8,456
Other Private Civil	11,902	4,089	11,992	4,076
Bankruptcy	841	285	860	270
Administrative Agency Appeals	7,141	2,313	7,301	2,325
Original Proceedings and Miscellaneous Applications	4,786	4,006	4,918	4,047
DC	**1,125**	**368**	**1,134**	**357**
Criminal	66	14	85	13
U.S. Prisoner Petitions	86	75	70	58
Other U.S. Civil	247	104	245	105
Private Prisoner Petitions	10	10	5	5
Other Private Civil	142	62	173	71
Bankruptcy	4	4	9	9
Administrative Agency Appeals	476	27	454	20
Original Proceedings and Miscellaneous Applications	94	72	93	76
1st	**1,504**	**510**	**1,589**	**550**
Criminal	522	43	563	76
U.S. Prisoner Petitions	88	64	122	94
Other U.S. Civil	78	33	78	38
Private Prisoner Petitions	112	84	91	69
Other Private Civil	446	179	460	166
Bankruptcy	34	9	29	6
Administrative Agency Appeals	139	34	162	44
Original Proceedings and Miscellaneous Applications	85	64	84	57
2nd	**4,416**	**1,896**	**4,942**	**2,282**
Criminal	705	55	700	195
U.S. Prisoner Petitions	232	181	371	338
Other U.S. Civil	249	147	255	151
Private Prisoner Petitions	525	482	563	517
Other Private Civil	1,547	605	1,631	618
Bankruptcy	66	31	86	29
Administrative Agency Appeals	822	179	1,003	192
Original Proceedings and Miscellaneous Applications	270	216	333	242

Table B-12.
U.S. Courts of Appeals—Types of Opinions or Orders Filed in Cases Terminated on the Merits, by Circuit, During the 12-Month Period Ending September 30, 2015

Circuit	Total	Disposed of by Consolidation	Last Opinion or Final Order								
					Written Opinion or Order						
					Signed [1]		Reasoned, Unsigned [1]		Unsigned, Without Comment		
			Total	Oral	Published	Unpublished	Published	Unpublished	Published	Unpublished	Percent Unpublished
Total	**34,244**	**2,622**	**31,622**	**1**	**3,794**	**5,667**	**290**	**17,741**	**30**	**4,099**	**87.0**
DC	797	286	511	-	241	-	12	257	-	1	50.5
1st	993	79	914	-	346	26	5	525	-	12	61.6
2nd	2,914	286	2,628	-	234	2,346	47	1	-	-	89.3
3rd	2,185	67	2,118	-	150	1,325	2	527	-	114	92.8
4th	3,363	169	3,194	-	196	310	2	2,686	-	-	93.8
5th	4,743	698	4,045	-	288	82	43	3,617	1	14	91.8
6th	3,305	158	3,147	1	300	668	12	2,163	1	2	90.1
7th	1,739	151	1,588	-	562	-	28	996	-	2	62.8
8th	2,394	118	2,276	-	518	2	54	495	2	1,205	74.8
9th	6,898	347	6,551	-	497	4	34	3,341	26	2,649	91.5
10th	1,301	34	1,267	-	254	863	2	148	-	-	79.8
11th	3,612	229	3,383	-	208	41	49	2,985	-	100	92.4

NOTE: This table does not include data for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

[1] Includes only those opinions and orders that expound on the law as applied to the facts of each case and that detail the judicial reasons upon which the judgment is based.

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Ph.D., University of Cambridge, England **Judicial Discipline Reform** **2165 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6506**
M.B.A., University of Michigan Business School **DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org**
D.E.A., La Sorbonne, Paris www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org **tel. (718)827-9521; follow @DrCorderoEsq**

August 17, 2016

Mr. Donald J. Trump
Donald J. Trump for President, Inc.
725 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Dear Mr. Trump,

1. The campaign is in trouble and the number of days to recover is worryingly small. This is a proposal for shifting attention from slipping poll numbers to your theme 'Not a third term for Barak Obama through Crooked Hillary Clinton' by bringing up at a press conference a story rooted in articles(*>jur:65fn107a) in *The New York Times* (*NYT*), *The Washington Post* (*WP*), and Politico that suspected P. Obama's first nominee to the Supreme Court, Then-Judge, Now-Justice Sotomayor, of concealing assets. In the documents that she submitted to the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Judicial Nominations she failed to account for $3.6 million(id.107b,c).

2. Assets are concealed to hide their illegal origin, e.g., in a bankruptcy fraud scheme run by bankruptcy judges(jur:65§§1-3). They are appointed for a 14-year term by circuit judges, such as J. Sotomayor was(jur:xxxv-xxxviii), and are removed by them and district judges, not by Congress. On average, 75% of all cases enter the Federal Judiciary through the bankruptcy courts, where the money is: In 2010, bankruptcy judges ruled on $373 billion in controversy in only personal bankruptcies(jur:27§2). A large majority of such bankruptcies is filed by the most vulnerable people: bankrupts who cannot afford a lawyer and have to appear pro se. They are easy prey of the judges and their cliques(jur:81fn169). How they were appointed suggests a variation on the "Pay to Play" notion that you used to depict Sec. Clinton's sale of access to the State Department against a donation to the Clinton Foundation: "Share and share generously"(‡>ol2:440§B).

3. The J. Sotomayor asset concealment story will allow you to charge "the sleazy media" with partiality now that *NYT* is running a story about Campaign Chairman Paul Manafort having received payments under the table from the former pro-Russia Ukrainian government: Did *NYT* enter into a quid pro quo with the Obama administration to kill its J. Sotomayor story in exchange for a benefit, a hefty one? Obama nominated her, another woman and the first Latina, to the Court in order to ingratiate himself with the people and entities that had requested such a nominee from him to replace Retiring J. Souter and from whom Obama expected in return support for the passage in Congress of what was to become his signature legislation: Obamacare.

4. *NYT* could have expected to win a Pulitzer Prize if it had pursued the story until it had caused J. Sotomayor or even P. Obama to withdraw her name or resign as a judge or a justice. *NYT* could not dismiss that prospect lightly after it failed to act on a tip(jur:102fn198f) that the Watergate scandal reached into the White House, thus leaving to *WP* the historic journalistic feat of bringing down a president, Nixon, who resigned on 8aug74. *WP* and Politico, which killed the story contemporaneously with *NYT*, would not have risked letting the glory go to it. Did they too enter a quid pro quo? To find out, you can make a masterful move: Demand that Obama, J. Sotomayor, Sen. Schumer(ol2:422¶3), and the FBI release the secret FBI vetting reports on her as a district, circuit, and supreme court nominee. Challenge Sec. Clinton to join you in calling for such release, lest she show that, if elected, she will not only cover up all wrongdoing by Obama, but also engage in more of her own when nominating the successor to Late J. Scalia(ol2:437 5th¶).

5. I respectfully request a meeting to present to you and your officers this proposal and the enclosed plan for the for-profit business of exposing judicial wrongdoing.

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

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.
Judicial Discipline Reform
2165 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6506
tel. (718)827-9521

Requested Input for the Debate

1. Unaccountable judges' consequent riskless wrongdoing

a. It harms at least 100 million people who are parties to the 50 million federal & state cases filed annually, (ol:311¶1) who have their property, liberty, and all their rights and duties disposed of for judges' benefit, (ol:173¶93) and form a huge untapped voting bloc, the dissatisfied with the judiciary, part of your base:
The Dissatisfied With The Establishment

2. President Obama: "Clinton is steady and true"

a. Discredit him by showing that he lied to the American people when he vouched for the honesty of Then-Judge Sotomayor(jur:xxxv-xxxviii), whom *NYT*, *WP*, and Politico suspected of concealing assets(jur:65fn107a,c);

b. Then-Senator Clinton also confirmed judges;

c. taint them, the Democratic brand, and the Establishment by causing the media(ol:319) to investigate two unique, national stories of judicial wrongdoing(ol:154¶3; jur:5§3):
Obama-Sotomayor and Federal Judiciary-NSA(ol2:440);
and
Trump becomes the voting bloc's Champion of Justice(ol2:445)

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
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

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

September 16, 2016

Mr. Donald J. Trump
Donald J. Trump for President, Inc.
725 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Dear Mr. Trump,

1. On the Internet, you requested input for your debate with Sec. Clinton. Here is mine. It rests firmly on your statement at the Values Conference that the most important decision that a president has to make short of declaring war is to nominate justices to the Supreme Court. It shows the importance to you and *We the People* of the rule of law and its application by honest justices:

   a. Although 2,293 federal judges were in office on 30sep15(*>jur:22fn13), in the last 227 years since the creation of the Federal Judiciary in 1789, the number of them impeached and removed is 8!(jur:21§1). If President Obama and his cabinet were appointed to office for life and were in effect irremovable, would you and voters fear that they would abuse their power in self-interest?

   b. Chief circuit judges abuse judges' self-disciplining authority by dismissing 99.82%(jur:10-14) of complaints against their peers; with other judges they deny up to 100% of appeals to review such dismissals(jur:24§b). By judges immunizing themselves from liability for their wrongdoing, they deny complainants their 1st Amendment right to "redress of grievances"(*>ol:364fn12).

   c. Circuit judges appoint bankruptcy judges(jur:43fn61a), whose rulings come on appeal before their appointers, who protect them. In CY 2010, these appointees decided who kept or received the $373 billion at stake in only personal bankruptcies(42fn60). *Money! lots of money!* the most insidious corruptor(27§2). It has fueled a bankruptcy fraud scheme(65§B; jur:xxxv-xxxviii).

   d. In the Federal Judiciary, the model for its state counterparts, its circuit judges dispose of 93% of appeals on procedural grounds and with "unsigned, unpublished, without comment, by consolidation decisions"(†>ol2:457§D) so perfunctory that the judges do not even have to read the pleadings to rubberstamp a ¢5 form where the only operative word is overwhelmingly "Affirmed" and which they deprive of precedential value. But they require parties to pay a filing fee of $505. It is a scam! It is bound to outrage the public and rally it and the media behind your call that...

   e. ...the media should investigate wrongdoing in the Judiciary through two unique, national stories (ol2:440): P. Obama-Justice Sotomayor –while a nominee she was suspected by *NYT*, *WP*, and Politico of concealing assets(jur:65fn107a,c); and Judiciary-NSA on interception of communications of critics of judges(ol2:476), which can explode into a scandal bigger than Snowden's.

2. There is probable cause to believe that my communications with other critics and victims of wrongdoing judges have been intercepted(ol2:425). That can be ascertained by IT experts, just as Former CBS Reporter Sharyl Attkisson(ol:215) and CBS hired such experts and they ascertained that her personal and work computers had been hacked. On that basis, she has sued through her attorneys at Judicial Watch(ol:216fn2) the Department of Justice for $35 million for hacking her computers in search of files on her investigative reporting on the attacks at the Benghazi embassy and the fiasco of DoJ's Fast and Furious gunrunning operation(ol:346¶131).

3. At the debate, denouncing wrongdoing(ol2:437) by judges, some confirmed by Then-Sen. Clinton, and proposing those stories can launch a Watergate-like investigation; let you set the campaign's key issue; and rally the huge(ol:311) untapped voting bloc of the dissatisfied with the judiciary to your website(362, 444), ideas(423), and business(463). To present this input to you and your officers, I respectfully request a meeting.

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
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

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

September 29, 2016

Mr. Donald J. Trump
Donald J. Trump for President, Inc.
725 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Dear Mr. Trump,

1. In your first presidential debate, you challenged Sec. Clinton to produce her 30,000 deleted emails in exchange for your production of your tax returns. While she did not take up your challenge, she did not turn it down either. This opens the opportunity for you to raise the stakes by making a national announcement on tweets, emails, at rallies, and through Gov. Pence at his vice presidential debate that will build up enormous expectation and focus the attention on you:

   a. At 8:05 a.m. on Saturday, October 8, the eve of the 2nd presidential debate, Mr. Trump will enter through the right door the studio of Good Morning America with George Stephanopoulos and Robin Roberts of ABC, the network of the anchor of that debate, Martha Raddatz, and before the cameras of the national and international media and the eyes of scores of millions of viewers he will be holding a copy of his tax returns with a flash drive on top containing their digital version in a not-passworded pdf file, none bearing any redactions.

   b. If Sec. Clinton enters through the left door holding a copy of her 30,000 deleted emails with a flash drive on top containing their digital version in a not-passworded pdf file, none bearing any redactions, both candidates will walk to, and release them on, a table behind which there will be five people, the document receivers, who indisputably enjoy their trust:

      1) Martha Raddatz, anchor of the second presidential debate;
      2) the moderator of the second presidential debate, Anderson Cooper of CNN;
      3) the moderator of the third presidential debate, Chris Wallace of Fox News; and
      4) the chairs of the Commission on Presidential Debates (CPD), Mr. Frank J. Fahrenkopf, Jr., and Mr. Michael D. McCurry.

   c. If after checking the paper and digital versions of those documents at least three of these five document receivers agree that Mr. Trump and Sec. Clinton have produced what they are supposed to, the receivers will use the flash drives to make those documents available on the websites of ABC, CNN, Fox, CPD, and the websites of the national and international media represented at that event. There will be some 36 hours for the media, the viewers, and the rest of the world to analyze the documents before the debate the next day.

   d. If one candidate fails to show up and produce the expected documents to the receivers, the other will not be required to produce his or hers, but may do so voluntarily. Obviously, if with the cameras of the world trained on a door the corresponding candidate fails to enter through it with the documents in hand, he or she will suffer a credibility-devastating blow.

2. On this occasion, you, Mr. Trump, can **a.** denounce unaccountable judges, some confirmed by Then-Sen. Clinton, who risklessly engage for their benefit in wrongdoing that deprives parties and everybody else of their property, liberty, and rights, and intercept their communications to protect themselves, which can set off a scandal; **b.** call for a Watergate-like generalized media investigation of the two unique national stories of P. Obama-Justice Sotomayor and NSA-Federal Judiciary (infra); **c.** demand nationally televised hearings on judges' wrongdoing; **d.** cause the resignation of judges, whose vacancies you will get to fill; and **e.** attract the huge untapped voting bloc of the dissatisfied with the judiciary, part of The Dissatisfied With The Establishment. To present this and other proposals[1], I[2] respectfully request a meeting with you and your officers.

Sincerely, Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.
DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org
2165 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6506
tel. (718)827-9521

How Donald Trump, to avoid going to Election Day on a 50% chance of winning or losing it, can take advantage of the carefully staged show before the national and international media of his readiness to make his tax returns public to

1. denounce the unaccountability of judges, which gives rise to the mindset of impunity that induces them to engage risklessly in wrongdoing, including illegal, criminal activity;
2. call on the media to investigate the following two unique national stories of judges' wrongdoing; and
3. demand nationally televised hearings on such wrongdoing and its cover-up by President Obama and other Establishment politicians;

whereby Trump can emerge as

THE VOICE OF THE DISSATISFIED WITH THE ESTABLISHMENT,

THE CHAMPION OF JUSTICE OF THE HUGE UNTAPPED VOTING BLOC OF THE VICTIMS OF WRONGDOING AND ABUSIVE JUDGES, and

THE Architect of the New American Judicial System

September 29, 2016

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
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

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

October 11, 2016

Subjects of articles on institutionalized judicial wrongdoing in the proposed paid series of articles for publication

1. The series of articles offers you –the publisher, editors, and colleagues– and me the opportunity to pioneer the news and publishing field of judicial unaccountability reporting in the public interest as well as your own, your publication's, and my commercial and reputational interest. We can reasonably pioneer that series because it is attuned to the mood of the largest segment of the public, The Dissatisfied With The Establishment, and the needs of our target market, the dissatisfied with the judicial and legal systems. It can give rise to a recurrent feature, e.g., a rubric or a syndicated column, or a newsletter on judicial unaccountability and judicial reform.

2. The readers of the proposed series of articles will start to understand the routineness, extent, and gravity of judges' wrongdoing. That will outrage them at judges who cloaked in impunity deny parties what *We the People* are owed in government by the rule of law: due process and equal protection of the law. They all will realize that the judiciary has institutionalized wrongdoing as its modus operandi. Only *We the* outraged *People* have the power to reform it by demanding expository news. They are the market that gives the publisher of the articles and me the incentive to pioneer the news and publishing field of judicial unaccountability reporting.

3. The series begins with the analysis of the Federal Judiciary's statistics on how its judges deal with their caseload. That first article(ol2:453) will allow the publisher and me to agree on their number, length, format, treatment of(references) and footnotes, payment, etc. It will pave the way for other articles as well as related marketing activities, such as the following:

   a. judges' unaccountability(ol:265) and their consequent riskless wrongdoing(jur:5§3; ol:154§3);

   b. their enablers and condoners(jur:81§1);

   c. its investigation through two unique national stories (ol2: 440), which can

   d. launch a Watergate-like generalized media investigation(ol:194§E) to gain readers' attention and

   e. open a market for a tour of presentations(ol:197§G) by me sponsored by you on, among other things, how the audience can:

      1) participate in the investigation(ol:115; jur:xlviii), e.g., as citizen journalists, and

      2) enter a writing contest for students -which can turn them into our future readers-;

   f. patterns of wrongdoing established by parties(ol:274; ol2:468) and

   g. through statistical, linguistic, and literary analysis(jur:131§b; ol:42, 60);

   h. the appointment of J. Scalia's successor(jur:69fn 132; jur: xxxv-xxxviii):

   i. the constitutional convention(ol:136§3);

   j. the requirements for judicial reform(jur:158§§6-8);

   k. holding a multimedia public presentation(jur:97§1; dcc:13§C) at a top university(ol2:452); and

   l. creating an institute of judicial accountability reporting and reform ad-vocacy(jur:130§5).

4. The series can induce *We the People* to reform the judiciary by asserting our status as the masters of even our judicial public servants, who are hired by, and must be accountable to, us. It can also(ol:3§6) make us Champions of Justice. So let's meet to discuss the terms of publication.

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
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

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

October 28, 2016

Mr. Donald Trump, Jr.
Donald J. Trump for President, Inc.
725 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Dear Mr. Trump, Jr.,

1. It has been written that "Trump did not create chaos; chaos created Trump"[1]. That chaos has generated his base in the dominant segment of the national public: The Dissatisfied With The Establishment. This is a proposal for him to secure his base's support by showing that 'the system is rigged' in that part of the Establishment that counts the most: the Federal Judiciary.

2. Mr. Trump has recognized that nominating candidates to the Supreme Court is the most important decision that a president can make after that of declaring war. Appointments to the Judiciary are so important that they were the subject of the first question of the third debate.

3. Indeed, one federal judge can hold a law enacted by the 535 members of Congress and the President unconstitutional and five justices can declare it null and void. So politicians put judges on the bench and then hold them unaccountable to avoid retaliation that can doom their legislative agenda. They spare judges criticism, never mind investigation, let alone prosecution. Consequently, in the last 227 years, only 8 federal judges have been impeached and removed. Additionally, judges are the only public officers that have an aggressive abusegenic privilege: They have life appointment, and with it comes a sense of entitlement and time to act on grudges.

4. The result of the corruptive 'live and let live' scheme, compounded by abuse of their self-disciplining authority to self-immunize from liability(*>jur:21§§1-3)[2], is that federal judges -of whom 2,293 were in office on 30sep15- do whatever they want sure that they will suffer no adverse consequence. They wield arbitrary, 'absolute power, which "corrupts absolutely"'(jur:27fn28).

5. Judges are supposed to ensure that 'our government is, not of men and women, but by the rule of law'. Yet, for their benefit(ol:173¶93), they abuse their power over your and our property, liberty, and rights. So, they disregard due process and the equal protection of the law; and dispose of 93% of appeals in decisions "on procedural grounds, by consolidation, unpublished, unsigned, without comments"; most are non-precedential as-hoc summary orders on ¢5 forms(†>ol2:453)[2].

6. Unaccountable judges wreak chaos in the application of the law, thus provoking public dissatisfaction with a system of justice rigged with institutionalized wrongdoing(jur:49§4). That is how judges cause profound dissatisfaction in the more than 100 million parties to the more than 50 million cases filed in the state and federal courts every year(jur:8fn4,5). This does not begin to count the scores of millions of cases pending or deemed to have been wrongly or wrongfully decided or the related people affected: family, friends, employees, suppliers, etc.

7. Chaos can lead to nothing but deeper dissatisfaction. It can also compel the change toward the more equitable society that P. Obama promised but did not deliver, for he used the Establishment's means to attempt change. Transformative chaos must expose wrongdoing that so outrages (ol2:461§G) the public as to cause a trust and institutional crisis that renders change inevitable.

8. Chaos you have added; more you will cause. But if you can harness your chaos and that of The Dissatisfied, you can use chaos as the force that unrelentingly and unmitigatedly exposes the full extent, routineness, and gravity of the wrongdoing(jur:65§B) that festers in politicians/judges' connivance; and subjects judicial public servants to accountability to their masters, *We the People.*

9. Sec. Clinton is a member of the Establishment, the beneficiary of continuity, the loser in the event of change, the opposer to chaos, the sworn enemy of even harnessed chaos, which is potentially more effective and thus more menacing. Then-Senator Clinton confirmed nominees to the federal bench only to protect and turn them into unaccountable judges. Hence, she cannot afford to have judicial wrongdoing investigated, which can not only expose wrongdoing judges, but also incriminate her as an accessory after their first wrong that she tolerated and before all subsequent wrongs that she thus encouraged(jur:88§§a-c). Her political self-preservation is the interest that she prioritizes over protecting *the People*. She can be depicted as one of the connivers, who will not usher in any change in the safe haven for wrongdoers, the Federal Judiciary.

10. At a press conference and rallies, Mr. Trump can denounce(jur:98§2) a Judiciary rigged with constitutional checks and balances that have been rendered inoperative by connivance and abuse; and ask professional and citizen journalists to expose it by investigating the two unique national stories of P. Obama-Justice Sotomayor and Judiciary-NSA(ol2:440). Their findings of widespread judges' "appearance of impropriety"(jur:68fn123a) will force judicial resignations and erupt in the chaos that emboldens *the* outraged *People* to demand accountability(jur:158§§6-8).

11. I want to contribute to Mr. Trump's chaos that through official investigation with the powers of subpoena, search and seizure, contempt, and disclosure of FBI vetting reports tears the Judiciary's garment, not the one prescribed by law, but that worn in practice to cover up wrongdoing as the modus operandi of its Black Robed Predators(ol:85), dark knights who from benches prey on those who enter the courts and those outside them. So, I also submit this letter as an application to become a staff(cf.ol2:483) in his administration; otherwise, on the team building his TV station, especially its investigative(ol:194§E) newscast. The latter is discussed in my skit(ol2:501§G) that portrays him and Sec. Clinton addressing the recent charity gala. Imagine if he had performed a skit that made him come off so gracious, humorous, and witty as to turn him into the one who stole the show and endeared himself to the public. I can write other similar skits(id.).

12. To present this and other proposals[3] for expository chaos as the force of change by public outrage and discuss this job application, I[4] respectfully request a meeting with him and you.

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

Sincerely, Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

---

1. Jonathan Rauch, How American Politics Went Insane, The Atlantic, July-August 2016; and interview on PBS aired on September 19, 2016, http://www.thirteen.org/programs/pbs-newshour/is-this-syndrome-causing-american-political-dysfunction_clip/.

2. The statements preceding, and the materials corresponding to, the (blue text references) are based on, and found in, respectively, my study of judges and their judiciaries, which is titled and downloadable thus:

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

* Vol. 1: http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/*OL*/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf >all prefixes:page# up to ol:393

† Vol. 2: http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/*OL2*/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf >from ol2:394

3. See my previous letters to Mr. Trump and supporting materials, which lay out more proposals for exposing politicians-judges' connivance and wrongdoing, collected in the file whose link is in the footer.

4. https://www.linkedin.com/in/dr-richard-cordero-esq-0508ba4b; @DrCorderoEsq

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

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
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

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

October 25, 2016

How Sec. Clinton stole the show at the charity gala, causing Mr. Trump to concede that "She's such a naspy, naspy woman", and the strategy that she devised to turn "naspy" into the theme that would win her the election

******* Part 1 of 2: At the charity gala *******

Everybody knows that the third presidential debate between Mr. Donald Trump and Sec. Hillary Clinton was yet another display of personal animosity between them. It was there for everybody to see before they even uttered a word, as both entered the stage, walked up to their respective podium, and stayed put. They did not shake hands then, let alone at the end of the debate.

Thereby they reflected the disunity that has split our country into not just two factions, but rather several bitterly opposed factions incapable of budging toward each other to meet at or near a democratic, pragmatic, and constructive center for the benefit of all of us, *We the People*.

What few know is how each of the candidates could have thought of transforming the animus of that occasion into the theme of a strategy that would reunite the country behind her or him and lead to a win on Election Day.

The first opportunity to do so came the day following the debate, Thursday, October 20, at the annual Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation Dinner, a charity gala intended to bring in money to help poor children in New York. This is an occasion for self-deprecating humor, not for mean-spirited, acerbic criticism of an opponent.

It was Sec. Clinton who understood it to be such. Chance had determined that she would take the podium first. When she did, she seized the opportunity to do something that nobody had ever done. Normally, at such an occasion, laughs are drawn by one joke after another, as stand-up comedians do. Instead, she embarked on one single "Hillyarious" story in length, content, and tone. It brought the house down. It brought her up on their shoulders. This is what she said when she went to the podium.

"Coming tonight to this uplifting event is in itself very uplifting after the third presidential debate that we had last night. It gives me, and I'm sure Donald too, the opportunity to continue the very congenial atmosphere in which we exchanged so many substantive ideas.

"I was so positively excited at the end of it. He finally convinced me of how much I mean to his campaign and how admiring of me he is by not letting even two minutes go by without talking about me with effusive comments. You have grown on me. I felt the two of us came closer than ever before to being on the friendly terms that we had put so much effort to establish between us.

"Our friendship has a bright future. When you, as it is likely to happen, win and go to the White House, you won't be alone, feeling lost without me inspiring your every sentence, with nothing left to do but improvise the details of how to govern. I'll be there...again, for I was there for 8 years, as the first woman in the seat of the presidency. You only have to call on me for guidance and I'll jump to your side to hold your hand through every step, however difficult the case may be, even the not so simple matters of what to say and where to say it. Don't worry, I'll be

prudent, letting you appear to be governing, just as I did when Bill was said to be the president.

"This explains why last night, I slept restfully in the warm embrace of that reassuring prospect of our distribution of labor. It goes to your credit, Donald, that you elicited it with your praise-laden characterization of me as "Such a..." Oh, Donald!, I'm so thankful and fond of you.

"So much such that I would like to share with you and all of you gathered here tonight the dream that I had last night. We may be able, I so hope, to continue it tonight.

"Indeed, I had a dream. In my dream, I had moved back to my little hut in the suburbs after I had been trounced at the election and had to decide whether to concede my defeat or to run once more to the courts to mount a ballistic attack. As you know, I am not afraid of filing lawsuits. I have sued people left and right, well mostly left, not as of right.

"But I was rather depressed. I had just learned that while I was campaigning, thieves had broken into my home and stolen everything, including my most precious possessions: my jewels by Microsoft and Apple. I feel so exposed when I am not wearing them.

"In addition, I felt lonely. Bill was again running after some mothers...and fathers too, looking after their needs at our soup kitchen foundation.

"Then the telephone rang. But I was not in the mood to talk. But it kept ringing. But I still was not in the mood to talk. But the telephone kept ring. I thought it was yet another marketer trying to sell me another package of psychiatric counseling for people in suicidal situations.

"Then it hit me that perhaps it was Chelsea asking why the pictures of my grandchildren that she had emailed me had bounced. She has sent me more than 33,000. I adore each one of them, the pictures, that is, not those little wet brats running around, crying, and disrupting my attention to guarding state secrets.

"So I picked up the phone. You can't believe who it was! Go on, take a guess. Come on, guess. Wait, have you fallen asleep? The one with the dream is me. You're supposed to be awake and listening! O.K., I tell you: It was Donald! He was so consoling and empathetic, as he always is with everybody, especially those weaker than him, so everybody. He was what I needed. He said"

> "I don't claim to know what you're going through because I have never been crushed in an election as you just were by me.
>
> "Moreover, I have fired more people in my life than I have hired and I could read their pain in their faces. I can only imagine how you feel after President Obama commented on your defeat saying that he knew you would be flattened at the polls because you had turned out to be his worst appointment ever and the most incompetent secretary of state in the history of our nation, a disgrace, a total disgrace. He said for good measure that he was firing you retroactively. That hurts, I guess."

"Donald then offered to send me the clip of the President's utter repudiation if I had not seen it. He is such a generous man!, he is. In fact, you won't believe what he then said to calm me down.

> "I know I am about to move into your former home in D.C. and that every time you'll picture mentally your living room, I'll be there; and every time you'll picture your kitchen, I'll be there; and every time you picture your bedroom, I'll be there with somebody.
>
> "So I would like to make it up to you: I'm inviting you to my victory party at Trump Tower. You'll have the opportunity to see the campaign headquarters that I have been running there as a circus and that beat you into the dust. Tonight, we will have special

performances by my closest friends."

"That was a fantastic invitation, Donald, and so timely. I was really chocking in that hut in the suburbs. A high tower is what you need when you are suffocating and contemplating suicide. At least you catch some fresh air on your way down.

"So he sent his private 747 stretched-out jet to pick me up on my doorstep. In no time, we landed on the roof of Trump Tower. It was all worth it. The show was fabulous, as was the company.

"Although Trump has pulled off so many stunts in this campaign, he surpassed himself with a new one: He swung from chandelier to chandelier over his dinner table, dropped at the end of it before Melania's plate, opened his arms, and sung to her Al Jolson's "Mammy, forgive me!" as Gov. Pence and Campaign CEO Stephen Bannon played the old tune at **https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=684n8FO68LU** since Donald is such a big fan of historical facts and accuracy.

"Then it was his best friends' turn:

"Putin danced with one after the other of his Russian dolls in a ballet set ever dangerously closer to the fireworks of a sparking Internet switch.

"Turkish President Erdogan lassoed sheep, rabbits, and chicken dressed as ghosts as they scurried and fluttered over the circus's rings in his number "I catch you 'cause I can".

"President Xi Jinping vaulted the Trump Tower using as a pole a T-beam made of Chinese steel borrowed from Donald's warehouse.

"For my entertainment, Julian Assange of WikiLeaks worked his magic by bringing from the dead my deleted emails. I'm so grateful to him for all he has done to reunite me with my loved ones!

"It was so much fun! I just couldn't believe I was dreaming. But Donald assured me that I wasn't, saying

> "This is how things are in reality. Here at headquarters, I run a campaign as highly coordinated and in sync as a three-ring circus. It is how I will run government. And I want to assure you that however busy I will be recouping the money that I invested in the campaign, including a salary for me as a candidate for the people, the doors of the White House will always be open for you whenever you want to crawl in begging for a favor."

"I was so excited. What a generous man, Donald is. So now that we are here and awake, a least I am, I would like to beg the first favor of you, Donald. After we are done with these boring speeches, can I come tonight to your Circus at the Tower?"

Trump, always the gentleman to all ladies, in general, and babes, in particular, stood up and replied with his customary wide open smile, "Yes, dear, come to tonight's performance."

Hillary was overjoyed. As she always spreads inviting warmth to everybody around her, she blurted, "Can I bring over my friends, please?"

With open arms, Trump said in his raspy voice of a circus master of ceremonies, "I grant your second begging. The friends of Hilly are my friends. Yes, bring all of them over."

It was the first time that he had called her Hilly. She was ecstatic !

"I am so grateful that you have come to appreciate me enough to call me Hilly. I long to learn more about you as a person, Donald the Man, not just the wise statesman.

"The fact is Donald is a very modest person and talks little about himself and even less about his

issues…or ours. He has this amazing capacity to summarize in only 140 characters what others would need a platform book to say it. It is as if every character were a coded message.

"I must admit, I'm not clever enough at decoding; but I'm sure those among you who have a doctorate in disencryptology and access to a supercomputer get the richness of Donald's one forty wisdom.

"That's why I so loved the debates: Even in what little was left in his two-minute answers after praising me, he could concentrate on the issues so much insightful information. You could see it even without an electronic microscope. He is just so skilled at sharing information, actually wisdom. When I grow up, in intelligence, I want to be like him, my intellectual hero.

"As for now, I rejoice at the opportunity to get to know Donald the Man in the protective company of my friends." So she slowly pivoted on her feet as she kept repeating: "You heard him, my friends, you all can come with me tonight to see Trump in his Circus at the Tower."

All were as exhilarated by the prospect of the extraordinary things that they would see at his circus as they had been by the phantasmagoric things that had appeared in his campaign.

Hillary, who is so forward looking to anticipate the consequences of her acts, said to her friends: "After I'll take you there, Donald's assistants will be exhausted from running after him to clean up after his acts. We should bring them some entertainment of our own." She looked around and shouted: "Bill, Bill, where are you? Bill Gate, stand up so we can see you."

Bill Gate stood up. She asked him, "Can you bring your video games?" Bill nodded.

Then she called out: "Goldman, Goldman Sachs, where are you?"

The people at a table stood up somewhat hesitatingly. She asked them, "Can you bring your monopoly and your new game 'Pay to Play'?" Though they looked timid, they too nodded.

She went on, "Marco, where are you, Marco? Please step up so somebody can see you."

Marco Rubio stepped on the table and she asked him, "Can you tell your story of survival tonight? It is going to be so uplifting to Donald's senior staff in its first part and to him in its second part. I mean your story, "The Dwarf In Influence and his Seven Snow Whites?"

Marco grinned affirmatively.

"You're great!", said Hillary. Then she added:

"We can follow your act with two more that are sure to be a hit. Rosie O'Donnell, that old flame of Donald's, can sing the song that made the couple famous back in the days when Donald was starting off as one of his father's construction workers, 'I left my heart in the tower' ".

Rosie stood up, raised her right arm and her middle finger as if it were the torch of the Statute of Liberty, and with her left hand she held, instead of a tablet with the Declaration of Independence, her fork, stabbing it up and down.

Hillary addressed herself to the person sitting next to Trump, Cardinal Timothy Dolan.

"Father Dolan, you are Donald's spiritual advisor and have been so successful in instilling in him the Christian values of generosity, compassion, and humility. We would be so strengthened in our faith in humankind and the future of American politics if you came with us and had your choir children perform your latest choreographed mass, "Angels Dancing under a Pinhell"."

The Cardinal nodded as he flashed his endearing avuncular smile.

Hillary looked at the table where Trump's children were sitting and signaled to them to stand up. They did slowly, unsure of what was to come. She said, "I love you so much! More than my grandchildren: No messy pampers and all that. So, we're going to bring you a gift. I know you have everything. But do you like a big surprise gift?" Trump's children nodded somewhat embarrassed. But Hillary said with that confidence-inspiring demeanor that is her trademark, "We're going to bring you puppets!"

Lastly, Hillary addressed Trump again. "We all are going to have so much fun tonight. Thanks to your penchant for inclusiveness, the whole of us will be with you at your circus."

Then she turned to the house: "All the babes will be there. Babes, stand up. You're going to enjoy yourselves safely with all of us who love and respect you. Yes, babes, you know who you are, please, stand up." As she insisted, a few of the most beautiful young ladies stood up.

"You're gorgeous! and you too, all the other babes, stand up, you're always babes to somebody. Boys, boys, let's give our babes a loving and respectful round of applause!"

As the men began to applaud, more and more women began to stand up bashfully. Yet, their faces were flushed with gratitude and joy.

"And all the Hispanics, stand up. You are coming with us to the circus tonight."

Now the women began to applaud as men also stood up.

"You, the Muslims, you are joining us, stand up! Let's go together to the circus."

More people kept standing up and the house was shaking with a thunderous applause.

"You, the Blacks, stand up, up up up, you want circus with us! Yes, we want circus!"

The house was overtaken by a frenzy of joy as everybody began to chant, "We want circus!, We want circus!"

Hillary had to shout to make herself heard:

"You, the people with disabilities, stand up, roll with us, let us take you to the circus with us!, for we all want circus! We want circus! We want circus!"

Hillary was alone at the podium, but she stretched out her arms as if she were reaching out to hold hands with people next to her and then began to swing her arms to and fro.

Soon everybody began holding hands and swinging their arms. At a round table where the men were wearing small caps as headdress, that is, kippahs or yarmulkes, they and the women began to lean to the right as they held hands and then to the left until they fluidly began taking steps to one side and then the opposite side; soon they were circling their tables, their eyes, their hold bodies twinkling with carefree amusement. Their dancing spread as if embers of a bonfire carried by a twister of irrepressible joy were igniting it at other tables.

Those sitting at the rectangular long tables, the high tables, began to sway sideways with cheerful abandon. At other tables, people laughed and giggled and rhythmically let out high pitched cries to match the creaks of their knees and hips as they bobbed up and down while swinging their handheld arms in the opposite direction. The house kept chanting with furor as their paroxysm rose in unison, "*We want circus!" We want circus! We want circus!*"

As soon as Hillary sensed that exhaustion was taking over, she began to talk loudly and slowly to calm people down. Gradually, ever more puffing and panting people began to stand still. They were sweaty, their throats were sore, their arms were barely attached to their sockets,

but all were brimming with the emotions unleashed by a totally unexpected, spontaneous physical manifestation of the joy of sharing an unforgettably congenial experience.

“Since the third debate, I have relished Donald’s novel characterization of me. He said I was “Such a naspy woman”. I don’t quite know what ‘naspy’ means. But I know one thing: If he said that of me, then it must be a heartfelt compliment, for he is the kindest, sweetest man I know.

“I guess with ‘naspy’ he summarized in even less than 140 characters what he said at the second debate, that I was a determined person that never quits and keeps going at it no matter what. I hope that it also means what I have shown tonight: I am the Reunifier of Americans.

“Thank you for calling me naspy. It has inspired me a lot and I hope many other women and men too. Whenever you open your mouth, you become my ace card, my Trumpy! Friends, let’s express our appreciation to Trumpy with the strongest and above all sincere round of applause.”

She began to clap and chant and everybody joined her, stamping with every strike of their hands the earnest message of the joy of togetherness that they were sending to their addressee:

“Trumpy! Trumpy! Trumpy!”

Trump stood up and, as he always does, humbly bowed to the house. Soon Boehner tears flowed to his eyes, for deep down, as his best friend and under-the-skin connoisseur, Elizabeth Warren, put it, “Trump is an outwardly secure, yet big-hearted, emotionally grabbable man”.

As soon as he began to compose himself, he walked to the podium. By then, Hillary had been scurried away by Huma Abedin, her Campaign Vice Chairwoman, who had come to share with her the good tidings of yet another miraculous Resurrection of Clinton’s Emails and had taken her to offer thankful prayers and make a plea for the salvation of her soul and her campaign. It was Trump’s turn to roast himself and, respectful of all traditions and customs, he did.

“Dear *my* friends of mine. I realize that to follow...her...Hillary...Hi...Hilly’s act opens a great opportunity for me. The skit that I prepared is, of course, the most self-deprecating and the most gracious toward an opponent in the history of all charity galas since the Last Supper. However, I clearly anticipate, because I always do it all, that if I were to do my skit, I would so outperform Hi...Hilly that it would be embarrassing...for her, I mean, of course.

“That would not be in keeping with the gentleman that I am and have always been since Adam took the blame for Eve eating the apple, because nobody is more of a gentleman than I am to all women, whether they eat apples or way too much. It follows that I want you all to come to my Three Ring Circus at the Tower tonight.

“There will be ice cream and hot chocolate; peanuts and pumpkins; salty crackers and sweet potatoes; and all sorts of treats and plenty of tricks and even more ghosts and rattling shackles because with me it is every day and night *Halloween!* and you never know what you’re going to get...I myself don’t know what I’m going to give. But it is going to be spooky, believe me!

“And you don’t have to worry about overindulging in believing or eating because I am going to have my personal doctor over there, the wonderful Dr. Ben Carson. If any of you feels sick to your stomach with what you had to swallow in my circus, I will have him give you what he has been offering to give me since he gave himself one with such enlightening effect that he dropped out of the primaries to support me: a lobotomy, better than Obamacare, no ever higher annual premiums, just one shot at it and you’re forever a healthier person.

“I haven’t taken Ben up on his offer because I have been too busy with my charity works, the

main one of which is, of course, my participation in the presidential campaign to relieve the American people of its hunger for a reasonable, knowledgeable, and reassuringly reliable leader. In any event, during my exhaustive preparation for the debates, I read a yellow sticky on medicine and now I know more about medicine than Ben and his peers, the so-called surgeons general, so pompous, generals too! I bet, they don't know anything about commanding troops on the battlefield, as I do. Believe me! So I myself will give each of you a lobotomy if it turns out on November 9 that you failed to grant my friend Hilly her only and consuming wish: to go back full time to her true calling as an email specialist. She's such a naspy woman!"

As soon as Hillary's Campaign Manager, Robby Mook, heard those words, he seized the opportunity to give the signal to his assistants at his table. As one man, they jumped up, climbed on their chairs, and began chanting at the top of their voices:

"We want naspy! We want naspy! We want naspy!"

In every corner of the house, people popped up and joined them in chanting. In no time, the whole house had turned to where Hillary had taken a seat next to her adoptive spiritual father, Cardinal Dolan, who had played such a decisive role in her conversion to the credo of One Message, One Truth. Graciously, Hillary took the Cardinal's arm and raised it as if it were that of Sen. Kaine. The room went crazy, chanting with insane passion:

"She's a naspy! She's a naspy! She's a naspy!"

Still at the podium, Trump took it all in with great satisfaction, spreading his arms wide open, like Nixon bidding farewell at the door of the helicopter after resigning on August 9, 1974. He was basking in the as yet unspoken, self-congratulatory claim that it was thanks to his effort for years that a person had been born right there among the people: *Hilly the naspy!*

By contrast, Trump's Campaign Manager, Kellyanne Conway, had grasped the gravity of the situation: With her event-appropriate, self-deprecating, and Trump-complimentary skit, Hillary had stolen the show. She would be portrayed by the media as charitable toward her opponent, gracious in style, and surprisingly "Hillyarious". But Trump had managed to place himself at the opposite, negative end of his bipolar assessment of everything, which admits of no degrees between the extremes of a simple dualistic set of best ever and worst ever. Hillary had played him.

That had been Hillary's sole objective: to turn the charity gala into her show. However, even before she, Kaine, Robby, Huma, and her top aides had left the Waldorf Astoria hotel where the gala was held, they had the effervescent sense that not only had they attained that objective much better than expected, but also an unexpected window of opportunity had opened on the term *Hilly the naspy!* They felt that the immensely enjoyable and favorable gala experience was a situation-changing event: It gave them momentum. But they could not yet realize that if they worked with it strategically, they could turn it into the material for an October surprise.

What they did realize by instinct and experience was that while on the premises, never mind within earshot of anybody else, they should not discuss the matter. Since they possessed the required discipline to proceed in accordance with their realization, they acted around the other attendees as if only sharing a moment of levity. So they kept their excitement bottled up.

********** Part 2 of 2: Strategizing **********

A. How their vans exploded soon after they were turned on

Once Hillary and her party got on their two vans and began driving to headquarters to

pick up their cars, they could not repress their excitement anymore. They exploded. It was the mad chaos of a triumphal mood. Everybody was laughing and shouting and sputtering their comments and observations at once. Nobody could understand a word of what the others were saying. It did not matter. This was not a moment for reflection; it was for unrestrained celebration.

At the end of the gala, attendees were stepping over each other to reach them, shake their hands, embrace them, and kiss them as they thanked them for a marvelously funny and entertaining evening. Now in the vans, each of them had to share with the others the compliments that had been poured on them. The torrents of reporting to the others what they had been told quickly converged into a maelstrom of confusion that whirled all the more powerfully because as soon as they got in each of their vans, they turned on their tablets, smartphones, and laptops to communicate via Skype with those in the other van. Instantly, they became Babels on wheels:

"The first skit of its kind, bound to set a new standard. Fireworks of wit. Punch lines flying like darts to the bull's eye. Gracious and elegant. The debut of a storyteller. The combination of masterful diplomacy with incisive psychology. The magical transformation of dread of a debate-like confrontation into surreal conviviality. Give it like this to Congress and you'll have a shot at your legislative agenda. A cathartic experience. An unimaginable night when the spirit soared on the wings of laughter. Humor to change hearts. The bliss of a wonderful counter-expectation. A victory for the joy of togetherness. I laughed so hard, I did it in my pants!" and on and on in sheer amazement at Hillary's gift for humor never before suspected. *Hilly* had emerged from nowhere.

B. Thinking strategically to craft the strategy for the final stretch

As they were getting close to headquarters, Sen. Kaine managed to usher in a measure of sanity by asking repeatedly, "We're arriving, people. What next?"

Robby noted that the events of the night would be highlighted by the media the next day and they had to be ready to add momentum to the favorable press that they would receive. So Hillary asked them to come in to do something whose meaning they understood right away: to think strategically about the new situation.

Indeed, they had discussed on several occasions the concept of strategic thinking that they had found at *>ol:52§C in the study by Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.:

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 >all prefixes:page number up to ol:393

† **Volume 2:** http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/*OL2*/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf >from ol2:394

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

By thinking strategically to analyze the new situation and devise a plan of action as described in that study, they reached a significant initial determination. The event at the gala and the imminence of its becoming known nationally presented them with a new option for the final stretch of the campaign: to leave the nastiness of the campaign behind and take a kind, uplifting,

and joyful high road to victory led by a funny and gregarious reunifier capable of bringing the best in everybody for the common good: *Hilly the naspy!*

C. Defining "naspy" as the positive core of their new theme

The "Such a nasty woman" characterization that Trump had thoughtlessly hurled at Hillary as he unraveled the deeper he got into the third debate and the thinner his self-discipline wore, would be transformed into a term of their own. The Hillary campaign would not ask people to swallow their distaste of everything nasty and nevertheless proclaim themselves nasty as a cry of defiance and self-assertion.

Instead, they would coin "naspy". They would define it as a positive, complimentary term meaning not only determined and 'non-quitting', but also exuding civility, graceful, kind, witty, resourceful, and contagiously optimistic so as to be an inspiring, winning leader. It would be a term to be uttered without second thoughts. Rather than "stronger" to fight an opponent, the emphasis would be laid on "together" to join the joy. "Naspy" would be the core of the positive, uplifting theme for their new strategy to guide the campaign in the final days of the race.

Now they had to flesh out the 'naspy' term with the details needed for strategy implementation. They did not have much time to do so. They stayed at headquarters and got to work.

D. Crafting TV ads of all kinds of people joyfully walking to a voting center

Hillary, Kaine, Robby, Huma, and other assistants bandied ideas from here to there. Progressively, their ideas began to take shape and win consensus: They wanted an ad portraying people from all walks of life moving briskly from different directions, even dancing as they sang to invite others along the way, including those who looked the opposite of them, to join in a joyful trip that converged on a unifying center, that is, a voting center on Election Day where Hillary was to welcome them.

This led to a discussion of an appropriate place that would suggest the center of something. Robby came up with the idea of the green field of the Upper West Side Morningside Heights campus of Columbia University, of which he was an alumnus, because people could converge between the buildings on it and have the Low Memorial Library in the background that could bring to mind both the White House and the Supreme Court building as a...

"The triumphal arch!", shouted Huma, who had held a volunteer recruiting speech at a student association of archrival New York University.

It was an instant hit: The Washington Square Arch in Lower Manhattan, surrounded by NYU buildings, conjured up the idea of celebration of a triumphal victory, indeed, that of George Washington.

However, getting the necessary permits to film physically at the Square would take too long, as would cordoning it off to prevent it from being flooded by students, tourists, street performers, neighbors, cyclists, vehicles, delivery trucks, etc. So they decided to do it the high tech way: They would go digital.

The movement of people would be filmed at the Madison Square Garden, where a true circus, that of the Ringling Brothers, usually performed. Thereafter scenes from the Columbia University campus and the Washington Square Arch would be added digitally. Also, the ads that

would run in battleground states would use the same movements of people and song, but an algorithm would easily perform the digital addition of equivalent well-known local buildings and monuments.

The discussion of a multitude of people swirling on the Square led to another idea.The people on the ad that would walk between a set of buildings would be dressed in the same solid color and kind of dress. As they approached the Square, they would mingle with other people dressed in other colors and kinds of dress so that as they neared the voting place under the arch they made for a kaleidoscopic crowd in joyful colors and variety of dresses. This would illustrate the message in the lyrics that they would sing: Hilly the naspy was the reunifier of America after a divisive and bruising campaign.

E. Assembling an artistic team to translate their ideas into reality

After they were reasonably satisfied with the results and could no longer keep their eyes open, they slept wherever they could for the little time that was left. As early as they could that morning, they began calling people. They contacted the manager of their account at the TV advertising agency that was making their ads and prevailed upon him to dispatch to Hillary's headquarters their best TV ad makers. They wanted to ensure that these ad people would not be distracted from producing their ads in a record short time.

They also got in touch with a composer who should come up with a catchy, vibrant, energizing song, something reminiscent of ABBA's Thank you for the music. They also got hold of a male and a female celebrity who would narrate the positive message of being joyfully reunified for the common good under the inclusive leadership of a gregarious *Hilly the naspy*.

The ad people contacted a digital studio reputed for doing the most spectacular special effects for big budget Hollywood pictures. They expected it to be willing in exchange for a hefty fee, which the campaign could easily afford, to drop everything it was doing in order to concentrate on producing in rapid sequence a series of localized TV ads for the new strategy.

F. Variations on Hilly the naspy for T-shirts, signs, and posters

As more volunteers arrived at headquarters, they were told about the new strategy. They too contributed their ideas for variations on its *Hilly the naspy* theme. Those variations would be seen at every rally in hand-held signs, posters on walls, and the T-shirts worn by volunteers working at rallies and bought by supporters, whether at rallies or on the Hillary website. Accordingly, an instruction was issued to all the state headquarters and local offices to print and distribute materials with the new logos and similar positive and uplifting ones likely to find resonance with the local voters.

Among the logos that Hillary, Kaine, Robby, Huma, and the headquarters volunteers came up with were these:

a. She's naspy!...and I too	b. We want Hilly!	c. Such a naspy Hilly
d. Naspy is the winner	e. Naspy is kinder	f. I love naspy
g. Hilly, America's reunifier	h. Be naspy, vote Hilly	i. Stronger reunified
j. Go Hilly, join us	k. Be naspy, reunify!	l. Hilly for 1 America

m. We reunify, we're naspy n. I'm naspy for Hilly o. Vote, be naspy

They also came up with ideas for designs with those logos to be printed on T-shirts in bright colors made by local shops on rush orders. Among the designs were these:

1. a color gradient that converged on a luminous center where the logo was written;
2. the logo was written in the inverted U shape of an arch;
3. the logo appeared on a billboard atop an arch;
4. the logo formed the road that ascended and led under the arch;
5. the logo appeared on the frontispiece of the arch;
6. the logo was written on the roof of a 3-D arch that tilted outwardly;
7. the logo was on the inside of the vault of a 3-D arch tilted toward the torso;
8. the logo was the arch's foundation, its legs resting on the space between two words;
9. the logo appeared in the shape and colors of a rainbow;
10. the logo appeared as lightning striking the arch and electrifying it;
11. the logo appeared as the rim of a sun that cast sunrays on the arch and brightened it;
12. the logo appeared as an incandescent arch overarching the arch and illuminating it.

Within 48 hours from the end of the charity gala, there rolled out onto the national scene the new strategy of leaving behind everything nasty about the campaign and moving forward with the naspy theme of kindness and the joy of being reunified as *We the People*. A lot rode on it for Hillary, Kaine, Robby, Huma, and everybody else involved in the campaign both at headquarters and in their offices throughout the country. Hilly the naspy was supposed to take them to victory at the polls under a triumphal arch.

In that vein, Robby, ever the electoral strategist, came up with an idea: "At every rally from now on, we will replay the video of the charity gala before you enter the stage. It will put the audience in a joyful mood and make it see you as a well-rounded person with an insanely hilarious streak. You will tell the audience that the video is posted to your website."

Robby's idea was right on: The video went viral instantly. It was followed by a request that a high percentage of people who viewed it granted: to donate to Hillary's campaign.

G. Sec. Clinton consults with Dr. Cordero, the author of the strategic thinking concept

Soon after the new strategy was put in place, Robby and Huma suggested that Sec. Clinton bring in Dr. Cordero to consult with him on the further application of his strategic thinking concept to the campaign. They also wanted to ask for his advice on how, in case she won the election, she should proceed as president elect with the nomination of a successor to the Late Justice Scalia and to the sooner rather than later Retiring Justice Ginsburg. She also wanted to express her appreciation for his analysis of her performance at the charity gala.

The meeting was attended by the three of them and Sen. Kaine. It was very cordial and constructive. Emphasizing its forward-looking nature, Sec. Clinton asked Dr. Cordero how he could contribute to her administration if she became president. Dr. Cordero answered without hesitation

and with conviction, as if he were making a statement before a Senate confirmation committee.

“I would like to be your Attorney General. I want to carry out the investigation of the Federal Judiciary and its judges for their unaccountability and consequent riskless wrongdoing so manifest in their disregard of the requirements of due process and equal protection of the law. They have provoked the dissatisfaction with our judicial and legal systems of so many people among the more than 100 million parties to the more than 50 million cases that are filed annually in the federal and state courts(*>ol:311§1).

“The dissatisfied form a huge untapped voting bloc. They are ignored and left to fend for themselves by the politicians who recommend, nominate, and confirm judges and then hold “*their* men and women on the bench” unaccountable. They need an advocate.

“In turn, they can open the way for you to introduce the change that can help you win over the Dissatisfied With The Establishment, the ones who have given their unwavering support to Establishment Outsider Trump and Establishment Critic Sen. Sanders.

“Depending on how you handle that change, they can give you their sup-port and help you become a successful president or they can mount an even stronger challenge in the mid-term election, thus reducing your support in Congress and your 2020 reelection chances.

“As your Attorney General, I would work to make them and the rest of the country have reasons to acknowledge you as their Champion of Justice.”

After Dr. Cordero ended his answer, Sec. Clinton looked at him incredulous. She did not know whether he was joking, charity gala style, or he meant it as dead seriously as he appeared to be. Sen. Kaine, Robby, and Huma looked at each other speechless and at Dr. Cordero respectfully. Then they turned to Sec. Clinton, waiting for her to react.

Finally, she said with the benevolent smile on her face and the playful tone in her voice of a consummate diplomat.

“I don’t doubt that you could be a competent attorney general. But after reading your charity gala skit, I’d rather say that your vocation is that of a writer of dreams”...and she smiled facetiously.

The others chuckled. By contrast, Dr. Cordero replied matter-of-factly:

“But dreams don’t pay my rent and food”.

“Perhaps Saturday Night Live can give you a gig there...and next time I appear on the show you write something as funny as your charity gala skit. I can talk to some people to get you onboard.”

“I’d rather you gave me a job as an investigator of wrongdoing judges.”

“Dream on!”

“Okay, let’s begin with this: I can write skits for the many celebratory meetings that you will and should attend as part of a strategy for whipping up good will among the public and getting everybody, whether they voted for or against you, excited about attending and following on their media devices your next important public appointment: your inaugural speech in January. You wouldn’t like to have fewer people in attendance than President Obama did twice.”

That statement caught Sec. Clinton’s imagination. She appeared interested in what Dr. Cordero had to say. “And how would you go about doing that?”

“Don’t remind people of the campaign anymore. We had enough of it. Instead, joke about your transition to life without the campaign: about your plan to relax after the election only to be over-

whelmed by people asking you for a job...'but I ain't being no employment agency! I'm not working at all! I won the presidency and got free tickets on *Air Force One* to visit my friends in the 11,200 countries that I went to as a lowly secretary. Now I'm it! and I'm on holiday! until next year, or the year after that if you people keep interrupting my rest and bugging me'."

They all laughed heartily. Dr. Cordero went on.

"Tell your audience that you were taking a long bubble bath when Putin called to complain about the lights going off in Moscow and to warn you that if he found out that the blackout was your retaliation for his release of embarrassing emails of yours, he would turn the lights off in the whole of the U.S. So you told him in no uncertain terms, "Listen, you little third-rate malicious hacking despot, if I have to take a bath in cold water because of you, I'll nuke you!"

"Then you got so nervous about having sent the NSA the order for the blackout from your personal smartphone that you dropped it in the bathtub and it almost got you electrocuted. Do you have any idea, you ask your audience, how difficult it is to get your hair down when it is porcupine up with static electricity? Now you know why I almost didn't make it here."

Sec. Clinton burst into hysteric laughter and so did Sen. Kaine, Robby, and Huma. They just could not believe that Dr. Cordero had switched so swiftly and convincingly from an apparently earnest applicant for the cabinet position of attorney general to the delivery of a string of jokes performed with the flair of a stand-up comedian. That was what Dr. Cordero had been aiming for because laughter makes people thankful and receptive to the one causing it.

"The only thing that matters to me is exposing judges' unaccountability and consequent riskless wrongdoing. On September 30, 2015, there were 2,293 federal judicial officers in office. They can remain there for life. They have power over people's property, liberty, and all the rights and duties that shape their lives. And they do whatever they want, relying on their impunity because they know that in the 227 years since the creation of the Federal Judiciary in 1789, only 8 federal judges have been impeached and removed.(*>jur:21§§1-3)

"By contrast, you have a mandate limited to 4 years, subject to the checks and balances of Congress, the media, mid-term voters, the international community, and the public. Who has more means to harm people: you or judges?

"That is why I want to expose their wrongdoing. If you are not interested in doing so, the battle over the Supreme Court vacancies may offer Mr. Trump the opportunity to do it.

"He may adopt my proposal that he use the time needed to create his own TV station to attract professional and citizen journalists to the background investigation of any person nominated by you to the Court; and to launch the Watergate-like generalized media investigation(*>ol:194§E) of two unique national stories: the P. Obama-Justice Sotomayor and the Federal Judiciary-NSA stories(†>ol2:440), which will expose wrongdoing as the judges' institutionalized modus operandi(jur:65§B).

"He can publish their findings in his website's daily newscast, his version of MSNBC and the precursor of his TV newscast. I want to lead that investigation, whether for you or for him, and in both cases on behalf of *We the People* and our birthright to government by the rule of law."

Sec. Clinton looked inquiringly at Sen. Kaine, Robby, and Huma, who were looking in amazement at Dr. Cordero back in his serious skin. Sec. Clinton fixed Dr. Cordero with her eyes and became pensive. Nobody disturbed her thinking.

After a while, she said...

****

Blank

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
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

2165 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6506
tel. (718) 827-9521; follow @DrCorderoEsq
Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

May 25, 2012

The *DeLano*-Judge Sotomayor story

A judge-run bankruptcy fraud scheme covered up by a judge concealing assets of her own
An expository news piece showing
how federal judges' self-exemption from discipline, reciprocal cover-up of their wrongdoing, and unaccountability due to the failure of politicians and the media to exercise checks and balances and investigate their conduct have allowed judges to turn coordinated wrongdoing into the Federal Judiciary's institutionalized modus operandi; and
how it can set off a Watergate-like generalized media investigation whose findings can so outrage the public as to force politicians to undertake judicial reform

1. The evidence hereunder concerns what *The Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, and Politico[107a] suspected in articles contemporaneous with President Barak Obama's first justiceship nomination, to wit, that Then-Judge Sonia Sotomayor of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (CA2) had concealed assets of her own(65§1). The evidence is in the financial statements that she filed with the Senate Committee on the Judiciary[107b]. They show that in 1988-2008 she earned and borrowed $4,155,599 + her 1976-1987 earnings; but disclosed assets worth only $543,903, leaving unaccounted for $3,611,696 - taxes and the cost of her reportedly modest living[107c]. Thereby she failed to comply with that Committee's request that she disclose "in detail all [her] assets…and liabilities"[107b]. Her motive was to cover up her previous failure to comply with the requirement of the Ethics in Government Act to file a "full and complete" annual financial disclosure report[107d]. The President disregarded the evidence(77§5) of her dishonesty just as he did that of his known tax cheat nominees Tim Geithner, Tom Daschle, and Nancy Killefer[108].

2. The President also disregarded a case that incriminates Judge Sotomayor in the cover-up of concealment of assets as part of a bankruptcy fraud scheme(66§2) and in protecting the schemers[110], i.e., *DeLano*[109a],over which she presided[109b]. His vetting of her through his staff and the FBI must have found that case, for it was in the CA2's public record. The Judge so clearly realized how incriminating[131] that case was that she withheld it(69§b) from the documents that she was required by the Senate Judiciary Committee to submit in preparation for holding confirmation hearings on her justiceship nomination. By so doing, she committed perjury, for she swore that she had complied with the Committee's initial and supplemental requests for documents[107b].

3. *DeLano* concerns a 39-year veteran banker who before retiring filed his personal bankruptcy, yet remained employed by a major bank, M&T Bank, as a bankruptcy officer! He was but one of a clique of bankruptcy system insiders: His bankruptcy trustee had 3,907 *open* cases[113a] before the WBNY judge hearing the case; one of his lawyers had brought 525 cases[113b] before that judge; his other lawyer also represented M&T and was a partner in the same law firm in which that judge was a partner[113c] at the time of his appointment[113d] to the bench by CA2; and the judge was reappointed[61a] in 2006, when J. Sotomayor was a CA2 member. M&T was likely a client of that law firm[114b-c] and even of the judge when he was a bankruptcy lawyer and partner there. They participated in a bankruptcy fraud scheme run nationally and enabled by the Federal Judiciary[115].

4. A co-schemer, the 'bankrupt' officer declared $291,470 earned with his wife in the three years preceding their bankruptcy filing[117a]. Incongruously, they pretended that they only had $535 "on hand and in account"[117b]. Yet, they incurred $27,953 in known legal fees, billed by their bankruptcy lawyer, who knew that they had money to pay for his services[117c], and approved by the trustee and the judge. They also declared one single real estate property, their home, bought 30 years earlier[117d] and assessed for the purpose of the bankruptcy at $98,500, on which they declared to carry a mortgage of $77,084 and have equity of only $21,416[117e]…after making

mortgage payments for 30 years! They had engaged in a string of eight mortgages from which they received $382,187, but the trustee and the judge refused to require them to account for it[117g].

5. For six months the bankruptcy officer and his wife, their lawyers, and the trustee treated a creditor that they had listed among their unsecured creditors as such and pretended to be searching for their bankruptcy petition-supporting documents that he had requested[118a]. It was not until the creditor brought to the judge's attention[118b] that the 'bankrupts' had engaged in concealment of assets that they moved to disallow his claim[118c]. The judge called on his own for an evidentiary hearing on the motion only to deny discovery of *every single document* that the creditor requested, even the bankrupts' bank account statements, indispensable in any bankruptcy[119a]. Thereby he deprived the creditor of his discovery rights, thus flouting due process. He turned the hearing[119b] and his grant of the motion into a sham[120]. He also stripped the creditor of standing in the case so that he could not keep requesting documents, for they would have allowed tracking back the concealed assets. On appeal, the judge's colleague in the same small federal building[121a] in Rochester, NY, a WDNY district judge, also denied *every single document* requested by the creditor[121b].

6. All these circumstances rendered this bankruptcy officer's bankruptcy petition suspicious per se. Yet, when *DeLano* reached CA2, Then-Judge Sotomayor, presiding[109b], condoned those unlawful denials and denied in turn *every single document* in 12 requests[122a](16). She too needed those documents to find the facts to which to apply the law[122b]. Thus, she disregarded a basic principle of due process, which requires that the law not be applied capriciously or arbitrarily[122c] in a vacuum of facts or by willfully ignoring them. Her conduct[121c] belied her statement before the Senate Judiciary Committee that her guiding principle as a judge was "fidelity to the law"[132f].

7. Judge Sotomayor also condoned the refusal of the bankruptcy judge to disqualify himself for conflict of interests and "the appearance of impropriety"[123a-b], just as she refused to disqualify him [123c]. During her membership in the 2nd Circuit's Judicial Council[20], she too denied the petition to review the dismissal without any investigation of the misconduct complaint against him[124]. This formed part of her pattern of covering up for her peers: As a CA2 member she condoned, and as a Council member she applied, the Council's unlawful policy during the 13-year period reported online of denying 100% of petitions to review dismissals of complaints against her peers[125a]. Thereby she contributed to illegally abrogating in effect an act of Congress giving complainants the right to petition for review[123b]; and also condoned the successive CA2 chief judges' unlawful practice of systematically and without any investigation dismissing such complaints[125a]. She did not "administer justice" [to her peers] rich"[90] in judicial connections, but rather a 100% exemption from accountability[125b]; and the "equal right"[126] that she did to them was to disregard all complaints against them, no matter their gravity or pattern, whether the allegation was of bribery, corruption, conflict of interests, bias, prejudice, abuse of power, etc.[127] Her total partiality toward her own was "without respect"[90] for complainants, other litigants, and the public. Instead of Equal Justice Under Law, Judge Sotomayor upheld Judges Can Do No Wrong. She breached her oath.

8. By so doing, Judge Sotomayor rendered wrongdoing irresistible: She assured her peers of its risklessness, insulating it from any disciplinary downside while allowing free access to its limitless scope and profitability upside. So she emboldened them to engage ever more egregiously in the bankruptcy fraud scheme[60] and other forms of wrongdoing. By removing wrongdoing's stigmatizing potential and allowing its incorporation into the judges' modus operandi, she encouraged their resort to its efficiency multiplier: coordination. Through it wrongdoing becomes institutionalized and wrongdoers' fate becomes interdependent, requiring their continued reciprocal cover-up[89]. Then-Judge Sotomayor thus ensured that they would cover up her concealment of assets; now a Justice, she is not a champion of the Judiciary's integrity, but rather their accomplice[129a].

9. Indeed, the *DeLano* bankruptcy officer had during his 39-year long banking career learned who had turned the skeletons in the closet into such. The risk of his being indicted and trading up with domino effect motivated J. Sotomayor and her peers to allow him to retire with at least $673,657(jur:15) in known concealed assets[112b]. To protect peers, other insiders, and herself, she failed in her duty under 18 U.S.C. §3057 to report to the U.S. attorneys, not hard evidence, but just 'a belief that bankruptcy fraud may have been committed'[130a]. In how many of the thousands of cases [113a-b,114b] before their appointed[61] bankruptcy judges have she and other judges complicitly let the bankruptcy fraud scheme fester with rapaciousness[130b] and who benefited or was harmed thereby?

10. President Obama too had a duty: to vet justiceship candidates and choose one, not in his interest, but for their fitness. He was not entitled to have his staff and the FBI vet them only for him to hush up[158] their finding[107a] of J. Sotomayor's concealment of her assets[107c] and of those trafficked in the fraud scheme. Had he acted responsibly in the public interest, he would have realized that she had withheld(69§b) *DeLano* to prevent her cover on the scheme from blowing up and scuttling her nomination, and either withdrawn her nomination or disclosed the incriminating information to enable others to make informed decisions. By burying that information under lies about her integrity, he fraudulently got a dishonest nominee confirmed and misled the Senate and the public.

11. A.G. Eric H. Holder, Jr., also had a duty. By taking the oath of office, he bound himself to uphold the Constitution and enforce the laws thereunder in the interest of, not the President, but rather the people[159a]. Similarly duty-bound were the other federal[159b-f] and state officers[160] who vetted Judge Sotomayor or received complaints about her, the schemers[161], and their condoners. But they would not even ask those complained-against to answer the complaint or request any evidence-corroborating document[160d]. As for Sen. Charles Schumer, he disregarded the evidence submitted to him, endorsed J. Sotomayor, and became the President's point man to shepherd his nominee through the Senate. So did Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand. Although she, as Sen. Schumer's protégé, knew or should have known the incriminating evidence, she recommended the Judge to the President, introduced her to the Senate Judiciary Committee, and endorsed her to New Yorkers and the rest of the U.S. public.(78§6) For such dereliction of duty aimed at protecting their party members and reelection donors, they should be held accountable in the 2012 race.(xviii; xxxii)

12. To that end, *DeLano* can be used as a test case for a *Follow the money!* investigation.(102§a) It can expose the condonation by the President and his administration of, and the involvement by J. Sotomayor, other judges, and bankruptcy and legal systems insiders in, deficit-aggravating tax evasion and a nationwide judge-run bankruptcy fraud scheme corruptive of the Judiciary.(27§2) There is probable cause to believe that these coordinated wrongdoers have also interfered with the email, mail, and phone communications of those trying to expose their wrongdoing. This calls for a *Follow the wire!* investigation(105§b). These investigations can remedy the abdication of the Executive, Congress, and the media(81§1) of their duty of oversight(35§3) of the Judiciary. They have connived in self-interest and to the people's detriment to allow judges -their servants- to become unaccountable(21§A). So judges routinely deny due process and substantive right[iii] and discipline self-exempt by systematically dismissing complaints against them(21§1). As a result, in the 225 years since the creation of their Judiciary in 1789 only 8 judges have been im-peached and removed![14] Such survivability produces, and is the product of, **Judges Above the Law**.

13. To expose wrongdoing judges there is proposed:

14. **a)** a Watergate-like generalized media investi-gation(101§D) of the evidence(21§§A,B) guided by the query: 'What did the President(77§5) and the justices know[23b] about J. Sotomayor's tax evasion[102a,c] and other judges'[213] wrongdoing and when did they know it(75§d)?';

15. **b)** an academic and business venture(125§3); and **c)** presentations(171§F; xxv).

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
www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

2165 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6506
tel. (718)827-9521; follow @DrCorderoEsq
Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

The Salient Facts of The *DeLano* Case[109a]

revealing the involvement of bankruptcy & legal system insiders in a bankruptcy fraud scheme

(*D:#* & footnotes are keyed to Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/Follow_money/DeLano_docs.pdf; blue text points to bookmarks on the left)

1. *DeLano* is a federal bankruptcy case. Part of a case cluster, it reveals fraud that is so egregious as to betray overconfidence born of a long standing practice[1]: Coordinated wrongdoing evolved into a bankruptcy fraud scheme.[2] It was commenced by the DeLano couple filing a bankruptcy petition with Schedules A-J and a Statement of Financial Affairs on January 27, 2004. (04-20280, WBNY[3]) Mr. DeLano, however, was a most unlikely bankruptcy candidate. At filing time, he was a 39-year veteran of the banking and financing industry and continued to be employed by M&T Bank precisely as a bankruptcy officer. He and his wife, a Xerox technician, were not even insolvent, for they declared $263,456 in assets v. $185,462 in liabilities(*D:29*); and also:
   - **a.** that they had in cash and on account only $535(*D:31*), although they also declared that their monthly excess income was $1,940(*D:45*); and in the FA Statement(*D:47*) and their 1040 IRS forms(*D:186*) that they had earned $291,470 in just the three years prior to their filing;
   - **b**. that their only real property was their home(*D:30*), bought in 1975(*D:342*) and appraised in November 2003 at $98,500[4], as to which their mortgage was still $77,084 and their equity only $21,416(*D:30*)…after making mortgage payments for 30 years! and receiving during that period at least $382,187 through a string of eight mortgages[5].(*D:341*) *Mind-boggling!*
   - **c**. that they owed $98,092 –spread thinly over 18 credit cards(*D:38*)- while they valued their household goods at only $2,810(*D:31*), less than 1% of their earnings in the previous three years. Even couples in urban ghettos end up with goods in their homes of greater value after having accumulated them over their working lives of more than 30 years.
   - **d**. Theirs is one of the trustee's *3,907 open* cases and their lawyer's *525* before the same judge.
2. These facts show that this was a scheming bankruptcy system insider offloading 78% of his and his wife's debts (*D:59*) in preparation for traveling light into a golden retirement. They felt confident that they could make such incongruous, implausible, and suspicious declarations in the petition and that neither the co-schemers would discharge their duty nor the creditors exercise their right to require that bankrupts prove their petition's good faith by providing supporting documents. Moreover, they had spread their debts thinly enough among their 20 institutional creditors(*D:38*) to ensure that the latter would find a write-off more cost-effective than litigation to challenge their petition. So they assumed that the sole individual creditor, who in addition lives hundreds of miles from the court, would not be able to afford to challenge their good faith either. But he did after analyzing their petition, filed by them under penalty of perjury, and showing that the DeLano 'bankrupts' had committed bankruptcy fraud through concealment of assets.
3. The Creditor requested that the DeLanos produce documents[6] as reasonably required from any bankrupt as their bank account statements. Yet the trustee, whose role is to protect the creditors, tried to prevent the Creditor from even meeting with the DeLanos. After the latter denied *every single document* requested by the Creditor, he moved for production orders. Despite his discovery rights and their duty to determine whether bankrupts have concealed assets, the *bankruptcy* and *district judges* denied him *every single document*. So did the *circuit judges,* even *then CA2 Judge Sotomayor*, the presiding judge, who also needed the documents to find the facts to which to apply the law. They denied him and themselves due process of law. To eliminate him, *they* disallowed his claim in a *sham evidentiary hearing*. Revealing how incriminating the documents are, to oppose their production the DeLanos, with the trustee's recommendation and the *bankruptcy judge's approval*, were allowed to pay their lawyers $27,953 in legal fees[7]…though they had declared that they had only $535. To date $673,657[8] is still unaccounted for. Where did it go[9]? How many of the trustee's 3,907 cases have unaccounted for assets? For whose benefit?[2]

[1] §XIII [2] §III [3] §V. [4] §X [5] §§I.B & VIII [6] Cf. §XII [7] §XI [8] §I.B [9] §II

The End

Blank