

November 9, 2018

Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr.
Supreme Court of the U.S.
One First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20543

Dear Chief Justice Roberts¹,

1. I and the people assembled with me, exercising our 1st Amendment “freedom of speech, of the press, and the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances”(*>[jur:111§3](#))², which no statute or self-interested required ‘confidentiality’ can abrogate, file publicly this complaint under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980 (the Act), 28 U.S.C. §§351-364([jur:24](#)^{18a}) about Judge Brett Kavanaugh, Chief Judge Merrick Garland, and their peers and colleagues in the U.S. District of Columbia Circuit (the complained-about judges or the judges; DCC) for dismissing 100% of the 478 complaints about them filed under the Act in DCC, and denying 100% of petitions for review of such dismissals during at least the 1oct 06-30sep17 11-year period. This is a fact established by the statistics([infra 795§C](#)) that they were required under 28 U.S.C. §604(h)(2)([jur:26](#)^{23a}) to submit and did submit to Congress and the public.
2. The Act is to be construed broadly: It does not require complainants to show standing to file a complaint about a judge, whether by having suffered injury in fact as a result of the judge’s misconduct or disability complained about; meeting any residence requirement relative to the judge’s workplace or residence; or otherwise. Rather, it provides under §351(a) that “Any person alleging that a judge has engaged in conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts, or alleging that such judge is unable to discharge all the duties of office by reason of mental or physical disability, may file with the clerk of the court of appeals for the circuit a written complaint containing a brief statement of the facts constituting such conduct”.
3. The 15 complaints filed with DCC about J. Kavanaugh following his confirmation hearings in Sep. 2018 were transferred under Rules 25 and 26 of the Rules for Judicial Conduct and Disability Proceedings(Rules; [jur:125](#)²⁶⁴; †>[OL2:778](#)) by C.J. Garland, who disqualified himself, to DCC Judge Karen Henderson, who in turn transferred them to you. You assigned them on Oct. 10 to Ten Cir. C.J. Timothy Tymkovich. We respectfully petition you and all other officers to likewise transfer and process this complaint with the other 15 so that their processing may be informed by each other; all be used to detect judges’ patterns and trends of misconduct and the Federal Judiciary’s institutionalized policy of misconduct as its modus operandi; and their processing may lead to the independent investigation of the Judiciary’s unlawful interception of its critics’ communications.

A. The facts of the complained-about judges’ prejudicial conduct

4. Through their 100% dismissal of the 478 complaints about them and 100% denial of the petitions for review, the judges have “engaged in §351(a) prejudicial conduct”. Indeed, they have:
 - a. arrogated to themselves the power to abrogate in effect that Act of Congress, which it is “the business of the courts” and its judges([¶c infra](#)) to enforce together with its other acts;

¹ http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero-SupCt_CJ_JGRoberts.pdf

² The materials corresponding to the ([parenthetical references in blue](#)) are contained in my 2-volume 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* †

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

- b. abused the self-disciplining power entrusted to them under the Act by exonerating themselves from all complaints so as to evade any disciplinary action, thereby resolving in their favor the conflict of interests arising from being the target and the judges of the complaints;
- c. breached their oath of office under 28 U.S.C. §453 whereby “[We] solemnly swear (or affirm) that [we] will administer justice without respect to persons [like our peers, colleagues, and friends as opposed to other parties to complaints], and do equal right to the poor [in connections to us] and to the rich [in IOUs on us that we gave the peers, colleagues, and friends who dismissed complaints about us], and that [we] will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon [us] as judges under the Constitution and laws of the U.S. [e.g., the Act]”. Instead, they administered ‘unequal protection *from* the law’ with respect to relationship to them by being 100% partial toward their peers, colleagues, and friends when they became the target of complaints, all of which they dismissed;
- d. disregarded their duty under the Code of Conduct, Canon 1, which requires them to “uphold the independence and integrity of the judiciary”. They have shown that how they “discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon [them] as judges under the...laws [such as the Act]” depends upon whether the person whose conduct they are judging is their peer, colleague, or friend, on whom they dependent for cover-up of their misconduct and disability;
- e. prejudiced through interdependent partiality “the integrity of the judiciary”, of whose essential character for the “effective...administration of the business of the courts” they have imputed knowledge because the Commentary to Canon 1 provides that “Deference to the judgments and rulings of courts depends on public confidence in the integrity and independence of judges. The integrity and independence of judges depend in turn on their acting without fear or favor. Although judges should be independent, they must comply with the law and should comply with this Code. Adherence to this responsibility helps to maintain public confidence in the impartiality of the judiciary. Conversely, violation of this Code diminishes public confidence in the judiciary and injures our system of government under law”;
- f. failed to maintain the “good Behaviour” required of them under Article III, Section 1, of the Constitution “to hold their Offices”; defined by what their oath singles out, i.e., their pledge to “faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties [under the] laws”, such as the Act; and reiterated by Canon 1 in its Commentary “they must comply with the law”;
- g. committed “impropriety and the appearance of impropriety” prohibited by Canon 2, for under Canon 2A “reasonable minds with knowledge of the relevant circumstances after reasonable inquiry would conclude” that it is ‘beyond reasonable doubt’ impossible for all the judges to independently deem that 100% of the 478 complaints about them filed over 11 years were properly dismissible but for a complicit reciprocal complaint dismissal agreement;
- h. denied complainants the benefit intended for them under the Act of redress for the prejudice that they had suffered or witnessed relating to the judges’ misconduct or disability;
- i. deprived complainants and the rest of the public of the working mechanism for complaining that the Act had provided for their protection from misconducting and disable judges;
- j. showed reckless disregard for 100% of the nature, extent, frequency, and gravity of the misconduct and disability complained about in the 478 complaints filed about, and dismissed by, them, whose recklessness was aggravated by their systematic failure to investigate the complaints through the appointment of special committees, provided for under §353;
- k. showed reckless indifference to the rights and well-being of complainants and the rest of the public by leaving them exposed to 100% of the prejudice caused by the misconduct and

disability complained about, and any additional prejudice at the hands of the exonerated judges, who were left free of any deterrent to further committing misconduct and indulging in disability; and at the hands of other judges who, realizing that misconduct and disability had no adverse consequences for judges, committed misconduct and indulged in disability;

- l. disregarded Canon 3 providing that “The duties of judicial office take precedence over all other activities”, for the number of extra-judicial activities highlighted on their individual page on the DCC website allows ‘the math of perfunctoriness’(OL2:760) to demonstrate how lack of time accounts for 93%(OL2:457§D) of appeals being disposed of through the clerk-filled out, reasonless, arbitrary, fiat-like dumping forms of summary orders(jur:43§b);
- m. intentionally “prejudic[ed] the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts” and the persons to whom they swore to administer justice, *We the People*, for it is a torts tenet that “people are deemed to intend the foreseeable consequences of their acts”. By dismissing 100% of the complaints and denying 100% of review petitions, the judges rendered their misconduct and disability riskless, which enabled their further prejudicial misconduct and disability. Worse yet, they emboldened themselves and others to commit misconduct and indulge in disability of ever more diverse nature, to a greater extent, more frequently, and of higher gravity. While dismissing and denying for over a decade, they saw their foreseeable prejudice become a fact, whose continued occurrence they intended;
- n. deceived potential and actual complainants by pretending that their complaints would be fairly and impartially processed although the judges intended to dismiss 100% of them, thus running the Act’s complaint mechanism as a sham that works fraud on *We the People*.

B. Action requested

5. Therefore, we respectfully petition the judicial officers processing this complaint to:
 - a. deem and treat this complaint as the public document that it already is; and make it available to the public easily and widely as it progresses through the stages of its processing;
 - b. communicate to us and the public the judges’ answers; and afford the opportunity to reply, for it would constitute partiality toward them to take their answers at face value;
 - c. in the interest of justice for the complainants and public confidence in judges, make the 478 complaints and their dismissal orders, review petitions, and denials public, and transfer them under Rules 25 and 26 to be processed impartially by DCC-unrelated §353 special committees, whose members need not be judges or lawyers (*next*) and which can replace the failed mechanism of judges –priests, police officers- judging their peers, colleagues, and friends;
 - d. hold fact-finding public hearings on this and all other complaints to ascertain the causes for complaint, which hearings Judge Anthony Scirica, Chair of the Judicial Conduct and Disability Committee, stated at the Oct. 30 hearing on Code and Rules proposed changes are conceivable as part of the Committee’s work; and let independent fact-finders, i.e., news anchors and editors, investigative reporters, and journalism professors(OL2:777¶21c), conduct them to find whether dismissing complaints not matter the nature, extent, frequency, and gravity of the misconduct and disability turned into all judges’ pattern of action that became the Judiciary’s institutionalized policy of misconduct as its modus operandi(OL2:756¶¶9-11);
 - e. have independent IT, mail, and phone forensic experts investigate the Judiciary’s interception of its critics’ communications(OL2:781), such as mine by email, mail, phone, my website, *PayPal*, *GoFundMe*, *LinkedIn*, and *FB* accounts(*>ggl:1); and make their findings public:

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

Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net , DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org ,
CorderoRic@yahoo.com , Dr.Richard.Cordero.Esq@gmail.com ,
Dr.Richard.Cordero.Esq@outlook.com , Dr.Richard.Cordero.JDR@gmail.com ,
Dr.Richard.Cordero.Esq.JDR@gmail.com; tel. (718)827-9521

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

**Put your money
where your outrage at abuse
and quest for justice are.**

Donate to Judicial Discipline Reform's
professional research and writing effort
to advance our common interest in exposing
unaccountable judges' riskless abuse of power;



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

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

C. Links to official court statistics on complaints about judges and their analysis

6. Article on official statistics on complaints about J. Kavanaugh, DCC Chief Judge Merrick Garland, & peers and their analysis using "the math of abuse": http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero_JJ_Kavanaugh-Garland_exoneration_policy.pdf
7. Table of complaints against judges lodged in, and dismissed by, DCC in the 1oct06-30sep17 11-year period: http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero_table_exonerations_by_JJ_Kavanaugh-Garland.pdf
8. Collected official statistics on complaints about federal judges in the 1oct96-30sep17 21-year period: http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero_collected_statistics_complaints_v_judges.pdf
9. Template to be filled out with the complaint statistics on any of the 15 reporting courts: http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero_template_table_complaints_v_judges.pdf
10. Article on statistics and math: neither judges nor clerks read the majority of briefs, disposing of them through 'dumping forms': unresearched, unreasoned, arbitrary, and fiat-like orders; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf >OL2:760, 457§D

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

Sincerely,

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.
Judicial Discipline Reform
New York City

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

Dr%C3%9Cordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

Judicial Discipline Reform

New York City

www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

Volume I

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

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

Volume I:

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

or

<http://1drv.ms/1kvhB8>

or

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/jur/DrRCordero_jud_unaccountability_reporting.pdf

or

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

Volume II:

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

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

Judicial Discipline Reform

New York City

www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

Volume II

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

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

Volume II:

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

Volume I:

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

or

<http://1drv.ms/1kvhB8>

or

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/jur/DrRCordero_jud_unaccountability_reporting.pdf

or

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

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

Judicial Discipline Reform

New York City

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

Exposing
Judges' Unaccountability
and
Consequent Riskless Abuse of Power

Pioneering the news and publishing field
of
judicial unaccountability reporting

A three-volume study of judges and their judiciaries that exposes their coordinated abuse of power as their institutionalized modus operandi; and promotes a generalized media investigation and unprecedented citizens hearings that inform and so outrage the national public as to stir it up to assert its right as *We the People*, the Masters of all public servants, including judicial public servants, to hold judges accountable for their performance and liable to compensate the victims of their abuse

VOLUME III:

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates3.pdf

Volume I:

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

Volume II:

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates2.pdf

- Dashboard
- Jetpack
- Posts
- Media
- Pages
- Portfolio
- Comments 91
- Feedback
- WooCommerce
- Products
- Payments 1
- Analytics
- Marketing
- Appearance
- Plugins
- Users**
- All Users
- Add New
- Profile
- Tools
- Settings 1
- Collapse menu

Users [Add New](#)

Screen Options Help

 Hi, Really Simple SSL has kept your site secure for a month now, awesome! If you have a moment, please consider leaving a review on WordPress.org to spread the word. We greatly appreciate it! If you have any questions or feedback, leave us a [message](#).
- Rogier
[Leave a review](#)  [Maybe later](#)  [Don't show again](#)

 **Are you enjoying using Facebook Page Feeds Widget?**
You have been using [Facebook Page Feeds Widget for WordPress](#) for sometime now! Could you please do me a favor and give it a 5-star rating on WordPress to help us spread the word and encourage my hardwork?
[Leave a Review](#)
No thanks / I already have

To get the most out of Social Media Feather and to help enable its continued development, please read the [ShareThis Terms of Service](#) and [Privacy Notice](#), then [click here to accept the terms](#).

All | Administrator | Editor | Author | Contributor | Subscriber | Customer | Shop manager

Search Users

Bulk actions [Apply](#) Change role to... [Change](#) **44,914 items** << < 1 of 2,246 > >>

<input type="checkbox"/>	Username	Name	Email	Role	Posts
<input type="checkbox"/>	 1970mdegcf	—	einarcruckshank1989@e.bengira.com	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	 1Barret1cuple	—	tornado102034@hotmail.com	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	 1ofthemany	—	terree@comcast.net	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	 32350284247	—	s.dj.fhbnjew.31.5@gmail.com	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	 36187892923496	—	pe.rs.a.i.to.v.2.0@gmail.com	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	 365betv31h	—	yana.negrebetskaya.95@mail.ru	Subscriber	0