

September 15, 2018

**The official statistics<sup>1</sup> of the U.S. District of Columbia Circuit show that Judge Brett Kavanaugh<sup>2</sup>, Chief Judge Merrick Garland, and their peers recieved 478 complaints<sup>3</sup> about judges in their Circuit during the 1oct06/30sep17 11-year period, but abused their power by dismissing 100% of them regardless of allegation gravity and without investigation. They have impugned their impartiality with their policy of covering up for abusive judges while leaving parties at their mercy.** Congress should hold televised public hearings on whether unaccountable federal judges have institutionalized abuse by making it their modus operandi.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Endnotes by Dr. Cordero

‡ See the equivalent table of complaints concerning Then-Judge Sonia Sotomayor of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit(\*>jur:11); Then-Judge Neil Gorsuch of the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit(†>OL2:548); and all circuits (jur:10 12-14; 21§a). These tables are supported by Dr. Cordero's study of judges and their judiciaries, titled and downloadable thus:

**Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Wrongdoing:**

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

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

[www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org](http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org) > + New or Users >Add New

---

<sup>1</sup> a. This table is based on Table S-22 in the Annual Report, 28 U.S.C. §604(a)(3), submitted to Congress as a public document by the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts (AO), §§601-613(\*>jur:21<sup>10</sup>). The Report must include the statistics on complaints filed against judges and action taken; §604(h)(2). This table supports the main article at [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero\\_JJ\\_Kavanaugh-Garland\\_exoneration\\_policy.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero_JJ_Kavanaugh-Garland_exoneration_policy.pdf).

b. Each of the federal District of Columbia Circuit, the Federal Circuit, the 11 numbered regional circuits and the two national courts, i.e., the Court for International Trade and the Federal Claims Court, must file its statistics on complaints about its judges with AO for inclusion in the statistical tables of its Annual Report. The tables for the 1oct96-30sep17 21-year period have been collected at [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero\\_collected\\_statistics\\_complaints\\_v\\_judges.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero_collected_statistics_complaints_v_judges.pdf). Readers can download that file and prepare similar tables for any circuit and court, and any period of years, using the corresponding statistics to fill out the template at [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero\\_template\\_table\\_complaints\\_v\\_judges.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero_template_table_complaints_v_judges.pdf).

c. The above table for the District of Columbia Circuit is representative of the other courts' policy of dismissing complaints against their respective judges and their judicial councils' policy of denying the petitions for review of those dismissals. That constitutes the foundation for the assertion that the judges have proceeded to abuse the self-discipline power granted to them under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act(28usc351-364 at \*>jur:24§b) to exempt themselves from discipline, placing themselves beyond investigation to assure their impunity. They hold themselves unaccountable by arrogating to themselves the power to abrogate in practice that Act of Congress. Thus, they harm the complainants, who are left with no relief from the harmful conduct of the complained-about judge and exposed to his or her retaliation. Also, they harm the rest of the public, who is left with judges who know that in reliance on their peers' protection, they can abusively disregard the rule of law, e.g., due process and equal protection of the law(†>OL2:455§§B-D) By reciprocally dismissing complaints against them they protect their status as Judges Above the Law.

---

<sup>2</sup> On judicial councils see [\\*>jur:57<sup>96</sup>](#) and id. [>28usc§332\(g\)](#).

<sup>3</sup> a. Any person, whether a party to a case or a non-party, even a judge, can file a complaint against the conduct or disability of a federal judge under the provisions of the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980, 28 U.S.C. §§351-364; [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/28usc\\_Judicial\\_Code.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/28usc_Judicial_Code.pdf). The complaint is not a means of avoiding an appeal on the merits from a judge's decision. In fact, the complaint need not be related to any lawsuit at all; e.g., it may concern the attendance of a judge at a seminar where she became drunk and disorderly or at a fund raising meeting in favor of a political candidate or against a given issue where the judge appeared to breach her impartiality or place the prestige of judicial office in favor or against thereof. But it is obvious that the most frequent occasion where a person comes in contact with a judge and for complaints against her to arise is a lawsuit, whether at the trial or the appeal level.

b. In any event, the complaint must be filed with the chief circuit judge of the circuit where the complained-about judge sits. The chief and the complained-about judge may have been colleagues, peers, and friends for 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 years or more. If they hold life-appointments, as circuit and district judges do, they are stuck with each other for the rest of their professional lives. If she is a bankruptcy judge, she was appointed for a renewable term of 14 years by the respective circuit judges under 28 U.S.C. §152. If she is a magistrate judge, the respective district judges appointed her for a renewable term of 8 years under 28 U.S.C. §631(a) and (e).

c. The very last thing that they want is a peer holding professional and personal grudges against them for their rest of their lives or even for a term of years for failure to dismiss the complaint and insulate her from any discipline. Actually, appointing-judges who hold an appointee of theirs liable for misconduct or incompetence indict their own good judgment and the quality and impartiality of their vetting procedure. Think of all the criticism that has been heaped on President Trump for having appointed General Michael Flynn his National Security Advisor allegedly without having found out during the vetting of him that he had had meetings with the Russian ambassador; and for demonstrating a dishonest character when he lied thereabout to the Vice President. The President fired him less than a month after appointing him.

d. Worse yet, finding that a judge behaved dishonestly or incompetently casts doubt on her character and professional capacity. This provides grounds for every party that has appeared before her to file a motion in his own case for recusal or disqualification, to quash her decision, to reverse and remand for a new trial, for leave to appeal...*'Why bother!'*, shout the judges handling the complaint. 'It suffices for me as chief circuit judge to dismiss the complaint by signing a decision with boilerplate text alleging that it relates to the merits of the case or lacks any evidence; or by us in the judicial council having an unsigned 5¢ form issued that disposed of the petition for review of such dismissal with one single operative word: Denied. That's how we avoid all the hassle and the bad blood that comes with it.'

e. And then there is the self-serving consideration of reciprocally ensured survival: 'Today I dismiss this complaint against you, and tomorrow, when I am or one of my friends is the target of one of these pesky complaints, you in turn dismiss it'. By so doing, the judges assure each other that no matter the wrongdoing they engage in, their "brothers and sisters of the robe" will exempt them from any discipline and let them go on to do ever graver wrongs. ([\\*>jur:68§§a-c](#))

The result is the same: Complainants are left to bear the dire consequences of the misconduct and wrongdoing of judges, and the rest of the public is left at the mercy of a judicial class with ever less integrity and regard for the strictures of due process and equal protection of the law, for the class is composed of Judges Above the Law.

- 
- <sup>4</sup> The left column of tabulating entries has evolved over the years, with some entries being added, eliminated, or changed in their wording and order. This table's left column contains all current entries in their current order. To enable distribution of all historical data in an effort to achieve completeness of data, accurate tabulation, and comparability of comparable entries, some old entries have been added to their corresponding new ones in the same cells and others are found in their own cells. Old entries appear after the newly added ones and in their appropriate position in the complaint-filing-to-decision process of the authority in question; e.g., if "Withdrawal" referred to the withdrawal of a petition to the judicial council for review of a dismissal by the chief circuit judge, it appears near the bottom of "Judicial Council Proceedings". In case of doubt, simply go to the corresponding year in the row of years at the top of the table, click on the endnote symbol, and click on the corresponding link to download the official statistics for the year in question..or download the file that collects all the 1oct6-30sep17 complaint statistics(supra [OL2:751endn.1b](#)).
- <sup>5</sup> <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2007>
- <sup>6</sup> <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2008>
- <sup>7</sup> The adoption on March 11, 2008, of new rules for filing and processing complaints against judges caused the complaints filed from 1oct07 through 10may08 under the old rules to be reported in Table S-22A in the 2008 Judicial Business Report; and those filed under the new rules from 11may-30sep08 to be reported in that year's Table S-22B. The same applies to the corresponding 2009 tables.
- <sup>8</sup> <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2009>. While the 2009 Judicial Business Report covers only the fiscal year that started on October 1, 2008, its table on complaints against judges includes the complaints filed under the new rules during May 11 through September 30, 2008. This period alone is reported in Table S-22B of 2008.
- <sup>9</sup> <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2010>
- <sup>10</sup> <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2011>
- <sup>11</sup> <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2012> >Complaints against judges, Table 10 Judicial Complaints Commenced, Terminated, and Pending Fiscal Years 2010-2012 >Table S-22, <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/s-22/judicial-business/2012/09/30>
- <sup>12</sup> <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2013> >Complaints against judges, <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/complaints-against-judges-judicial-business-2013> >Table 10 Judicial Complaints Commenced, Terminated, and Pending Fiscal Years 2011-2013 >Table S-22, <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/s-22/judicial-business/2013/09/30>
- <sup>13</sup> <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2014> >Complaints against judges, <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/complaints-against-judges-judicial-business-2014> >Table 10 Judicial Complaints Commenced, Terminated, and Pending Fiscal Years 2012-2014 >Table S-22, <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/s-22/judicial-business/2014/09/30>
- <sup>14</sup> <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2015> >Complaints against judges, <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/complaints-against-judges-judicial-business-2015> >Table 10 Judicial Complaints Commenced, Terminated, and Pending Fiscal Years 2013-2015 >Table S-22, <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/s-22/judicial-business/2015/09/30>
- <sup>15</sup> <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2016> >Complaints against judges,  
\* [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest\\_Jud\\_Advocates.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf) >all prefixes:# up to OL:393      OL2:753



---

<http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/complaints-against-judges-judicial-business-2016>

>Table 10 Judicial Complaints Commenced, Terminated, and Pending Fiscal Years 2015-2016

>Table S-22, <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/s-22/judicial-business/2016/09/30>

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/s-22/judicial-business/2017/09/30>

<sup>17</sup> An entry not present in an early version of the table or deleted from a subsequent one is represented with a -. The data for an entry that has changed position may be repeated; e.g.; Line 2 &109.

<sup>18</sup> Over the years, the judges have added some headings and removed others to and from the table for reporting the statistics on complaints against judges. This explains why some cells have no values, which is indicated by an unobtrusive hyphen - so that it may not be misinterpreted as a failure to include the corresponding value. In the same vein, this is a composite table that aggregates all headings and entries and place them in the most logical position in the series of headings and entries. The most significant addition and removal came when the new rules for processing these complaints were adopted in 2008. The use of the new rules became mandatory on May 11, 2008. Since then a new reporting table with more numerous and detailed headings and entries has been used to report the statistics on complaints filed under the new rules.

Although the new rules for filing complaints against federal judges showed more complaint categories, the systematic dismissal of them and denial of petitions for review of such dismissals by judges protecting their own as well as themselves has continued unabated: ‘I protect you today, and if tomorrow I’m or any of my friends is the one complained against, you protect me or them. The new rules was a ruse by the judges to dissade Congress from taking action to correct the fact that the judges had applied for over 20 years the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980 in such a way as to render it useless so that judicial discipline was as inexistence as it had been since the creation of the Federal Judiciary in 1789, a period during which there was no formal mechanism for complaining against judges; see the history of, and a comment on, the new rules at [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/judicial\\_complaints/8-4-3DrRCordero\\_new\\_rules\\_no\\_change.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/judicial_complaints/8-4-3DrRCordero_new_rules_no_change.pdf).

<sup>19</sup> Table S-22A(stat:28) for the fiscal year 1oct08-30sep09 deals only with the action taken on the complaints filed under the old rules up to and including May 10, 2008. By definition, none of those complaints could have been filed during that fiscal year. Consequently, that table does not report any complaint filed.

<sup>20</sup> [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/statistics&tables/statistical\\_tables\\_complaints\\_v\\_judges.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/statistics&tables/statistical_tables_complaints_v_judges.pdf) >stat:24:

<sup>21</sup> The table(cf. stat:24) used to report complaints about judges filed under the old rules did not report the number of complainants’ petitions to the judicial circuit to review the unfavorable disposition of their complaints, which consisted in their systematic dismissal without any investigation. Accordingly, it did not report on the disposition by judicial councils of such petitions. The table(cf. stat:26) used for reporting under the new rules began reporting both the number of petitions for review and their disposition. This explains why the number of “Received Petitions for Review” is 176(L65), yet the number of “Petitions Denied” is 242(L68). This illustrates that the circuit and district judges on the judicial council of the respective circuit overwhelmingly disposed of those petitions through their systematic denial. Thereby they attained the same objective: their self-exemption from discipline to ensure their unaccountability as Judges Above the Law.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. stat:28. The entry “Action on Petition for Review: Petition Denied” under the heading Judicial Council Proceedings” first appear in Table S-22B of 2009(stat:30).

Blank



**Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.**

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

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

Judicial Discipline Reform

New York City

[www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org](http://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](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf)

or

<http://1drv.ms/1lkvhB8>

or

[http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/jur/DrRCordero\\_jud\\_unaccountability\\_reporting.pdf](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](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf)

**Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.**

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

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

Judicial Discipline Reform

New York City

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

Volume II

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

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

**Volume II:**

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

**Volume I:**

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

or

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

or

[http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/jur/DrRCordero\\_jud\\_unaccountability\\_reporting.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/jur/DrRCordero_jud_unaccountability_reporting.pdf)

or

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

←

→

http://www.judicial-discipline-reform.org/wp-admin/users.php

Search...

Users < Judicial Discipline R...

Tools (Alt+X)

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help

Convert Sele

My Site Reader

Write

Screen Options Help

Users

Add New

WooCommerce is not being forced over SSL -- Using PayPal with Braintree requires that checkout to be forced over SSL.

All (24,594) | Administrator (1) | Subscriber (24,593)

Search Users

Bulk Actions Apply Change role to... Change

24,594 items 1 of 1,230

<input type="checkbox"/>	Username	Name	Email	Role	Posts
<input type="checkbox"/>	197	—	a.com	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	10i	—	t.net	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	36!	—	l.ru	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	791	—	h.com	Subscriber	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	AA	—	.com	Subscriber	0

100%

2:17 AM

The file with the above table and its supporting materials can be downloaded and made available to others through this link:

[http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero\\_table\\_exonerations\\_by\\_JJ\\_Kavanaugh-Garland.pdf](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/retrieve/DrRCordero_table_exonerations_by_JJ_Kavanaugh-Garland.pdf)

Their basis is my study of judges and their judiciaries, which holds the materials corresponding to the ([blue text references](#)). It is titled and downloadable thus:

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

By Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

\* Volume 1: [http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest\\_Jud\\_Advocates.pdf](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](http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf) >from OL2:394

- a. On judges' abuse of power over your property, liberty, and all the rights and duties that frame your life, and their systematic denial of your constitutional right to due process and equal protection of the law, see †>[OL2:608§A; 455§§B-D](#); and their failure to read briefs, see [729](#).
- b. On their unaccountability through self-exemption from discipline see [\\*jur:21§a](#), †>[OL2:548](#).
- c. See also the proposal for the publication of a series of expository articles at †>[OL2:719](#).

Visit the website [Judicial Discipline Reform](#) 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 knowledgeable outrage **at judges' abuse of power**  
and your passion for justice are.

DONATE

in support of professional research and writing, and advocacy to advance  
the common interest in exposing unaccountable judges' **riskless abuse**:

here



or

at the [GoFundMe](#) campaign at  
<https://www.gofundme.com/expose-unaccountable-judges-abuse>

*Enough is enough!*

We won't tolerate any abuse by anybody anymore.

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

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

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

Blank

Blank