

November 19, 2013

Ms. Judy Kelly
ALM, Conferences & Trade Shows
120 Broadway, 5th Floor
New York, NY 10271-1101

Dear Ms. Kelly,

I would like to be considered for inclusion on the speaker faculty list of Legal Tech's February 4-6, 2014, event at The Hilton New York.

I. Subject

Auditing Judges' Writings

A business venture to apply advanced IT to develop a software product that performs statistical, literary, and linguistic analysis of written materials to detect patterns of decision-making and partiality that have predictive value useful for litigants to devise legal strategy

II. Type of product

This is a proposal for developing an advanced Information Technology software product running on artificial intelligence to audit court decisions and other writings of judges for authorship and partiality, understood as including biases, prejudices, conflicts of interests resolved to one's benefit, and personal agenda pursued in disregard of the duty to be fair in accordance with the rule of law.

III. Benefits

Competitive advantage can be gained if before writing a brief, arguing in court, or dealing with the opposing party one finds out what makes the judge assigned to the case at hand decide cases one way or another. One can do that by identifying the variables of the judge's cases and the features of his writings that with statistical significance correlate with the way he made rulings and decisions in the past so that the significant variables in the present case can be relied upon as determinants of the statistical probability that he will rule on, or decide likewise.

To the extent that such variables and features are irrelevant to the merits of the corresponding cases, the statistically significant correlation with the way the judge handled them provides objective data on which to base a motion for recusal for bias and for appeal from the judge's denial(cf. [jur:45§2](#)) of such motion or to devise legal strategy to play to the judge's biases.

IV. Beneficiaries as intended clients

Lawyers, their clients, and the ever-growing number of pro ses^{35,38} will benefit from this product, for they all want to know the probability that the judge or judges handling their cases will treat them fairly and impartially based on the relevant elements that should determine the merits of their cases. It will give them a competitive advantage over not only opposing parties who do not use the product, but also over the judge insofar as it will allow them to obtain, as it were, 'inside the judge's mind information' and to deal with him accordingly. Advocates of legislated judicial reform will also benefit from objective data showing judges' wrongdoing([5§3](#)).

These beneficiaries constitute a large market: over 2 million federal and 48 million state cases are filed each year(jur:8fn4,5). Since every case has at least two parties, at least 100 million people and entities would benefit annually from this product. Those numbers, of course, do not begin to account for the scores of millions of cases pending in either of those jurisdictions.

V. Audience at Legal Tech

The presentation of this business venture will appeal to developers of software for both lawyers and the fast growing pro se market; all those interested in anticipating legal market trends under the ever more extensive application of IT to legal business; and hence, investors.

VI. Overview of the analysis: data source, examination, determination, and benefit

Statistical, linguistic, and literary analysis has a scientific basis recognized by the scientific community and its results are capable of demonstration to a court performing an independent assessment of reliability. Hence, whether under *Frye* or *Daubert*, the analysis is likely to be admissible in court. Regardless of such admissibility, the analysis is valuable as the source of essential information for parties to strategize how to deal with those with the most power to steer their cases to failure or success: the judges.

Also, the use of scientific, non-legal arguments in court has a long legal history, for it can be traced back to the famous Brandeis briefs. The best known of them was filed in *Muller v. Oregon*, 208 U.S. 412, 28 S.Ct. 324 (1908), where Then-Attorney Brandeis used social and economic studies to argue to the Supreme Court that it should uphold statutes limiting workdays for women to a maximum of 10 hours. He persuaded the Court to do so. Later on, he became a member of it The proposed analysis for auditing judges' writings will exhibit the scientific refinement achieved over the more than a century since Brandeis' days and will initially be targeted on judges and the vast corpus of their decisions. Cf. Dr. Cordero's use of statistics¹⁴ at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/statistics&tables/correctioneers/correctional_population_1in31.pdf.

A. Statistical analysis

1. Data source: written and transcribed or recorded oral rulings and decisions.
2. Examination using artificial intelligence and optical character recognition to discern the variables in the largest number of writings to increase statistical accuracy and develop a relational database that allows the widest correlation of variables to identify the dominant ones:
 - a. intrinsic: the parties' or victims' race, gender, social standing, wealth, level of education; appearance pro se, representation by a solo practitioner or a large law firm; civil, or criminal case concerning commercial, family, civil rights, IPO, or other matters;
 - b. extrinsic: time of day, day of week, season of year; proximity to a judicial holiday, the judge's vacation, her attendance at judicial meetings, seminars, CLE presentations; the publication of her book and participation in a book presentation tour; the correction of exams that the judge gave in the university course that she teaches; etc.
3. Determination of frequency correlation between one or more variables in a case and the judge's decisions to dismiss, grant discovery, send the case to the jury, deny a motion to set aside the verdict; a batch of cases expediently decided by summary orders⁶⁶ of the same date; etc.
4. Benefit: Identification of variables that have an outcome-determinative impact on the judge's conduct to establish the statistical probability of the same conduct in the case at hand.

B. Linguistic analysis

1. Data source: written rulings, decisions, and other writings purportedly of a given judge.
2. Examination of the use of language: choice of words, syntactical structure, punctuation, grammatical correctness, stylistic flair, etc.
3. Determination of authorship of the examined writing and correlation of its grammatical quality, reflective of the amount of effort put into writing it, with its visibility, e.g., high quality for a law journal article or a decision to be published in a media-covered case as opposed to perfunctory⁶⁸ writing for decisions marked by the judge “non-precedential, not for publication” (43§1), which renders process before him wasteful and the decision meaningless for appeal.
4. Benefit: Objective data describing a judge’s conduct can be invoked to impugn a decision on grounds of denial of equal treatment; breach of the contract entered into when the court offered judicial services in exchange for the payment of filing fees; and breach of the judicial oath to “administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich”, so that those “persons” are third-party beneficiaries of the oath and have a claim of action against the judge(26§d) who breaches it by discriminating against them and in favor of others.

C. Literary analysis

1. Data source: written rulings, decisions, and other writings of a given judge.
2. Examination of their semantic aspect: the explicit message that the author conveys to his audience and the implicit one that he sends intentionally or unwittingly in his subtext. This is the most innovative and technologically challenging analysis, relying most heavily on artificial intelligence to understand meaning and describe objectively one’s psychology.(142§3)
3. Determination of the judges’ reasoning, interests, and attitudes, including partiality, of which the judge may be unaware, for they form an integral part of his understanding of the world, whereby the analysis can help even him take a critical view of himself in light of other criteria.
4. Benefit: The most insight into the judges’ character and value system that motivate his conduct.

VII. Qualifications

I hold a doctorate of law from the University of Cambridge in England, where my thesis dealt with the integration of the banking industry in the European Union. I earned a law degree from La Sorbonne in Paris, where I concentrated on currency stability and the abuse of dominant positions by entities in commerce, similar to antitrust law. I also earned a Master of Business Administration from the University of Michigan after concentrating on the use of computers, their networks, and software expert systems to maximize workflow efficiency and productivity.

I worked as a researcher-writer at the preeminent publisher of analytical legal commentaries, i.e., Lawyers Cooperative Publishing, now part of Thomson West. There I wrote commentaries on the regulation of financial activities under federal law(a&p:17). Currently at Judicial Discipline Reform, I am promoting(Lsch:9) the formation of a multidisciplinary academic and business team of professionals(128§4) to advocate judicial accountability and discipline reform with a view to creating a for-profit institute(153§§c-g). To further that endeavor, I have set forth a much more detailed proposal for the development of the IT software described above(131§b).

I respectfully refer you to it in support of this application to speak at your February 2014 Legal Tech event in New York. Therefore, I look forward to hearing from you.

*Dare trigger history!(jur:7§5)...*and you may enter it. Sincerely, s/Dr.Richard Cordero, Esq.
ol:44 Application of Dr R Cordero, Esq, to Legal Tech for inclusion as speaker in its feb14 NY event

November 18, 2015

Dean Martha Minow
Harvard Law School
1563 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138

Mr. Daniel Lewis, CEO
Ravel Law
San Francisco, CA
daniel@ravellaw.com

Dear Dean Minow and Mr. Lewis,

Kindly find below my proposal for auditing judges' decisions through an academic study and an IT R&D project that analyze them to detect judicially relevant attitudes and predict decisional conduct. It rests on my study **Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Wrongdoing**: Pioneering the news and publishing field of judicial unaccountability reporting*.

A. Research Question

1. How statistical, linguistic, and literary analysis performed by conventional methods and a yet to be developed IT product based on artificial intelligence can constitute an objective means of identifying the authors of judicial decisions and ascertaining their fairness and impartiality – understood as a function of their biases, prejudices, conflicts of interests resolved to one's benefit, and personal agenda pursued in disregard of the duty to act according to the rule of law– so that in reliance on such objective means lawyers may predict a judge's decision and devise legal strategy; applications for recusing or disqualifying a judge may be determined; and entrepreneurs may pioneer the business field of judicial decisions auditing and predictive analytics?

B. Conceptual Framework

2. The concept underlying the proposed research is that recurrent sets of elements, that is, patterns, and charged terms –e.g., the difference between referring to John Doe, Esq., as a lawyer or as a hack– appear in the written and oral expression of any individual as well as of a group of people that share a language, a culture, and a level and kind of education. Those patterns and terms have author-identifying capacity because they can be used to determine whether a given individual is the author of a piece of writing and to identify who is the author among a group of people. Moreover, those patterns and terms have character reflective capacity because they reflect on the system of beliefs, moral values, and attitudes of an individual and of people. The analysis of charged terms allow detection of patterns, which in turn allow assessing the degree to which a judge satisfied the legal requirements of fairness and impartiality in one or all her decisions.
3. Statistical analysis does so, at its most basic, by relying on number crunching and comparison of the frequency of objective features in judges' decisions, such as whether the winning party was a pro se client or a business, her race, the amount of money at stake, etc. It plots those numbers on a system of coordinates and establishes standard deviations. Such analysis is of immense value precisely because it is based on objective facts and their individual and comparative quantification. Thus, it can be as reliable as it can be surprisingly revealing of absence or presence of bias.
4. Linguistic analysis can use optical character recognition software to identify the string of characters and establish the author's lexicon, to wit, the pool of words that she uses and their frequency. Then it moves to the more difficult but equally objective application of grammatical rules to determine in which of the 9 parts of a sentence each word falls and in what syntactical order the judge placed them in a sentence and grouped them through punctuation. This analysis allows determining which decisions the judge wrote herself and which were written by others, such as her clerks or staff lawyers with some or no supervision by the judge. Such determination

is most useful for a party to strategize: Before the start of the case, the party can rely on it to estimate the degree of attention that the judge is likely to pay to a case whose decision she has every or no intention to write; and after the decision is issued, to determine whether the judge wrote it or had a clerk or a staff lawyer write it. If the latter, the party can present on the strength of objective analysis a challenge to the decision, e.g., on the ground that there was a constitutional denial of equal protection of the laws because judicial decision-making power was transferred to, and exercised by, a non-judge who legally had been neither invested with such power nor authorized by law to exercise it, and who may not even have been in the courtroom during the whole of the case. It is as if at the end of the case, a juror had been replaced by a member of the audience who may or may not have been in the courtroom during all the sessions or a member of the public who watched some or all of the case on TV at home or only read the transcript.

5. Literary analysis, the most ambitious and innovative part of the research: It analyzes the person through the meaning of her language while linguistic analysis focuses on the personal use of language. It will analyze language as a reflection of the author's character. To do so, software must go beyond analyzing strings of characters with the tools of Boolean logic, proximity connectors, and variation symbols, e.g., wild cards. Those tools implement the functional premise of current search engines, even those that use natural language for the formulation of the search query: A given string of characters or those close to it are likely to have been used in the searched-for text; to find it, an objective analysis of text is performed. However, the proposed software must perform subjective analysis. It must be sophisticated enough to interpret the subtext of text to reach, not the characters used to write it, but rather the character of the writer. To do so, it must search for patterns and charged terms that reveal the abstract, that is, beliefs, values, and attitudes, and determine the subjective, namely, whether she was fair and impartial in her decision and how that decision reflects on the fitness of her character to be a judge. To do so, the software is expected to be based on artificial intelligence as the engine of an expert system.

C. Method

6. Auditing judicial decisions through statistical analysis can be started right away given that there are already either official statistics of the courts, cf. <http://www.uscourts.gov/Statistics.aspx>, or access to the decisions either at the office of the clerk of court or online, cf. Public Access to Court Electronic Records, <http://www.pacer.gov/>. See samples of statistical work at * >jur:10-14. Then determine the applicability of *res ipsa loquitur* to the queries whether by examining that work a lawyer can learn most valuable information concerning the partiality or impartiality of federal judges when one of their peers is the subject of a misconduct complaint; and whether that work would substantially influence that lawyer when devising his legal strategy for dealing with the judge presiding over his case whom he deems to have engaged in misconduct.
7. Auditing judicial decisions through linguistic analysis can begin by studying the literature on the several programs used for that purpose, writing a report in light of the intended use, and using it to form a multidisciplinary team that should include lawyers, IT experts, and experienced sellers of digital products. The team should test available programs and recommend which to acquire, including the right to modify its code, or whether the program should be developed in-house.
8. Auditing judicial decisions through literary analysis starts with the previous step and adds the review of the literature to determine the current state of development of artificial intelligence and expert systems. After choosing a program or deciding to develop it in-house, these steps follow:
 - a. Establishment of a baseline: Legal research using, for example, digests, will be conducted to identify cases that on appeal were reversed or vacated for unfairness or partiality. Those

cases will be preferred where the appeals court, otherwise the appellant, identified the passage or language of the challenged decision that evinced unfairness or partiality.

- b. Those decisions will be edited to eliminate text that is not necessary for the unfairness and partiality passage to remain in a context that makes sense as a judicial decision.
- c. Decisions challenged on grounds other than unfairness and partiality and praised on appeal for their fairness and partiality will be similarly edited to their minimal expression. These and the above decisions will form the control decisions. Their volume should be liable to be read by an average reader within an hour.
- d. An unfairness and partiality-identifying exercise will be conducted by submitting the control decisions to control subjects, that is, a pool of lawyers, judges, law students, and lay people identified through a questionnaire to fit the legal paradigm of “a reasonable man”. They will be asked to identify any passage in the control decisions that they deem to evince unfairness or partiality and to state their reason therefor.
- e. After review of the exercise results, the control subjects will be interviewed individually and as a group to provide additional reasons in light of what the others deemed to evince unfairness or partiality and to comment on what they generally deem to be unfair or partial.
- f. A table of the elements of unfairness and partiality will be drawn up and used to write software code that enables a program to identify passages that evince unfairness and partiality.
- g. Software will be acquired and modified as necessary or developed to identify with the help of the above table of elements the passages in the control decisions that with statistical significance were identified by the control subjects as evincing unfairness and partiality.

D. Possible Findings

9. Auditing judicial decisions through these types of analysis should determine the prevalence among the decisions and the perception among the public of unfairness and partiality in the judiciary. It should provide the basis for drawing up a set of measures to reform the judiciary so that "Justice should not only be done, but should manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done", *Ex parte McCarthy*, [1924] 1 K. B. 256, 259 (1923). It should provide parties' with both 'inside the judge's mind information' and a reliable tool for predicting the fairness and impartiality that they can expect, thus allowing them to strategize their conduct inside and outside the courtroom.

E. Importance To The Field

10. This is a proposal for path-breaking multidisciplinary research that will allow the undertaking of the first-ever systematic audit of the decisions of judges of the Federal Judiciary, the most secretive, opaque, and unresponsive of the three branches. Up to 90% of the decisions of the circuit courts are reasonless summary orders or decisions so “perfunctory” that the judges themselves mark them “not precedential” and “not for publication”(jur:43§b). Federal judges are unelected and enjoy de jure or de facto life tenure, and though public servants, they escape the scrutiny of their masters, *We the People*. As a result, they unaccountably wield absolute power that allows them to issue decisions tainted with unfairness and partiality. This research should begin the process of restoring power to *the People* by holding judges accountable for their decisions. Thereby it will contribute to giving effect to the principle that in ‘government, not of men and women, but by the rule of law’^{ol:5fn6}, Nobody is Above the Law, and that having one’s day in court should afford the realistic opportunity to seek and receive Equal Justice Under Law.

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

Sincerely, Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

What Journalists Stand to Gain From Investigating Two Unique National Stories
of wrongdoing at the top of government: the attention of a growing outraged audience; credit for raising issues that dominate the mid-term, primary, and presidential election campaigns; and recognition for launching a civic movement that forces a new *We the People*-government relation where the masters assert their right to hold their public servants accountable and liable to them

1. The national mood is one of distrust of government. From the failure to find WMD in Iraq, predatory home mortgage lending, the near financial collapse and massive unemployment, to the NSA, the VA, the IRS, the Benghazi, and the Fast and Furious scandals, the people have been given reasons to become distrustful. However, in almost all of those instances, only lower level officers were involved; the top officers are only alleged to have exercised bad judgment.
2. By contrast, the two proposed stories are unique, for they involve top officers in self-beneficial criminal activity. Their violation of the injunction “to avoid even the appearance of impropriety”^{123a} should be easy for journalists to show, yet generate enough public pressure to cause resignations^(*)^{jur:92§d} and impeachments. Here are the stories, stated as variations of a query of proven devastating consequences since it led to the resignation of President Nixon on 8aug74:

i. The President Obama-Justice Sotomayor story & the *Follow the money!* investigation

Did the President know that his first Supreme Court nominee, Then-Judge, Now-Justice Sotomayor, was involved in both concealing assets –which *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and Politico^{107a} suspected her of doing, and which is done to commit the crimes^{ol:5fn10} of tax evasion^{107c} and money laundering– and abusing the Federal Judiciary’s and/or the NSA’s computer network –see story ii. below–; but did the President cover it up and lie to the American 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 in Congress of the Obamacare bill, the key piece of his legislative agenda; and if so, when did he know it?^(jur:4¶¶10-14)

Journalists can pursue this story through the *Follow the money!* investigation^(ol:1, 66) and bring it to a head by calling on the President to release all the FBI vetting reports on J. Sotomayor and on her to request that she ask him to release them.

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

Have federal judges abused their computer network and expertise –which handle hundreds of millions of 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 the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA)– both to conceal assets –a crime^{ol:5fn10}– by electronically transferring them between declared and hidden accounts^(ol:1), and to cover up judges’ wrongdoing by interfering with the communications –also a crime^(ol:20 ¶¶11-12)– of would-be expositors and prevent them from joining forces to expose them; and if so, since when?^(ol:69§C)

3. The investigation of J. Sotomayor^(ol:100§A) will lead to that of THE CIRCUMSTANCES ENABLING HER WRONGDOING and reveal the key one: WRONGDOING COORDINATION that has allowed the Federal Judiciary to become a safe haven for wrongdoing^(jur:21§§A-B). Its exposure can determine an outraged public to assert its power to hold officers accountable; allow journalists to assert their role as its watchdog; and make of the elections a watershed moment in American politics. For context, see *Exposing Judges’ Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Wrongdoing: Pioneering the news and publishing field of judicial unaccountability reporting**. *Dare trigger history!*^(jur:7§5)...and you may enter it.

July 30, 2014

Research and Investigative Activities that Professional and Citizen Journalists and Students Taking a Course or Practicum Can Conduct to Expose Judges' Wrongdoing and Advocate Judicial Reform

1. The study of the Federal Judiciary titled, Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Wrongdoing: Pioneering the news and publishing field of judicial unaccountability reporting(jur:1) is based on both library research and field investigationⁱⁱ (investigation for short). To further pursue its exposure and reporting, two unique national stories have been proposed with their corresponding investigation, namely:

i. The President Obama-Justice Sotomayor story & the *Follow the money!* investigation

Did the President know that his first Supreme Court nominee, Then-Judge, Now-Justice Sotomayor, was involved in both concealing assets –which *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and Politico^{107a} suspected her of doing, and which is done to commit the crimes^{ol:5fn10} of tax evasion^{107c} and money laundering– and abusing the Federal Judiciary's and/or the NSA's computer network –see story ii. infra–; but did the President cover it up and lie to the American public by vouching for her honesty because he wanted to ingratiate him-self with those petitioning him to nominate another woman and the first Hispanic to re-place Retiring Justice Souter and from whom he expected in exchange support for the passage of the Obamacare bill in Congress; and if so, when did he know it?(jur:4¶¶10-14)

This story can be pursued through the *Follow the money!* investigation(ol:2; 66) It can make a striking call on the President to release all the FBI vetting reports on J. Sotomayor and on her to request that she ask him to release them; that can set a precedent.

ii. 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 rubber-stamped^{ol:5fn7} by the federal judges of the secret court established under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA)– both to conceal assets –a crime^{ol:5fn10}, unlike surveillance– by electronically transferring them between declared and hidden financial accounts(ol:1), and to cover up the judges' wrongdoing by interfering with the communications –also a crime(ol:20¶¶11-12)– of would-be exposers and prevent them from joining forces to ex-pose them? (See the statistical analysis supporting the interference suspicion^{ol:19§Dfn2}.)

This story can be pursued through the *Follow it wirelessly!* investigation(ol:19§D; 69§C).

2. Likely investigators can be interested in participating in the investigation at presentations of the available evidence of judges' wrongdoing(21§§A-B); the above-described unique national stories(ol:100); a realistic, feasible plan of investigation(ol:66) together with the additional investigative activities described infra; and judicial reform(jur:158§6-8).
3. Journalists can be addressed at private meetings, press conferences(jur:97§1), media outlets(ol:88), and during appearances at talkshows. The talkshow hosts can be encourage to become instrumental in organizing those presentations by contacting other fellow members of the media and thereby become Builders of the Coalition for Justice(ol:73).
4. Young idealistic hardworking students(jur:129§b) can be attracted to the investigation through 'recruiting' presentations(Lsch:9) held at graduate schools of journalism(ol:54, Lsch:23); law (Lsch:1, 21); business(104¶¶236-237); and Information Technology(ol:42, 60); after being

offered to, and accepted by, the officers of the student classes, pertinent student associations, and the organizers of the fair of student organizations held at the beginning of the academic year and of job fairs later in the year(jur:97§1).

5. Presentations can also be held at think tanks, civil rights entities, and public interest organizations(jur:86§4); political meetings(ol:51, 58); and meetings of veterans(ol:90, 94).
6. These presentations can contribute to identifying the necessary talent and financial supporters to produce the proposed documentary(ol:85) on judges' wrongdoing and judicial reform.

A. Additional(ol:66) investigative activities to propose to potential investigators

7. Find the court statistics^{10c,d}, analyze them, and make tables for the other(jur:10-14) circuits.
8. Retrieve and analyze the documents that judges filed to the commission on judicial nominations, which are likely to include financial affairs statements^{cf. 107b,c}.
9. Find out and analyze the state judges' financial disclosure reports, if any; federal judges have to file them publicly every year pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act^{107d}, which Judicial Watch downloaded in bulk and made available to the public^{213a}; then analyze them to determine whether their disclosures make sense at all(cf. ^{213b}, jur:104¶¶236-237).
10. Engage in private investigation work by finding out where a judge lives; how many cars he has and how often he changes them; to what school he sends his kids; where he goes on vacation; at what restaurants he eats and how often; what clubs he is member of and what their annual fees are; what brand of suits he wears; where his wife works, etc., and then ask the critical question: Can he afford all that on his judicial salary?
11. Find out what judicial conferences and seminars he has attended; who organized them; what role he played there, e.g., whether he gave a speech, participated on a panel discussion, conducted a workshop; whether he declared his attendance as he should and stated who paid for his hotel, transportation, meals, and entertainment, and whether he was reimbursed by the organizer^{cf.223}.
12. Go to the hotel at which the judge stayed during the seminar or conference, the clubs of which he is a member, and the restaurants that he patronizes, and talk to maids, janitors, waiters and waitresses, barmen, car and hotel limousines drivers, desk attendants, etc., to find out about his conduct and that of his fellow judges and the organizers(cf. jur:106§c).
13. Go to the county clerk's office registry, a marina, an airport and find out what property is registered in his name or in that of his family and relatives; try to find out whether he has registered property in the name of strawmen.
14. Hunt down the court reporters¹⁷⁶⁻¹⁷⁹ –the journalists who report on notable cases and court events– and try to join forces(ol:1) with them in your investigation(ol:54); or at least obtain some leads for your further investigation.
15. Write to the deans¹⁸⁰⁻¹⁸³ of journalism schools and professors of investigative journalism(Lsch: 23), and thereafter go to the schools to meet them, the class presidents(Lsch:1), and the students enrolled in the investigative journalism classes, who may have had some of their work published on the school websites; or find out from students in the student center or cafeteria who is in those classes; interest students in joining your investigation(ol:55, 66) given that journalism is taught by students going out in the field to search a story, write a journalism article, and submit it to their professor for correction and grading; have students join you in proposing to a professor your investigation or the development of a course that investigates the judiciary and its judges.

16. Go to the court website and read the biographical note of the judge and download his picture; then go to the law school or public library and use their commercial databases, cf. [jur:108§d](#), to search the name of the judge in order to find out in connection with what social, business, and professional activities his name appears, e.g. on what academic and business boards he sits, what groundbreaking and business opening ceremonies he attended; search the names of the members of his family to the degree of relationship provided by the law for the determination of conflict of interests and disqualification, cf. ⁴⁰ >28 USC §455.
17. Go to the website of the judge's judiciary and download his biography and photo; find out in what judicial committees¹⁰⁶ he has sat or sits and in what judicial activities he has participated, what articles he has written for the judiciary's newsletter(cf. [jur:iii/fn.ii](#), generally, and entries g and h, in particular).
18. Use the downloaded photo of the judge and run it through facial recognition software to find out in whose company he appears, cf. *Caperton v. A. T. Massey Coal Co.*²⁷⁶.
19. Access the judge's postings on social media, such as Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter, Youtube, etc., and use the names of people, entities, and activities as leads to determine the judges' connections and any conflict of interests and sources of undue influence.
20. In the law school or public library, access the WestLaw and Lexis-Nexis databases to search for law journal articles on the organization of the judiciary, judges' decision making, judicial wrongdoing, etc.(cf. [a&p:14](#)); download the list of all the decisions that the judge has written or the cases in which he has participated as an appellate panel members(cf. ^{107b} >JS:98§f et seq.).
21. Access the website of the university and law school that the judge attended and of the local law schools and universities and find out in connection with what activities and persons his name appears, e.g., on what moot courts he sat, what commencement classes he addressed, what fundraising activities he participated.
22. Go to the websites of the government, the legislature, and the political parties, and find out the names of the people who recommended, endorsed, supported, nominated, voted for and against the confirmation of the judge, appointed, donated to the electoral campaign and campaigned for the judge, and find out how he has repaid the favor to them when he sat on cases in which those people had an interest; find out who are the people who at present would determine whether to elevate the judge to a higher court, to chief judge of his court, or to reappoint him.
23. Progressively develop a sociogram for the judge, that is, a graphical representation of the people to whom and activities to which you have found him to be connected([jur:9](#)); Word and PowerPoint have several templates for developing sociograms; developing the sociogram on the computer will make it possible to easily correct and update it.
24. Make a list of all his journal and book publications and read as many of them as possible to determine where he stood on issues, how his position has changed since when compared with his judicial decisions, what his biases are, etc.
25. Audit the judge's decisions for patterns of dicta and decisions that reveal bias and prejudice rather than a principled view of the law consistently applied; to that end, the audit can use statistical, linguistic, and literary analysis(cf. [jur:131§b](#); [ol:42](#); [ol:60](#)).
26. Find in those decisions the names of lawyers and parties that have appeared before the judge; meet them and, in general, ask them about him, and, in particular, ask them the questions that you have developed in a questionnaire intended to elicit information about his impartiality, fairness, temperament, treatment of people in and out of his courtroom, any evidence, rumors, or

suspicion that he is involved in wrongdoing or is incompetent or physically disabled(jur:10 left column); etc., so that eventually you can compare the opinion in which they hold him with the opinion in which other judges are held(cf. jur:122§§2-3).

27. Go to the courthouse and without tipping anybody to the fact that you are investigating a judge, befriend the court clerks to obtain inside information about the judge and court procedures as they are actually performed even in disregard of the rules(Lsch:17§C).
28. Find out who his current law clerks are and talk to them very casually about the judge; if you sense that they disapprove of him or the court, see whether they can be turned into Deep Throats on the judge and the going-ons in the courthouse(jur:106§c); find out who were their predecessors, the judge's former law clerks, track them down, and ask them confidentially, on a promise of anonymity, how the judge was in and out of chambers; what they saw him do and asked them do; with whom of his peers he had friendly or hostile relations; with whom he played cards or went geese hunting; who were his acquaintances other than peers, lawyers, and parties; etc.
29. Interview the people with whom he worked at his previously held jobs, e.g., the secretaries, associates, partners, clients, at law firms where the judge worked.
30. Persuade candidates for public office to make, whether out of conviction or opportunism, the exposure of judges' wrongdoing part of their platform and coalesce them into a bipartisan coalition.

B. The need to work professionally and disseminate the findings effectively

31. The investigators need to memorialize their work in painfully accurate and complete notes, which will save them an enormous amount of time, extra work, and frustration when they want to:
 - a. go back to the source of a piece of information to further pursue it;
 - b. give a lead to a co-investigator;
 - c. defend against an attack on your credibility, honesty, and good faith;
 - d. appear authoritative at a press conference or a talkshow by showing journalists, the host, and their respective audience that they did their homework and know their subject;
 - e. avoid making misstatements or spreading unsubstantiated, exaggerated, one-sided anecdotes of victims of judges' wrongdoing;
 - f. prevent being bogged down and depleted of their financial resources by being sued for defamation and having to concentrate on defending against the suit;
 - g. win a suit for defamation by showing a complete defense to it: the truth.
32. Hard work is only valuable if it leads to making progress. Just sweating profusely is not useful, i.e.: Setting up another website on which to display the findings will merely add another site to the hundreds already on the Internet and have very little, if any, effect. The appropriate kind of hard work results from the investigators' thinking strategically(Lsch:14§§2-3, jur:xliv¶C, Lsch:20§1, ol:8§E, ol:52§C). This will lead them to implement the strategy(ol:56§C): to launch a Watergate-like generalized media investigation driven by the profit motive(ol:74§§B-D) and moral rewards(ol:3§F) of judges' wrongdoing, whose findings so outrage the national public as to stir it up to force politicians, lest they be voted out of, or not into office, to conduct the first-ever official investigation of the Federal Judiciary by Congress, DoJ-FBI, a special counsel, and their state counterparts using their intrusive powers of subpoena, search and seizure, etc., and to undertake judicial reform.

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

June 12, 2020

**Illustrative list of official courts documents and sources
to research riskless abuse of power by
federal judges of the United States[‡]**

1. The proposed research of judges' abuse of power will *begin* with a source that the judges will not be able to impeach: their own publications. Access to them should be easy where the judiciaries and even individual courts have websites that are open to the public and publish, in addition to judges' decisions, their own reports, statistics, newsletters, speeches, etc.
2. The examples of research sources provided hereunder are from federal and state judiciaries and courts in the United States. They are likely to have equivalents in your own country.
3. The research of all those sources will make our combined effort truly international. It will establish the common ground of the conduct of judges all over the world: Their unaccountability. That is the enabling circumstance of their abuse of power; it is aggravated by the secrecy, coordination, and the risklessness resulting from their self-exemption from complaints and connivance with politicians.
4. Our library research should furnish the convincing evidence that the media need to take the risky step of taking on judges by conducting field investigations(*>OL:194§E) into their abuse. In principle, this amounts to a division of labor. Yet, researchers and the media should be united in their objective: to inform and outrage *We the People*, the only entity strong enough to compel the holding of judges accountable and liable.

A. Key sources of official information of federal judges

5. The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts(AO), <http://www.uscourts.gov>; which issues, among many things:
 - a. The Annual Report [to Congress and the public] of the Director of the AO; <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/analysis-reports/directors-annual-report>;
 - b. Judicial Business of the United States Courts, containing the most comprehensive compilation of the federal courts' official statistics; <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/analysis-reports/judicial-business-united-states-courts>; and
 - c. *The Third Branch Newsletter*, published by the Federal Judiciary, www.uscourts.gov/news/2012/05/24/introducing-third-branch-news; for a list of AO's similar periodicals search on its website for "newsletters" or go to <https://search.uscourts.gov/search?affiliate=uscourts.gov&locale=en&query=newsletter>;
 - d. Judiciary News; <https://www.uscourts.gov/judiciary-news>;
 - e. official news releases and articles in the official newsletter of the federal courts, <http://www.uscourts.gov/News/InsideTheJudiciary.aspx>
 - f. other materials, <http://www.uscourts.gov/FederalCourts/PublicationsAndReports.aspx>
6. The **Federal Judicial Center**, which is "the education and research agency of the United States federal courts", <https://www.uscourts.gov/topics/federal-judicial-center>;
7. The **Judicial Conference** of the United States, presided over by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and including "the chief judge of each judicial circuit, the Chief Judge of the Court of

International Trade, and a district judge from each regional judicial circuit” as well as two non-voting members, a bankruptcy judge and a magistrate; its only functions are to make-policy for the Federal Judiciary and decide in the last resort disciplinary matters referred to it; <https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/governance-judicial-conference/about-judicial-conference>:

- a. See the official reports on its semi-annual proceedings: <http://www.uscourts.gov/FederalCourts/JudicialConference/Proceedings.aspx>; and

8. The **Supreme Court** of the U.S. Court, which issues, among other things:
 - a. The Chief Justice’s XXXX Year-End Report on the Federal Courts; <https://www.supremecourt.gov/publicinfo/year-end/year-endreports.aspx>; see also <https://www.uscourts.gov/topics/united-states-supreme-court>;
 - b. Justices’ speeches, e.g., <http://www.supremecourt.gov/publicinfo/speeches/speeches.aspx>
9. **The courts** of the 12 regional circuit courts, the one national circuit court; the two national court; the 94 district courts; and the 90 bankruptcy courts, whose websites can be located by going to <https://www.uscourts.gov/federal-court-finder/search>; <https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/federal-courts-public/court-website-links>; e.g., U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit; <http://www.ca2.uscourts.gov/>;
10. **PACER**, i.e., Public Access to Court Electronic Records, “an electronic public access service that allows users to obtain case and docket information online from federal appellate, district, and bankruptcy courts”; <https://www.pacer.gov/index.html>.
11. Rulings, decisions, and opinions of judges available through official court reporters and unofficial aggregators of official court materials, e.g.
 - a. Thomson Reuters’s Westlaw Edge, <https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/en/products/westlaw?cid=9008132&sfdccampaignid=7011B000001xcJTQAY&chl=gem> ;
 - b. LexisNexis’s Lexis Advance; <https://www.lexisnexis.com/en-us/products/lexis-advance.page>;
 - c. <http://www.findlaw.com/>;
 - d. <https://www.fastcase.com/>; and
 - e. Cornell Law School Legal Information Institute; <https://www.law.cornell.edu/>.

B. The laws of Congress and the statements of its members

12. Federal laws and rules of civil and criminal procedure, evidence; Codes: bankruptcy, tax, crimes, etc.
 - a. <http://uscode.house.gov/>
13. Reports providing the evidentiary justification for the need, purpose, and intent of legislative bills:
 - a. http://www.senate.gov/pagelayout/legislative/g_three_sections_with_teasers/legislative_home.htm and
 - b. <http://clerk.house.gov/floorsummary/floor.aspx>
14. Statements of members of Congress on their websites:

- a. <http://www.house.gov/representatives/> and
 - b. http://www.senate.gov/general/contact_information/senators_cfm.cfm;
15. Reports of the U.S. Govt. Accountability Office, <http://www.gao.gov/browse/date/week>.

C. Sources of information on the state courts

16. To research the courts of the several states and locate those entities that are the counterparts to those listed above, use as portals the following:
- a. Conference of Chief Justices; <https://ccj.ncsc.org/>; for their names and official addresses click on “Roster”; for their reports, go to <https://ccj.ncsc.org/resources/reports>;
 - b. Conference of State Court Administrators; <https://cosca.ncsc.org/>; go also to <https://cosca.ncsc.org/resources/website-of-interest>; and
 - c. National Center for State Courts; <https://www.ncsc.org/>; and check:
 - 1) Companion Sites & Resource Centers; <https://www.ncsc.org/information-and-resources/companion-sites>; and
 - 2) for an alphabetical list of state court sites go to <https://www.ncsc.org/information-and-resources/state-court-websites>.

D. Offer of a presentation on exposing judges’ abuse of power

17. I offer to present to you and your guests via video conference or in person my proposal for forming an international team to expose judges’ unaccountability and consequent riskless abuse of power. You may use the information in the letterhead to contact me and discuss the presentation's terms and conditions and its scheduling.
18. To decide whether to organize such presentation watch my video together with its supporting slides([†]>OL2:958) using the following links:
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_video.mp4
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_slides.pdf

E. Put your money where your outrage at abuse and passion for justice are.

Support the professional law research and writing, and strategic thinking of

Judicial Discipline Reform

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

Donate through

Paypal

https://www.paypal.com/cgi-bin/webscr?cmd=_s-xclick&hosted_button_id=HBFP5252TB5YJ

or

at the **GoFundMe** campaign at

<https://www.gofundme.com/expose-unaccountable-judges-abuse>

Dare trigger history!([†]>OL2:1108)[‡]...and you may enter it.

[‡]http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-International_Team.pdf

with the intent to:

- a. impede the broadcast of facts regarding its abusive discipline self-exemption and resulting riskless coordinated wrongdoing;
- b. hinder the formation of an entity for the advocacy of journalistic and official investigations of such wrongdoing; and thus
- c. forestall the adoption of effective judicial accountability and discipline reform.

**c. Field investigation on deep background:
the search for Deep Throat**

239. The investigative reporters(jur:102¶230) can continue their investigation in the field. There they can approach a source of information²¹⁶ that is essential to expose coordinated judicial wrongdoing: the judges' law clerks²¹⁷ and the clerks of court²¹⁸. They have inside knowledge of what goes on in chambers. But they will not talk openly. That would put at risk what every law clerk works for: a glowing recommendation from their judge that they can cash in for a job with a top law firm and an enticing sign-up bonus.¹⁴⁶ But law clerks are young and still have the idealism of young people. Some even studied law because they believed in our system of justice and the power of the rule of law to make a better world. In this frame of mind, they can only feel disgusted at all the wrongdoing that they must witness in silence in their judges' chambers and in the courtroom and are even required to execute as the judges' agents of wrongdoing.
240. Likewise, clerks of court know what goes on among the court judges. They are aware of the divergence between what they are supposed to do according to the internal operating rules²¹⁹ and what they are told by judges to do and even the reason for it. For example, clerks are supposed to spin the wheel to assign judges to cases randomly so that their biases do not influence which cases they pick or pass up and their prejudices do not predetermine their decision-making. But if a judge asks for a case, what is a lowly clerk going to do?, risk being reassigned from the sunny documents in-take room to the moldy archive warehouse? He may choose to do as told and keep quiet about his realization that...
241. Judge Brypen always asks for cases to which a certain land developer is a party, which owns the hotel chain where a bank holds its semi-annual meetings at which the Judge is always invited to speak. The day the Judge told the clerk to declare the court closed due to a flash flood, the Judge blurted that he would go "to my room at the Bella Vita", the local unit of that hotel chain. The following day he arrived on time at the court wearing a suit and a tie that the clerk had seen

²¹⁶ A Journalist's Guide to the Federal Courts, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts; p.10. Types and Sources of Court Information; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/AO_Journalists_Guide_sep11.pdf

²¹⁷ Law Clerks Handbook: A Handbook for Law Clerks to Federal Judges, 2nd ed., edited by Sylvan A. Sobel; Federal Judicial Center (2007); http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/law_clerk_handbk_07.pdf.

²¹⁸ a) National Conference of Bankruptcy Clerks; <http://ncbc.memberclicks.net/>;
b) Federal Court Clerks Association; <http://www.fcca.ws/>

²¹⁹ Cf. http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/CA2_Local_Rules_IOP_8sep11.pdf

before. Judge Brypen could not have brought those clothes from home the day before in anticipation of an unexpected flood or go home and change early that day, because the road to his home was still flooded. The clerk put it together: The Judge has a permanent room at the hotel where he keeps clothes; the land developer always wins his cases. The clerk will not talk about this for the record. However, on a promise of anonymity he can provide information that the investigative reporters cannot find as, or from, outsiders. He can help them find out whether Judge Brypen uses the room for free as payment of a bribe in kind, what he uses it for, whether the judge and the land developer meet in chamber or have scheduled meetings elsewhere, whether the former is an investor in the latter's business; etc.

242. Law clerks and clerks of court can be assured that if they want to contribute to exposing individual and coordinated wrongdoing in the Judiciary by confidentially communicating inside information to the investigative reporters, their existence and anonymity will be held so confidential as to turn the clerks into the modern version of a historic figure: Deep Throat, the deputy director of the FBI, William Mark Felt, Sr., who provided guidance to *Washington Post* Reporters Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein in their Watergate investigation and whose identity they kept secret for 30 years until Mr. Felt himself revealed it in May 2005.²²⁰ The same assurance can be extended, of course, to current and former legal and bankruptcy system insiders¹⁶⁹ (cf. *jur:9*) and members of the Judiciary as well as members of the Executive Branch and Congress.
243. This type of investigative reporting has hardly ever been practiced with the Federal Judiciary as the target, yet its potential is enormous. Just consider the amount of valuable information that can also be provided by waiters and waitresses, maids, concierges, drivers, and other personnel at hotels and resorts where judges attend or stay overnight when they participate in the semi-annual meetings of the Judicial Conference of the U.S.²²¹, circuit conferences²²², private seminars²²³, and meetings of classes of judicial officers and employees²²⁴. What did these service personnel

²²⁰ **a)** http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/FBI_No2_Deep_Throat.pdf;

b) <http://www.citmedialaw.org/state-shield-laws>; and <http://www.firstamendmentcenter.org/>

²²¹ The Judicial Conference⁹¹ meets in Washington, D.C., in March and September^{cf.fn.29} for two or three days at the Supreme Court and the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts¹⁰, which maintains its secretariat. At the latter venue, its circuit and district members meet with the judges that form the Conference's many committees, e.g., on financial disclosure reports, judicial conducts, and the code of conduct; <http://www.uscourts.gov/FederalCourts/JudicialConference/Committees.aspx>. Its meetings are always held behind closed doors, http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/DrRCordero-investigators_leads.pdf, after which it issues an anodyne press release on miscellanea, http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/Follow_money/JConf_systematic_dismissals.pdf.

²²² **a)** Each circuit holds a conference annually and in some cases biennially to deal with administrative matters, as provided for under 28 U.S.C. §333, http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/28usc331-335_Conf_Councils.pdf; cf. http://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/judicial_council/judicial_council.php. **b)** Circuit map: *jur:20* and http://www.uscourts.gov/Court_Locator.aspx

²²³ On the duty of judges to disclose attendance at seminars and who pays its cost; <http://www.uscourts.gov/RulesAndPolicies/PrivateSeminarDisclosure.aspx>

²²⁴ **a)** Federal Judges Association; <http://www.federaljudgesassoc.org/>; **b)** Federal Magistrate Judges Association; <http://www.fedjudge.org/>; **c)** National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges; <http://www.ncbj.org/>; **d)** Supreme Court Fellows Program; <http://www.supremecourt.gov/>

hear and whom did they see when they were serving the chief judge and his guests in his hotel suite at midnight after their inhibitions had been washed away by potent torrents of brandy and cognac and their boisterous conversation was littered with the flotsam of their wrongdoing: stories of how they had outsmarted the IRS by using offshore accounts set up by big banks with cases before them; how the day before leaving for the meeting they had cleared their desk of unread^{224e} pending cases by signing a bunch of summary orders so they could feel free to enjoy the ‘holiday’; how the next day they would meet privately with some bidders for the contract to remodel the courthouse; how they are planning for the judge to make an ‘unexpected’ cameo appearance at a political fundraising event where she will pronounce a few words of gratitude for the support of the audience and their contributions to the event organizers’ good work...‘for our veterans and those still fighting for our shared principles and constitutional values...umm in Afghanistan’; etc.(cf. [jur:22¶31](#))

d. Library investigation

244. The investigative reporters([jur:102¶230](#)) can also conduct a library investigation. Starting with the leads already available¹⁹⁸, they can search for relevant information in:
- a. commercial databases²²⁵, e.g., Accurant, Dialog, Dun & Bradstreet, EDGAR (financial filings), Hoover, Lexis-Nexis, Martindale & Hubble (directory of law firms and biographies of lawyers)²²⁶, Proquest, Saegis and TRADE-MARKSCAN, Thomson Reuters CLEAR;
 - b. WestLaw²²⁷, a division of the private company Thomson Reuters, and Lexis-Nexis²²⁸, also a private company, but both report under contract with federal and state governments court procedural rules, case decisions, and legislation, as well as vast amounts of information on an extensive list of topics, including judges, lawyers, companies, people, commercial and financial transactions, etc.;
 - c. credit reporting bureaus, e.g., Equifax, Experian, TransUnion; Privacy Guard;
 - d. federal government databases, e.g.:
 - 1) Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts²²⁹,
 - 2) PACER (Public Access to Court Electronic Records, particularly rich in bankruptcy

[fellows/default.aspx](#); **e)** cf. [fn.123c](#) >CA:1749§2

²²⁵ Cf. commercial databases with links at [fn.254a](#) >¶10

²²⁶ <http://www.martindale.com/>

²²⁷ **a)** <http://government.westlaw.com/nyofficial/>;

b) see also <http://www.nysl.nysed.gov/collections/lawresources.htm> and <http://public.leginfo.state.ny.us/MENUGETF.cgi?COMMONQUERY=LAWS+&TARGET=VIEW>;

c) <http://directory.westlaw.com/>

²²⁸ <https://www.lexisnexis.com/>

²²⁹ <http://www.uscourts.gov/Home.aspx>

- filings)²³⁰,
- 3) Code of Federal Regulations (regulations and decisions of federal agencies)²³¹,
 - 4) Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (73 I.G.s that act as watchdogs of federal government operations)²³²,
 - 5) General Accounting Office (the investigative arm of Congress, reputedly impartial and thorough)²³³,
 - 6) Office of Management and Budget (attached to the White House, i.e. the Executive Branch)²³⁴,
 - 7) Securities and Exchange Commission (filings of publicly traded companies)²³⁵,
 - 8) the U.S. Senate²³⁶ and the U.S. House of Representative²³⁷ (which contain a treasure trove of reports on the investigations and hearings that normally precede and provide the foundation for federal law);
 - 9) U.S. Code²³⁸ (the thematic collection of all public and private laws of the federal government),
 - 10) US Tax Court (where litigants’ filings may disclose otherwise confidential tax information)²³⁹,
 - 11) THOMAS (the Library of Congress)²⁴⁰,
 - 12) U.S. Code Congressional & Administrative News^{241a} (U.S.C.C.A.N.; containing the transcripts of congressional sessions; published by WestLaw)^{241b};
 - 13) government offices at the federal, state, county, city, and local levels with which documents must be filed and that may issue licenses, certificates, permits; etc., e.g.:

²³⁰ <http://www.pacer.uscourts.gov/index.html>

²³¹ <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/cfr/index.html>

²³² <http://www.ignet.gov/>

²³³ <http://www.gao.gov/>

²³⁴ <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/>

²³⁵ <http://www.sec.gov/>

²³⁶ <http://www.senate.gov/>

²³⁷ <http://house.gov/>

²³⁸ <http://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml>

²³⁹ <http://www.ustaxcourt.gov/>

²⁴⁰ <http://thomas.loc.gov/home/thomas.php>; cf. the Legal Information Institute of Cornell University Law School, <http://www.law.cornell.edu/>

²⁴¹ **a)** <http://www.westlaw.com/search/default.wl?db=USCCAN&RS=W&VR=2.0>; **b)** <http://directory.westlaw.com/default.asp?GUID=WDIR0000000000000000000000105257&RS=W&VR=2.0>

- a) National Association of Counties²⁴²,
 - b) National Association of County Recorders, Election Officials and Clerks²⁴³,
 - c) National Center for State Courts²⁴⁴
 - d) Drug and Food Administration and similar state agencies;
 - e) the departments of labor;
 - f) departments of vehicles;
 - g) departments of buildings;
 - h) departments of vital statistics, such as births, weddings, divorces, deaths, etc.;
 - i) departments of education that record enrollment in, and employment at, schools and other educational institutions;
 - j) land registries
- e. state sources of information:
- 1) state family courts (where divorce and child custody dispute may reveal hidden assets, unpaid taxes, and money laundering)²⁴⁵,
 - 2) Private Library Associations²⁴⁶;
 - 3) State & Regional Library Associations²⁴⁷;
- f. other sources of information:
- 1) social networks, e.g., Facebook, Twitter, UTube;
 - 2) accounts of dealings with judges and insiders posted by the public on websites that complain about judicial wrongdoing;²⁴⁸
 - 3) rosters of marinas, airports, and landing strips that register docking, maintenance services, and landing rights; etc.

²⁴² <http://www.naco.org>

²⁴³ <http://www.nacrc.org/>

²⁴⁴ <http://www.ncsc.org/>

²⁴⁵ <http://family.findlaw.com/family/family-law-help/state-family-courts.html>

²⁴⁶ <http://www.plabooks.org/>

²⁴⁷ <http://www.libraryconsultant.com/associations.htm>

²⁴⁸ Alliance for Justice, www.afj.org/; Citizens for Judicial Accountability, <http://www.judicialaccountability.org/>; Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington, <http://www.crewsmostcorrupt.org/>; National Association of Court Monitoring Programs, <http://www.watchmn.org/>; Judicial Watch, <http://www.judicialwatch.org/>; National Association to Stop Guardian Abuse; <http://nasga-stopguardianabuse.blogspot.com/2010/05/probate-judge-violates-ethics-code.html>; National Forum on Judicial Accountability, <http://www.njcdlp.org/>; Victims of Law, <http://victimsoflaw.net/>

**e. Investigation by appealing on
the Internet and social media to the public**

1) Accounts of dealings with the judiciary

245. The investigative reporters can also make innovative use of the Internet and social media to appeal to the public to submit their accounts of their dealings with the Federal Judiciary, in particular, and also the state judiciaries, in general. While those accounts may be anecdotal and not necessarily factually accurate or legally correct, they can help sound out the depth and nature of the problem of coordinated judicial wrongdoing. From this perspective, they can provide assistance by educating the investigative reporters on the forms of wrongdoing. The frequency and consistency of account details can prove invaluable in detecting patterns²⁴⁹ of conduct that reveal intentional conduct and coordination among judges, insiders, and others. This in turn can help figure out the most organized and pernicious form of coordinated wrongdoing: a scheme⁹⁴. Likewise, responses to neutral questionnaires can help determine public perception of the fairness, impartiality, and honesty of judges and the degree of public satisfaction with, and trust in, their administration of justice as what they are: judicial public servants of, and accountable to, the people.

**2) Questionnaires as precursors of
a statistically rigorous public opinion poll**

246. No doubt, such accounts and completed questionnaires will be submitted by a self-selected segment of the population. Submitters will most likely be people who bear a grudge against judges because of negative experiences with them. Such experiences have charged them emotionally to take advantage of the opportunity to vent their feelings toward judges and criticize their performance. Since responders need not constitute a representative sample of the general public, their responses cannot be equated with those of a public opinion poll conducted according to statistics principles to ensure randomness and population representativeness. Yet, their accounts and completed questionnaires can provide the groundwork for devising such a poll in a subsequent, more institutional phase²⁵⁴([jur:130§5](#)) of the investigation of coordinated judicial wrongdoing.

**3) Copies of past and future complaints against judges
made public as an exercise of freedom of speech and of
the press and of the right to assemble to petition for
a redress of grievances**

247. Another type of accounts of dealings with judiciaries that can prove useful even if submitted in a smaller number than general accounts of dealings with the judiciary is formal misconduct complaints against judges filed under federal¹⁸ or state law. In the Federal Judiciary, as revealed

²⁴⁹ Under the federal Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) a pattern of racketeering can be established by two acts of racketeering activity occurring within 10 years: http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/18usc1961_RICO.pdf >18 U.S.C. §1961(5).

by its official statistics²⁵⁰, **a**) these complaints are systematically dismissed by chief circuit judges(jur:24¶¶32-§c); **b**) petitions to review those dismissals are systematically denied by the circuit and district judges of judicial councils;^{127b} and **c**) petitions to review those denials have never been addressed by those chiefs and district judges that are members of the Judicial Conference²²¹. This consistent and unconditional partiality of judges toward their own provides evidence of coordinated conduct, whether through agreement(jur:89¶¶198-199), knowing indifference(jur:90§b), or willful blindness(jur:91§c), aimed at reciprocally covering up their wrongdoing regardless of the nature and gravity of the allegations(jur:68¶143) or the detriment to complainants and the administration of justice.

248. Judges' systematic dismissal of complaints against them allow the inference that judges **a**) have become accustomed to their practice of covering up their complained-about wrongdoing; **b**) have developed such practice into their express or tacit policy to tolerate and participate in each other's wrongdoing and, consequently, **c**) have no scruples about applying it when they become aware of their peers' wrongdoing through sources of information other than complaints regardless of the nature and gravity of such wrongdoing. What obtaining copies of the complaints themselves can add is concrete, even if unverified, details of the nature and gravity of such wrongdoing and the names of judges, insiders, and others alleged to be engaged in it. As in the case of general accounts, these details can prove invaluable in detecting patterns and figuring out schemes, such as the bankruptcy fraud scheme⁶⁰. Therefore, copies of these complaints can contribute to establishing that coordinated wrongdoing has become the Judiciary's institutionalized modus operandi.
249. Complaints against judges are not placed in the public record or otherwise made available to the public by the courts, which keep them secret even from Congress. But however much the judges would like to pretend that complaints are confidential, they are simply to be kept confidentially by them upon complainants filing them with the courts.²⁵¹ Congress itself cannot prohibit the media from publishing such complaints, for that would be an unconstitutional violation of freedom of the press. It follows that Congress cannot indirectly achieve that result through a prior restraint on publication by prohibiting every person in this country from sharing his or her complaint, whether in writing or orally, with anybody else, including the media. Doing so would be in itself an unconstitutional violation of freedom of speech. Therefore, the investigative reporters can invite the public to exercise their constitutional right under the First Amendment to "freedom of speech, of the press, [and] peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances"¹² by submitting to them copies of their past, pending, and future complaints against judges for review and possible publication.²⁵²

²⁵⁰ fn.19a and b >Cg:1-10F

²⁵¹ fn.18 >§360(a)

²⁵² http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/Programmatic_Proposal.pdf >5§C. Organizing and posting evidence

- d. public advocate, lobbyist, consultant, and litigator for both effective legislation on judicial accountability and discipline reform, and the establishment of a citizen board of judicial accountability and discipline and of an inspector general for the Federal Judiciary as key instruments for enforcing such legislation and implementing the reform.

b. As researcher

277. As researcher²⁶⁹ the institute of judicial unaccountability reporting and reform advocacy will conduct advanced statistical analysis and work in information technology.

1) Analysis of the official judicial statistics

278. The official statistics of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts¹⁰ constitute the main data source of the analysis of the means, motive, and opportunity of federal judges' unaccountability and consequent coordinated riskless wrongdoing.(jur:21§A) Those statistics lie at the basis of the tables(jur:10,11) showing the chief circuit judges' systematic dismissal without investigation of 99.82% of misconduct complaints against their peers and the out of hand denial, even reaching 100% during a 13-year period, by the respective judicial council of the petitions for review of dismissed complaints.(jur:24§b) The tables already prepared concern only either the aggregate statistics for the 13 circuits or the individual statistics for the 2nd Circuit.
- a. The institute can update those tables and perform the corresponding statistical analysis and tabulation for each of the other 12 circuits.
 - b. It can also research the records to establish which judges were holding the chief circuit judgeships or membership in the judicial councils and therefore participated in such unlawful and self-interested abrogation in effect of the Act of Congress^{18a} conferring upon people the right to complain about judges.
 - c. Those judges' participation can be confronted with their statements about their "fidelity to the law"^{132f} and their impartiality(jur:68¶143).
 - d. Similarly, judges' record of voting to deny ever more systematically petitions for panel rehearing and hearing en banc can also be researched in every circuit to establish the extent to which judges indulge in such "abuse of discretion"⁷⁴ and reciprocal cover up on the ground of the explicit or implicit agreement "if you don't rehear or review the decisions of the appellate panels on which I sat, I won't rehear or review those of the panels that you sat on, and never mind the appellants whining that the decisions were wrong or wrongful".(jur:45§2)
 - e. The suspicious stability year after year of the number of such complaints filed with judges-judging-judges has been compared with the remarkable trend of increasing number of cases filed at all levels of the federal courts hierarchy(jur:12-14) as the population increases and America becomes an ever more litigious society. This comparison can be updated and refined by comparing the increasing number of whistleblowers complaining against their employers as well as the increase in the number of wrongdoing public officers in the other

²⁶⁹ Cf. http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/DeLano_course/17Law/DrRCordero_proposal_synopsis.pdf

two branches of government, who are persons and members of the same society as judges are where lawful and ethical principles give way ever more blatantly to greed and expediency, as most recently shown by wide spread institutionalized fraud in the subprime mortgage debacle involving both lenders and borrowers.

279. Similar and other types of statistical work can be performed using current statistical methods while the advanced Information Technology software product proposed below is being researched and developed.

2) Research and development in Information Technology

280. The purpose of the institute's IT work will be to research and develop a software product capable of auditing the writings of or about subjects of the legal system and profiling them thereon. To that end, it will develop metrics of personal and official behavior and algorithms to identify instances, patterns²⁴⁹, and trends of behavior that have predictive function for the outcome of a case to be filed or already at bar; and that reveal the subjects' underlying motive, means, and opportunity to engage in such behavior(cf. [jur:21§A](#)). Thereby the product will provide objective, factual information that can help private users to reliably develop their legal strategy and public users to obtain probable cause to open and conduct official investigations involving the subjects.
281. The metrics of behavior will measure the subjects' suitability to play their role in the legal system. Suitability will be a function of the subjects' fairness, impartiality, competence, and integrity, or the lack thereof due to evidence or appearance of wrong or wrongful behavior, which may be motivated by a wrongful attitude, that is, bias, prejudice, actual or potential conflict of interests, or personal agenda. In short, this software product will enable users to evaluate a subject's past and probable future behavior and proceed accordingly.

3) Judges to be the first subjects to be audited and profiled

282. The product will concentrate initially on auditing the writings and profiling the subjects that play the single most outcome-determinative role in the legal system and as to whom the available written materials are most abundant and reliable as matter of public record that also has precedential value, namely, judges. There is no implicit prejudgment in stating that a judge will be audited for wrongdoing. It is obvious that if the judge is discharging her judicial duty to administer justice according to law and is an otherwise law-abiding and ethical person, then there is no problem. But it is not reasonable to assume that judges, who are entrusted with an enormous amount of power over people's property, liberty, and lives, remain immune to the inherently corruptive effect of such power²⁸. This is particularly so with regard to judges, who wield power to decide who gets or loses the most insidious corruptor: *money!*([jur:27§2](#)) This is even more so because judges, as individuals and especially reciprocally as members of a class of similarly situated people, have the means to self-exempt from accountability and discipline to ensure the risklessness of their wrongdoing([jur:21§1](#)).
283. Under those circumstances, the temptation to engage in wrongdoing and the pressure from other class members to tolerate the wrongdoing of any and all members of the class can be irresistible. This is the result of their wrongdoing having only an upside: It can be substantially beneficial in

professional(jur:25§c; 60§f), social(jur:62§g), and material(jur:27§2; 32§§2) terms yet carries no adverse professional, social, or material consequences. One statistic proves this: In the 223 years since the creation of the Federal Judiciary in 1789, the number of federal judges impeached and removed is 8!(jur:21§a) Nevertheless, of course, for those outside the judicial class and its enabling outsiders¹⁶⁹, judges' wrongdoing has a substantial downside, whether it be concrete adverse consequences on their property, liberty, and lives, or on the integrity of the judiciary and the rest of government by the rule of law.

284. Therefore, the only reasonable assumption that is supported by an understanding of the forces at play among a tight-knit class of people such as judges –cf. the police, political party leaders, sport teams– and that is not undermined by the naïve or partisan attribution to them of incorruptibility before or after becoming judge, is that wrongdoing by judges is, not waiting to happen, but rather waiting to happen again and to be exposed.
285. Moreover, for each judge there are numerous data sources that can be audited for analyzable data(jur:150¶337). That is so about the judge assigned to the case at bar as well as one likely to be assigned to it in a court where there are more than one judge or there is a schedule of panels of appellate judges to whom all cases are assigned that are filed during certain dates. Hence, the information obtained through auditing can allow legal strategizing and produce broadly based, reliable probable cause to initiate an official investigation, not to mention unofficial, journalistic ones. Eventually, the product can be applied to other legal system subjects with fewer data sources to mine for data, such as attorneys(jur:46¶46); clerks(73¶¶153-155; 106§c); bankruptcy professionals¹⁶⁹; those who recommend, nominate, and confirm judges(77§§5,6); types of cases, etc.

4) The nature of judicial wrongdoing

286. The term 'wrongdoing' is ample, comprising both judicial performance, i.e., a judge's behavior in his capacity as such, and personal conduct, i.e., the rest of the judge's behavior in any other capacity. Judicial performance may be either wrong, thus possibly pointing to the judge's incompetence, or wrongful because it is driven by an ill motive, such as bias or prejudice concerning a person, a cause, or a type of case; self-interest in a conflict of interests; or a personal agenda pursued with disregard for the law, a sense of proportion, or the bounds of discretion. A judge's personal behavior can be as criminally or civilly unlawful or unethical as that of any non-judge. Judicial performance and personal conduct have some overlapping.
- a. Judicial performance centers on a judge's fairness, impartiality, and competence in the conduct of judicial proceedings and decision-making; e.g., whether he has been fair by not imposing sentences or allowing damages that are disproportionately harsh or mild compared with the defendant's culpable act and the punishment meted out to, or the compensation demanded from, similarly situated defendants in previous cases; impartial by not depriving a party of its right to discovery so as to protect the opposing party from incriminating material being discovered; and competent by not ignoring that a controlling case has been overturned by a recent case or overruled by legislation or not failing to integrate such new piece of information into his handling of the case at bar.
 - b. Personal conduct centers on the judge's integrity in her private and official capacity. It concerns personal conduct such as her concealing assets and evading taxes; breaching a contract, e.g., by failure to pay rent or to buy or sell stock as agreed to; or using her

connections to secure admission to a college for a child despite the latter's disqualifying low grades or admission test score; and tolerating or even covering up other people's similar criminal, civilly unlawful, or unethical conduct.

- c. i. Overlapping judicial performance and personal conduct occurs, for example, when a judge dismisses a complaint against another judge to cover up the latter's wrongdoing; takes advantage of confidential information learned in chambers or submitted under seal to purchase or sell property in a time-sensitive fashion or on more favorable terms; asks for or accepts a bribe to throw a case one way or another; or resorts to a defense lawyer that has appeared before her to have the lawyer set up offshore bank accounts to conceal the judge's illegal assets or engage in money laundering.
- ii. There is also overlapping in the wrongful pursuit with judicial power of a personal agenda, as when a judge goes on a mission against police searchless warrants, although the Fourth Amendment only requires that searches not be unreasonable, not that they be executed only upon a search warrant; or a mission against computer hackers, such as those that hacked his private website and embarrassed him by exposing his collection of erotic pictures, whereupon he treats hackers as if they were terrorists, systematically denying them bail for posing a continued hacking threat to society and authorizing the tapping of their phone conversations, even with their lawyers, under color of measure to prevent the use of a phone for hacking.

287. Wrongdoing also includes failure to "avoid even the appearance of impropriety"^{123a}. That concept has two points of emphasis: "Impropriety" bears on the nature of the behavior, which may fall anywhere along the spectrum ranging from clearly criminal to unbecoming of a person holding judicial office, such as becoming drunk and boisterous at a party. "Appearance" bears on the very low 'burden of proof' that must be carried by any person, for example, a journalist or a hotel concierge, for their allegations to create such an unfavorable or suspicious impression of the judge as to make her hold on office untenable and require her resignation(jur:92§d), such as discreetly rewarding her law school student who in her opinion is the best of the month with an all-paid weekend trip to the Cayman Islands bearing a gift for a friend of the judge who picks it up at the hotel front desk; or eating diner alone with a married law clerk in a restaurant's private room.

5) Main uses and users

288. The **main uses** of the initial software product that concentrates on judges will be:
- a. to discharge an official duty both to hold judges accountable by monitoring their judicial performance and relevant personal conduct and to act on complaints about judicial misconduct by determining whether there is probable cause –not liable to attack as partisan animus– to believe that a judge has engaged in wrongdoing and should be investigate and, if warranted, disciplined or prosecuted; and
 - b. to detect any instance, pattern, or trend of behavior on the part of the judge or judges in the case to be filed or already at bar, which may or may not be wrong or wrongful but which may reveal the judge or judges' way of thinking and handling similar cases in the past, and devise legal strategy accordingly, for example, by deciding either to go ahead and litigate before them or petition on an objective, factual basis that the judges recuse themselves without incurring the risk of having the petition denied as a frivolous tactical move that can

provoke retaliation from the petitioned judges and their peers, or appeal their petition denial in order to have the judge or judges disqualified for cause.

289. The **main users** of the product will fall into two categories:

a. public

- 1) law enforcement agencies that must determine whether there is probable cause to believe that a judge has engaged in any wrongdoing, including failure to “avoid even the appearance of impropriety”(jur:134¶287), for which he or she should be investigated and held accountable; and
- 2) judicial performance commissions and citizen boards of judicial accountability and discipline(jur:160§8) empowered to:
 - a) monitor judges’ performance on a regular basis; and
 - b) receive complaints against any judge from a judge or any other person and process them; and

b. private

- 1) attorneys, their clients, and pro ses who must devise their legal strategy for proceeding in their own cases; and
- 2) entities, such as the proposed institute for judicial accountability and reform advocacy, that
 - a) on commission from a third party audit for a fee a trial or appellate judge; or
 - b) audit judges, publish the results on the entities’ websites, and make them accessible either on subscription or for free in the public interest and to attract webvisitors^{cf. 213a}.

290. All the main users must decide whether to spend months or years and thousands, tens of thousands, even hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars⁸³ in litigation. This can be emotionally-draining, for the stakes can include being sentenced to death, going to prison for the rest of one’s life or for many years, plea bargaining, or being acquitted; being held liable for a high money judgment and even devastating punitive damages; establishing an adverse controlling precedent or a public perception contrary to a party’s interest; or settling to dispose of the case with certainty as opposed to having it dismissed or reversed. At present, law enforcement officers, judicial performance commissioners, and attorneys base their decision on how to proceed on either their personal and thus limited and subjectively evaluated experience of practicing before a judge augmented by hearsay about such experience of others or base their decision only such hearsay alone if the decision-makers have never practiced before that judge. The decision may also be made by a client or a pro se relying on nothing more substantive than his passion-driven wishful thinking or fear-induced gut feeling. The toss of a coin may also be the decision-maker.

291. An advanced IT-based software product that evaluates a judge’s past behavior by auditing vast amounts of data from a wide variety of sources constantly added to can provide users with a more reliable foundation for predicting how the judge is likely to handle the case to be filed or already at bar and whether users should petition the judge to recuse himself; appeal a denial in order to have him disqualified; settle or plea bargain.

292. For instance, using this product, a private user could find out that the judge assigned to his case ruled in 87.2% of her cases in favor of women suing their employers for promotion discrimination as opposed to the initially assigned judge, whom the user caused to recuse himself because the product audited judicial and extra-judicial writings of both the judge and other people and found expressions of ideas –not decisions– that gave the “appearance”^{123a} of bias against women that work rather than stay home doing what they are supposed to do as wives. In reliance on that information, the user could decide to try his case more confidently rather than settle.
293. Likewise, the product can enable public users to discover the suspicious coincidence that a judge has been assigned purportedly by the luck of the draw conducted by the clerk of court whom he appointed(jur:30§1) to six involuntary bankruptcy petitions that any of three financial institutions, which financed the library annex of the law school of whose advisory board the judge was a member at the time of the annex construction, filed against debtors who were owners of land in the northern region of the judge’s judicial district and who protested to the judge to no avail his approval of the sale by the same bankruptcy trustees of their land at below market price at private auctions to thinly capitalized international companies formed only weeks after the filing of the petitions and which have had no more activity after they sold the land to one of the members of a consortium that recently announced plans to build a freight train-airplane-truck intermodal transportation hub and merchandise distribution center in the district’s northern region.(cf. jur:32§§2)3); 46§3) Based on this probable cause to believe that the judge has in effect engaged in a conspiracy to expropriate land for private use without due compensation, the public user can decide to open an investigation of the judge and others involved in this series of suspicious transactions.

6) Auditing a judge’s writings

294. The auditing feature of the software product will audit a judge’s judicial decisions in the case intrinsic data sources as well as his non-judicial writings constituting his case extrinsic data sources.(jur:150¶337) Its purpose will be to detect how a specific feature of a variable feature of cases, that is, the value of a variable –e.g., a parties’ wealth, level of education, subject matter–, relates to the outcome of the judge’s cases and whether that variable is controlled by a judge’s behavior, which may or may not be wrong or wrongful, but which may result from a wrongful attitude, such as bias, prejudice, conflict of interests, and personal agenda. The product will calculate the statistical probability that such variable value will determine the judge’s decision in a case that is or may come before that judge. Based on that information, a private user will be able to devise its legal strategy and a public user will be able to determine whether there is probable cause to investigate a judge for wrongdoing.

a) Statistical analysis for auditing a judge’s decisions

295. The auditing feature of the software program only audits a judge’s decisions and does so only through statistical analysis. This auditing is mostly in the nature of an accounting: A layout similar to a balance sheet is used, with the column on the left for plaintiffs and prosecutors and the column on the right for defendants. Under each column is set forth the same list of heading-like variables, each of which is subdivided into values. For instance, the variable ‘party gender’

is subdivided into the two values of male and female; and the variable 'party representation' is subdivided into counseled and pro se; while the variables 'religion', 'race', 'ethnicity', 'company size', or 'subject matter' may each have three or more values. Next to each value is the *frequency number*, that is, the total number of cases before the audited judge where the party was, let's say, Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Moslem, or None, followed by the *winning frequency* or number of cases where the parties with that value won; and the *frequency percentage*, or winning frequency expressed as a percentage of the frequency number. Other mathematical and statistical relations can be calculated in order to perform a more sophisticated analysis, but the ones named above suffice for the illustrative purpose here.

296. Let's consider the variable of political party affiliation and let's assign to it only two values, that is, affiliation to party A or to party Z. If either variable value has no bearing whatsoever on case outcome, then an A affiliated party opposing a Z affiliated party has the same 50%, toss of a coin chance of winning as of losing. That variable is outcome-irrelevant; it is a dependent variable because its influence on case outcome, if any, depends on the value of other variables. The opposite speaks for itself: If in 100% of cases the A party won when opposing a Z party, then the A value of the party affiliation variable is outcome-determinative. That variable is independent because its influence on the outcome of cases is not dependent on the value of any other single variable or set of variables. That variable is controlled by a judge's bias, prejudice, conflict of interests, or personal agenda, for there is no rational explanation in a system of justice governed by the rule of law that accounts for A parties winning 100% of cases when opposing Z parties, even where any two A parties have diametrically opposite values for all other variables, that is, they are completely different in every other respect, nevertheless they win merely because each is an A party opposing a Z party.
297. In this illustration, the political affiliation variable allows for proof of a judge's bias or prejudice: When opposing parties were both A parties or Z parties, there was no single variable that accounted for a party winning or losing 100% of cases. However, parties that were war veterans opposing non-veterans won 7 out of 10 cases; parties suing for, let's say, breach of contract won in 8 out of 10 cases; and parties defending against a charge of domestic abuse won in 9 out of 10 cases. Each of these three variables is dependent variables because none of each could determine the outcome of 100% of cases. Nonetheless, in combination they could become independent variables, and thus outcome-determinative: In litigation before the judge being audited where both parties were either A or Z parties, if a party was a war veteran and was suing for breach of contract, it won in 100% of cases.
298. The above makes the usefulness of the software product for auditing a judge's decisions patently obvious: An A party opposing a Z party could be all but certain of prevailing. Consequently, it would have no interest in either having the judge recuse himself or in settling with the opposing Z party on terms any lesser than the full relief requested. The same would hold true for a war veteran suing a non-veteran for breach of contract. The opposite would be the case for a Z party and for a non-veteran being sued for breach of contract: They would have every interest in petitioning the judge to recuse himself and doing so by invoking the evidence of his bias; otherwise, they would want to settle even by agreeing to the relief requested and thereby avoiding the expense of a judicial proceeding with a predetermined outcome adverse to them.
299. In the same vein but to varying degrees, a war veteran who learned that he had a 70% probability of winning over a non-veteran; a party suing for breach of contract with an 80% probability of winning; and a party defending against a domestic abuse charge with a 90% winning probability would find such information significant in devising their respective litigation strategy. By the

same token, a retired policeman suing an employed civilian; a party suing on reasonable reliance on an implied promise or estoppel by laches; and a party defending against a charge of assaulting another company executive officer could devise their litigation strategy by applying by analogy those statistics in the absence of statistics bearing on the specific variable values of their respective cases.

300. Likewise, law enforcement authorities, judicial performance commissions, and the proposed citizen boards of judicial accountability and discipline will use this product to determine whether there is probable cause to investigate a judge that has a record of ensuring a win for 100% of A parties opposing Z parties. Their attention will also be drawn to a judge whose record shows a pattern of partiality toward certain types of parties and subject matters.

(1) Enhancing the usefulness of statistics on a judge through comparison with judicial baselines

301. The *statistics on auditing a judge's decisions* take on much more significance when they are compared with their equivalent for all judges of her court, district, circuit, and judiciary. Each such level in the hierarchy of aggregates of judges can have its own *winning frequency average* and *frequency percentage* for each variable value. These comparative statistics represent baselines. The more a judge's winning frequency and, particularly, her frequency percentage for a given value deviate from the corresponding baseline, the more they point to the judge's anomalous behavior, which may signal wrongdoing.
302. To determine whether an audited judge's anomalous behavior results from wrongdoing the statistics on her can be vetted through a series of reasonable factual considerations; e.g., her unusually high number of winning defendants of Chinese descent is due to the fact that her judicial district includes China Town; the unusually high percentage of white collar convictions in cases before her is the result of the election of a district attorney who ran on a platform of holding accountable financial institution officers who organized or tolerated abusive subprime mortgage lending and, in addition, a pool of jurors particularly outraged by a notorious case of egregious abuse involving the husband of the state senate majority leader; her unusually high percentage of doctors held liable for high medical malpractice judgments is related to her having lost her kid brother when the apartment building that he was visiting collapsed due to a negligent engineering design.
303. Other patterns and trends may underlie a judge's decisions and come to light by auditing those decisions. The resulting statistics are revealing in themselves and even more so when compared with those on each level in the hierarchy of aggregates of judges, such as:
- a. the winning or losing of parties and:
 - 1) their wealth as well as the deciding judge's or panel judges';
 - 2) their pro se or counseled status, and if the latter, whether representation was provided by a solo practitioner or a small or medium firm or rather a large law firm capable or with a history of appealing unfavorable decisions and bringing their appeals to the attention of the media;
 - 3) their race; sexual or political orientations; religion; area of residence; employment status, type, and level; ethnicity; nationality; celebrity status and connection to

important people; etc.;

- 4) similarities between the investment portfolios of the judges of a court that cannot be explained by separate but coincidental investment decisions, and that point to either a group of people trading on inside information or acting as an investment syndicate and may have as their priority, not the administration of justice according to the rule of law, but rather the preservation of their portfolio value and enhancement of their return on investment³⁰;
- b. granting or denying of bail, its amount, and imposition of other conditions restricting movement to a house, a geographic area, the wearing of an electronic bracelet²⁷⁰, their consideration of the sentencing guidelines when imposing terms of imprisonment and other criminal punishment; etc.

(2) The archetype of judicial performance and the judge's decision auditing model

304. The auditing of individual judges' decisions and the calculation of baselines on aggregates of judges can provide a data rich, fact-based understanding of the qualitative and quantitative metrics of judges' performance realistic enough to enable the development of an *archetype of judicial performance* with disciplinary and prescriptive function.
305. The auditing statistics and the objective, factual considerations applied to test a judge's anomalous deviations from the baselines can provide the basis for developing a *judge's decision auditing model*. Its ever-greater sophistication can be the result of an ever more complex algorithm that takes into account general judiciary variable values adjusted by extra-judicial or judge-specific considerations. An algorithm can identify the one variable value or set of variable values that is most highly correlated to the respective case outcome.
306. The model's usefulness will be established to the extent to which it will produce *full range predictive statistical probabilities* that are reliable, to wit, that the model can predict with a degree of probability ever closer to 100% not only the final win or loss outcome of any given case before the audited judge for any given party, but also the content and outcome of the many intervening rulings on motions and objections and such predictions are correct in 100% of cases or a percentage ever closer thereto. The capacity to predict such range of probabilities will require, of course, that in addition to auditing the writings of a judge, the writings of or about other subjects of a case, such as attorneys, jurors, and circumstantial considerations, be audited and that all of them be profiled.
307. Such a vastly complex statistical model, whose most important variables are eminently psychological and sociological, is theoretically possible without the need to assume that human beings are predetermined to behave in a certain way. Rather, it suffices to assume that every individual is motivated by a hierarchy of harmonious and conflicting interests, that he or she pursues such interests in a sufficiently rational way to manifest them in patterns and trends of behavior characterized by constant elements, and that the interaction of a group of individuals is a system of interests susceptible to dynamic analysis of harmonious and conflicting interests.¹⁸⁷ That analysis can be infinitely refined incrementally by the dynamic reconfiguration of the

²⁷⁰ http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/Legal_news.pdf >Ln:147, 152

system as not only existing interests exit it, new ones enter it, and those in it are modified by the constant flow of knowledge, but also as the relative position of the interests on that hierarchy and the strength of their hold on that position are constantly recalibrated more accurately through an ever more perceptive analysis of the patterns and trends through which they manifest themselves. This means that the system of interests of an individual and of a group is neither closed nor stable. Even theoretically no analysis will ever be able to predict the system's behavior with 100% accuracy. It also means that a dynamic analysis takes into account changes even as it is ever more perceptive of the patterns and trends that give constancy to the system. By taking into account the frequent changes in the system, the analysis can predict ever more accurately the system's behavior. The set of rules that allows such analysis to be performed constitutes a model.

308. Computer models of hurricane behavior are used today to warn millions of people that they are in harm's way and advise them on how to protect themselves. Those models have become more reliable than watching birds fly away from a cloudy sky. Medical expert systems are being developed to make patient diagnoses more accurate than those made by doctors with different degrees of training, amount of information, and mental acuity due to sleep deprivation, emotional problems, sympathy for the patient, etc. The principles and techniques underlying those models and systems as well as others will be applied in an innovative way to the field of law by this software product as part of the pioneering work of the institute of judicial unaccountability reporting and reform advocacy and its development of this auditing and profiling software product.

b) Linguistic and literary forensic auditing

309. This feature of the software product focuses its auditing on the idiosyncratic use of language by an author –who in the early stages of product development and use will be the judge([jur:132§3](#)) in the case to be filed or already at bar; eventually other subjects of the legal system will also be audited–. It searches for patterns of speech to construct text, done by linguistic auditing, or for the message in the text and its meaning, done by literary auditing. The forensic versions of these two types of language-centered auditing aim to determine authorship of judicial decisions and reveal traits of the author's character as well as formal elements and substantive components of his writing.
310. A better understanding can thus be gained of the audited judge's way of reasoning, beliefs, expedient statements (those that he makes for reasons other than because he believes in them) and attitudes, all of which may have influenced or even determined the outcome of previous cases and may likewise affect the current case. Such understanding can enable private parties to devise legal strategy accordingly. It may bear on whether to file a case in a court where it may come before the audited judge or whether to pursue his recusal or disqualification. But the strategy may also deal with how to argue a case to that judge as a result of having gained a better understanding of him. Likewise, a better understanding of the judge gained through this auditing can enable public parties to determine whether there is probable cause to investigate the judge for wrongdoing and, if warranted, hold him accountable and liable to discipline or impeachment.
311. The **data sources** of linguistic and literary forensic auditing are broader than those used to audit a judge's decisions([jur:150¶337](#)). They include:
- a. the audited judge's judicial and non-judicial writings, such as articles in law journals and newspapers of more or less reputation; books; etc.; and

- b. available writings of other people, such as:
 - 1) his clerks' letters, memos, and articles;
 - 2) motions and briefs of lawyers that have appeared before the judge or his peers;
 - 3) law research and writing papers, student notes for law journals, moot court briefs, and articles by other people submitted at law schools to law school journals, moot court competitions, and other publishers where the judge and his peers teach or to which they are connected as moot court judges or law article reviewers or submitters.

312. The search function of a computer can only perform the very limited aspect of linguistic auditing of finding the recurrence of previously identified words and phrases. Boolean terms and connectors can only serve to find some variations of the search term and its relation to another or to the context. A natural language search engine operates by searching for text that contains terms already contained in the search query or variations thereof and ordering the resulting text by highest frequency. Neither of these search methods is capable of performing the type of analysis that linguistic auditing is intended to do: analyze the structure of language used in a piece of text and detect its fine peculiarities so distinctly as to be able to identify who is or is not its author. The above statements apply even more squarely to performing literary auditing, for it analyzes text to reveal its author's character and intention as well as his message and its meaning. These two types of auditing call for the innovative application of the discriminating capacity, which mimics critical judgment, of artificial intelligence.

(1) Linguistic auditing

313. Linguistic auditing is the more mechanical analysis of these two types of language-based auditing. It deals with an author's idiosyncratic use of language. The auditing begins with her choice of words, which reflects the level, extent, and geography of her vocabulary, and her spelling of those words, which concerns their morphology; moves on to her use of those words as the grammatical units of language –articles, nouns, pronouns, adjectives, prepositions, verbs, adverbs, conjunctions, and interjections–; to arrive at her linkage of those words through syntax, that is, the lineal, one-after-the-other order, affected by punctuation, in which she places her words to construct sentences that contain the logical components of linguistic communication: a subject, a predicate, and their complements. The author's choice of words and the syntactical structure in which she puts them together are supposed to be understood, that is, to convey a message in a given language, English in our case, as opposed to being nothing but an incomprehensible string of words although each separately may have some meaning.
314. Linguistic auditing limits its analysis to the choice of words and their structure, and does not reach the message or its meaning. But that is enough to be richly informative. This is so because those words and their structure have so many features that their particular combination can be special enough, if not unique, to allow the author to be identified: A piece of writing whose author is not known can be compared to exemplars, that is, other writings whose authors are known, and the similarities between the former and at least one of the latter can identify the author of both. However, such identification may not be possible because the author has not written any other piece or none of his other pieces is in the pool available for comparison. Even so, the linguistic auditing of an unidentifiable author can still be richly informative. It can

indicate whether the author is a native speaker of the language of the writing, his level of education and social status, age, attention to detail, where he has lived, his intended audience, etc.

(2) Linguistic forensic auditing

315. Linguistic forensic auditing allows the determination whether a judicial decision purportedly written by a judge was actually written by someone else. This can reveal the judge's dereliction of duty by making an unlawful delegation of judicial power in order not to make the effort to deal with certain types of parties, such as pro se, or subject matters, such as those found distasteful or too complex, or to free up her time for other activities, such as court administrative tasks or self-promoting writing and public speaking.
316. To that end, linguistic forensic auditing can compare the judges' writings and those of others in order to establish or provide foundation for the queries:
- a. whether the judge or a clerk, who may have just graduated from law school, a law student clerking for a summer or only part-time during the academic year wrote the text in question;
 - b. whether the nature and amount of judicial authority delegated to a clerk allowed him through his research, legal thinking, and writing to:
 - 1) decide a thorny or novel legal issue;
 - 2) create or depart from precedent;
 - 3) deprive parties of their property and liberty and harm substantially or even dramatically their lives by impairing their medical, parental, privacy, stockholder, voting, and similar rights and thereby injure their means, manner, and opportunity to do business or gain their livelihoods; and through the precedential effect of decisions, also affect similarly non-parties, even the rest of the people;
 - c. whether a contributing or the determining factor in delegating the writing of a decision was the preceding marking of it "not for publication" or "not precedential"[\(jur:43§1\)](#) or whether being so marked was the consequence of the decision's substandard quality resulting from having been written by someone else less competent than the judge¹³¹;
 - d. what the judge was doing to earn his well above the average salary of Americans²¹² when he was having someone else write the decision.

(3) Literary forensic auditing

317. Literary auditing performs the more subtle analysis of one piece of writing and most effectively of many pieces, such as transcripts, opinions, and articles, of the same author. It deals with their semantic aspect, that is, the explicit message that the author conveys to his interlocutor or reader and the implicit message that he sends intentionally or unwittingly in his subtext and that reveals his reasoning, interests, and attitudes, including wrongful ones, such as bias, prejudice, conflict of interests, and personal agenda. Thus, literary auditing allows the understanding of the author's character as well as his message.

(a) Revealing the author's character

318. Literary forensic auditing can reveal a judge's (and eventually other legal system subjects'):
- a. preference for deductive or inductive reasoning;
 - b. deference to, or defiance of, precedent and personal reputation of legal authority;
 - c. understanding of scientific, mathematical, and statistical evidence and embrace of it, which may come to light in a judge's reference to it in the jury instructions or reluctance to make the effort to understand it and deal with it;
 - d. reliance on personal opinion and conclusory statements or logical arguments, which may point to a dogmatic or professorial attitude;
 - e. richly or scantily detailed presentation of evidence and theories of the case;
 - f. propensity or reluctance to accord credibility to testimonial, physical, and circumstantial evidence and its effect on a judge's decisions on admissibility;
 - g. laziness or hard-working ethos and lack or abundance of self-confidence that determine her propensity to:
 - 1) remain in the safety zone of precedent;
 - 2) depart or overturn precedent;
 - 3) accept or reject new legal theories and the request to create new rights;
 - 4) uphold or strike down the constitutionality of a law;
 - 5) accept a proposed brief with an innovative argument that she may incorporate in her opinion or law journal article to make it appear as her own and be given credit for it as if it were such or ignore it in reliance on her own intellectual capacity and out of pride in her own intellectual accomplishments;
 - h. leniency or harshness in her decisions.

(b) Detecting the author's implicit message

319. Reading a piece of writing for its explicit message requires choosing a meaning among various possible meanings of each word in the context of the various meanings of each of the other words in a string of words forming a unit of thought, such as a sentence or a paragraph. Through this mental exercise, it is possible to determine the composite, explicit message of all the words together. That is a difficult task for a human mind, let alone for a software product. For such a product to replicate this exercise, it must be capable of 'understanding' the same explicit message that would be understood by the average speaker of that language who is a member of the author's intended audience. That presupposes reason and the exercise of critical judgment. It calls for the software to run on artificial intelligence. But even if the product can recognize the writing's explicit message, that remarkable accomplishment alone is not enough to qualify as literary auditing, never mind its forensic version.
320. The valuable contribution of literary auditing lies in using that explicit message that is literally – or visibly, as it were– conveyed by a string of words forming text –thus, a comprehensible piece of writing– as a stepping stone to the implicit message carried by its subtext. That requires an

even more sophisticated reading. It must analyze the explicit message of a string of words or compare that of two or more strings in order to detect what is not explicitly in any one string, but rather only implicitly. That implicit message may consist in the author's true, consistent revelation of his character or meaning that runs in the subtext of his explicit message or his development, refinement, and modification of that meaning, as well as his misconceptions, ambiguities, inconsistencies, contradictions, misrepresentations, and lies. Therein lies the value of literary auditing: in detecting an author's implicit message in one or more of his writings that he may not even be aware of, would not want to convey if he were aware of it, or that he is very much aware of but sends out in the expectation that the same writing will not reach his different audiences so that he can convey to each audience different, even inconsistent and contradictory messages.

321. It should be apparent that the user of the forensic version of literary auditing, whether she be a lawyer, not to mention a skillful one, or a person similarly situated, can make a powerful argument based on her detection of the implicit message of an author, whether such author is the judge in the case to be filed or already at bar, opposing counsel, the writer of a contract, a letter, a complaint, or any other document that may be introduced into evidence or otherwise used in the case, or of course, those who wrote laws, regulations, or opinions that may come into play or are already referred to in the case. What is more, well before the literary forensic auditing user makes any argument in writing or orally, she can put what she has learned through it to work very advantageously: She can use it to devise legal strategy or as a source of probable cause to open an official investigation of either the author, his peers, or other people.
322. However, literary auditing comes at a high cost. For one thing, it relies heavily on comparative analysis. Consequently, it should review the largest amount possible of the author's writings in order to increase the probability of stumbling upon unknown passages that when compared with known passages will reveal in greatest detail, and thus, with greatest reliability, his character and implicit message. Such comparative analysis is most effectively performed by one mind, that is, one person. It is inefficient, if not impossible, for a team of persons to exchange constantly between them everything in an author's writings that each has read in a joint effort to paint with many hands the picture of his character or for each team member to recognize that a passage that standing alone does not reveal any implicit message should nevertheless be brought to the attention of the team so that it can puzzle that passage and all other passages together into the author's implicit message.
323. Moreover, literary *forensic* auditing must be performed by people that have at the very least enough legal training or experience to recognize the potential in an implicit message: The message may reveal what the author must have known at the time of writing; provide a foothold for a persuasive argument based on what appears to be a point of honor or pride for the author; allow drawing up an alternative theory of the case; hint at a new line of questioning; expose a psychological pressure point, an evidentiary trump card, or a financial vulnerability of the author or another person; open the door to pin down the author to his consistent message or impeach his credibility with inconsistent messages; etc. If the user lacks the capacity or the contextual knowledge and imagination to use the implicit message creatively, detecting such message will serve no purpose. Making comparative analysis between string of words, passages, and pieces of writings possible and cost-effective in search of the author's character and valuable implicit messages is what justifies the development and use of a software product that runs on artificial intelligence and is able to perform literary forensic auditing. It can give the user an outcome-determinative competitive advantage grounded in the axiom "Knowledge is Power".

7) Judge profiling software

324. Profiling is what the FBI and other intelligence-gathering entities do to detect past and potential criminal and terrorist behavior of any American citizen and any other person. It is what jury consultants do: In light of their client's case and the legal interests of the parties, they draw up questionnaires for veniremembers, taking into account their past and present socio-economic, educational, family, and employment circumstances; case-related experience and criminal record; and even their race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation as well as information obtained by conducting their own investigations. Based on the veniremembers' answers, the consultants establish the profile of those that their clients should accept or challenge, and if the latter, whether for cause or as a peremptory strike. After the jury has been seated, the consultants advise their client on how to tailor its presentation of the case to the jury given its individual and collective psychological make-up; the probability based thereon that it will return a verdict one way or another; and whether to go to verdict, settle, or plea bargain.
325. This means that profiling is not a per se pejorative term reserved for the use by police of suspect categories to decide whom to stop, frisk, and arrest. Rather, profiling is a technique for behavioral analysis. Its purpose is to identify the fundamental and constant character traits of an individual in the context of his circumstances in order to draw up a picture of him that has a behavioral predictive function, that is, how his character and circumstances forecast his future behavior. Profiling:
- a. gathers extensive data of various types on the universal set of the population under study and individual members of it;
 - b. analyzes that data scientifically to detect patterns of general and individual behavior; and
 - c. calculates the statistical probability that certain character traits and circumstances influenced or determined a person's behavior in the past as well as the probability that they will do likewise when dealing with situations similar to those in the past or with new ones.
326. As such, profiling is a scientific technique accepted by the relevant expert community, including lawyers. Consequently, the institute researchers will apply these accepted profiling principles and techniques, mutatis mutandis, to provide a scientifically objective basis for calculating the statistical probability that the character and circumstances of a trial or appellate judge(jur:132§3) will influence or determine his handling in a certain way of a case to be filed or already at bar given the case's features. A software product that can output such behavior-analyzing profile with predictive function will be indisputably valuable. Today, parties estimate the likely impact of a judge on a case by venturing an educated guess or relying on a layperson's impression. The product will enable private users to make the qualitative quantum leap of devising legal strategy on the solid platform of extensive data on a judge's past written and verbal conduct scientifically analyzed by computer models to calculate the statistical probability of the judge behaving in a certain way. It will also enable public users to rely on statistical probability to determine the strength of their probable cause to open an official investigation for wrongdoing(jur:133§4). Users' reliance on the product will depend on its empirically demonstrated degree of accuracy, that is, how accurately its profile and behavioral probability forecast future behavior and the facts that a subsequent investigation would find.
327. Profiling a judge may also include the following types of research:
- a. legal analysis to determine whether the judge's decisions, non-judicial writings, and activities abide by, or disregard, the law, whether due to his wrong or incompetent

understanding of it or to his wrongful attitudes –bias, prejudice, conflict of interests, personal agenda–; for this type of critical analysis to be performed by computers so that its result is objective enough to win the approval of a majority of reasonable and fair-minded critics there will have to be developed a highly advanced software program that relies on artificial intelligence; meantime, that legal analysis will be performed by researchers;

- b. interviews with people for inside information about judges, clerks, their relation to insiders, etc., initially concerning the Federal Judiciary and progressively state judiciaries too([jur:106§c](#));
- c. opinion polls and surveys;
- d. use of facial recognition software to match photos in yearbooks, newspapers, the Internet, in court publications, taken at interviews and other meetings, etc., to establish the identity of people that may have legally changed their names or assumed new names to hide their identity, which may reveal the members in the judge’s social circles and help draw up the sociogram showing the flow of influence²⁷¹;
- e. computer and field search for evidentiary documents concerning wrongdoing, including:
 - 1) unreported trips²⁷² or attendance to seminars;
 - 2) non-disclosed receipt of gifts;²⁷⁵
 - 3) refusal to recuse so as to prevent discovery of wrongdoing or advance an improper interest;^{271b}
 - 4) hidden assets and money laundering([jur:65§§1-3](#));
 - 5) other forms of illegal activity that support civil or criminal charges([jur:71§4](#));

²⁷¹ **a)** The spectacular finding of a photo showing a state justice socializing at a posh seashore resort in southern France with a party who had contributed over \$3 million to his judicial race and who subsequently won a case before him where scores of millions of dollars were at stake led to litigation all the way to the Supreme Court and to vacating the decision in favor of that party; *Caperton v. Massey*, slip opinion, 556 U. S. __ (2009), http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/Caperton_v_Massey.pdf.

b) The Supreme Court has indicated that recusal does not require proof of actual bias, but rather a showing of circumstances “in which experience teaches that the **probability** of actual bias on the part of the judge or decision-maker is too high to be constitutionally tolerable.” (emphasis added) *Withrow v. Larkin*, 421 U.S. 35, 47 (1975).

c) In *Caperton* it “stressed that it was not required to decide whether in fact [the judge] was influenced [by one of the litigants]. The proper constitutional inquiry is whether sitting on the case then before [him] would offer **a possible temptation** to the average judge to lead him not to hold the balance nice, clear and true...[where] the probability of actual bias rises to an unconstitutional level [recusal is required].” (internal quotations omitted; *Caperton*, pages 8-9, 16) “Circumstances and relationships must be considered.” (id., 10); **d)** See also [fn.272](#)

²⁷² Chief Judge Hogan, chair of the Executive Committee of the Judicial Conference of the U.S., admits that some judges fail to report trips and to recuse themselves despite having investments in companies that are involved in cases before them; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/J_Hogan_JudConf_Exec_Com_aug8.pdf

- f. establishment and operation of an 800 hotline number for reporting judicial wrongdoing and receiving other investigative tips.

8) A judge's fairness and impartiality appearance coefficient

- 328. A judge's fairness and impartiality appearance coefficient will express in a numerical value people's expectation of the capacity of a judge to conduct a fair and impartial judicial proceeding. The coefficient will be a function of the attribution to the judge of bias, prejudice, conflict of interests, and his personal agenda as well as the congruence of the judge's declarations, e.g., his financial disclosure reports and filings with property registries.
- 329. The data sources of this coefficient will be those used for auditing decisions and profiling. The calculation of the coefficient will be based on a balancing test of the weight to be assigned²⁷³ to the different data sources given the nature of the information obtained from them and its impact on the fact and appearance of a judge's ability to conduct fair and impartial proceedings. For instance, the results of auditing a judge's decisions will be most objective and useful because by their own nature they will be expressed in sums and percentages. By contrast, assigning weights to other people's opinions about a judge will be a more subjective exercise. It will require the detection in the largest possible database of judges' auditing and profiling results of patterns of correlation between objective auditing values and subjective opinions.
- 330. The coefficient will allow comparison between judges through the development of a rating system based on the realistic determination of a minimum level of acceptable judicial fairness and impartiality as well as ranges of acceptability above the minimum that attract ever greater levels of reward and recognition or below the minimum that warrant advice and training, monitoring, admonition, censure, suspension, and referral to the U.S. House of Representatives (or equivalent state body in the case of state judges) for impeachment and removal.

9) The ratio and coefficients concerning extra-judicial activity and the patterns of time-consuming activities

- 331. The judicial to extra-judicial activity ratio will compare the amount of time and effort that the audited judge dedicates to his extra-judicial activities relative to the time and effort that he dedicates to his judicial ones. An objective basis for calculating the ratio can be found, on the one hand, in the judge's calendar and docket and, on the other hand, the time of day of the courses that he teaches as an adjunct professor at a law school; the moot court sessions that he judges; the presentations that he makes of his books, reports, etc., together with the travel time to

²⁷³ A similar statistical exercise is performed by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts in determining "weighted filings" "Under this system [of weighted filings], average civil cases or criminal defendants each receive a weight of approximately 1.0; for more time-consuming cases, higher weights are assessed (e.g., a death penalty habeas corpus case is assigned a weight of 12.89); and cases demanding relatively little time from district judges receive lower weights (e.g., a defaulted student loan case is assigned a weight of 0.10)." 2008 Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts; <http://www.uscourts.gov/Statistics/JudicialBusiness/JudicialBusiness2008.aspx> >PDF version and also Judicial Business >pp. 23 and 38; and http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/AO_Dir_Report_08.pdf >23 and 38.

and from the respective places.(jur:54§d) Likewise, the number of a judge’s written decisions and their number of words can make it possible to estimate the time it must have taken the judge to write them.²⁷⁴

332. By taking into account the extent to which the extra-judicial activities take place during regular business hours it should be possible to calculate a *coefficient of extra-judicial activities impact* measuring the impact of a judge’s extra-judicial activities on his judicial ones²⁷³. The calculation of the coefficient is warranted by the intuitive correlation that arises from the indisputable fact that a worker’s effort, attention span, and time are finite resources and cannot be dedicated simultaneously to two or more activities that the worker is required to perform personally rather than by delegation. Therefore, it is to be expected that:

a. the higher a judge’s:

- 1) number of articles and books published as a private person;
- 2) time and effort dedicated to researching and writing them;
- 3) participation in judicial committees and non-judicial committees and activities, such as:
 - a) teaching courses;
 - b) moot court judging;
 - c) public speaking;
 - d) attendance at judicial seminars and conferences;
 - e) attendance at non-judicial meetings of boards of charities, universities, law schools, and other entities, etc.,

b. the higher the number of the judge’s summary orders and “not for publication” and “not precedential” decisions(jur:43§1); and

c. the lower the judge’s:

- 1) *coefficient of administered justice*, which expresses the number and quality of reasoned published decisions satisfying the need for “Justice [that is] manifestly and undoubtedly [to] be seen to be done”⁷¹; and
- 2) *coefficient of judicial service rendered*, which expresses the time dedicated to the judicial activities for which the judge is compensated by the taxpayer with a salary in the top 2% of income earners in our country²¹² relative to the baselines, namely,

²⁷⁴ Lawyers Cooperative Publishing used to estimate that it took the lawyers on the staff of its American Law Reports Federal series (ALR Fed) four hours to research and write a page of their annotations. Law schools normally allow the full time instructors that join their faculty to prepare for and teach during their first academic semester or year only one 3-hour per week course in addition to holding a similar number of office hours to meet with their students and attending faculty meetings. Print media measure the work required of reporters in terms of, let’s say, two weekly articles each of X no. of words or Y no. of inches of standard column width. Just as it is possible to calculate “reasonable attorney’s fees” and the cost of writing an appellate brief, it is possible to calculate the time that it takes a judge to research and write so many words per decision.

the average time spent on judicial activities by the judges in her court, district, circuit, and judiciary, and the non-judicial officers in their judiciary, and the time spent on official activities by officers in the other branches of government who earn the closest salaries to the judges’.

333. It may be difficult for outside researchers to measure the time that a judge dedicates to different activities if the researchers do not have access to the time sheets or similar managerial devices that record time spent by judges on each activity and that are used by courts and the Administrative Office of the U.S. Court to calculate “weighted filings”²⁷³. Nevertheless, valuable insight into judges’ time management can be gained by establishing *patterns of time-consuming activities*, such as:

- a. the signing of summary orders and “not for publication” and “not precedential” opinions (jur:43§1) just before or after a judge:
 - 1) goes on holiday;
 - 2) attends a seminar or a judicial conference, particularly if she must prepare to present a paper or a committee report;
 - 3) needs to grade the exams of the students that she teaches as an adjunct professor;
 - 4) is engaged in a series of presentations of her newly released book;
 - 5) is occupied by her own or a friend or family member’s:
 - a) medical treatment;
 - b) divorce or wedding;
 - c) death or child birth;
 - d) money-making activities, such as a company incorporation or a merger or acquisition, which may be signaled by changes in investment portfolios and other items of personal and family wealth;
- b. handling of recusal motions, particularly those that are granted and thereby lessen the weight of the case load and free up time for other activities;
- c. attendance at seminars, conferences, and political meetings;
- d. participation in fundraising, whether by just ‘attending’ a political party’s fundraising activity²⁷⁵ or that of a school, charity, etc.

334. As in the case of totals and other statistics calculated in decision auditing(jur:138§(1), the ratio, coefficients, and patterns used here will gain in significance when compared with their equivalents and averages for the judges of a court, district, circuit, or judiciary. The latter can be

²⁷⁵ In light of mounting reports of improper conduct by U.S. Supreme Court justices, such as JJ. Scalia, Thomas, and Alito, Congressman Chris Murphy and 42 other members of the US HR called on the House Judiciary Committee to hold hearings on HR 862, the Supreme Court Transparency and Disclosure Act, which aims to subject the justices to the Code of Conduct for U.S. Judges^{123a}; to require that justices state their reasons for granting and denying motions that they recuse themselves from hearing certain cases; and to require the Judicial Conference of the U.S. to draw up a procedure for reviewing such denials; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/HR_SCT_ethics_reform_9sep11.pdf

used as baselines, the deviations from them measured, and the effort to explain them undertaken. This comparative exercise may find that the greater a judge's extra-judicial activities, the greater the deviation of his metrics from the corresponding baselines. It may be possible to express those deviations in a single, composite metric called *a judge's judicial performance coefficient*.

335. For instance, it can be found that a judge that teaches a course at a law school has an 84% probability of deviating from the average performance more than 90% of all other judges. Expressed in simpler illustrative terms, it could be found that 8 out of every 10 of those 'teaching' judges write decisions whose average length is 500 words while the average word count for non-teaching judges is 2000 words; that on average they have only 1 citation to authority as opposed to the average 12 for non-teaching judges; and that they cite no page of any brief or motion in the case while the average for non-teaching judges is 7. These statistics would support the argument that a judge with such time-consuming outside commitment gives short shrift to her writing of opinions, which are more likely to be arbitrary because the judge did not have enough time to pay due regard to the law or enough sense of professional responsibility to bother to read the briefs and motion.
336. A further statistical refinement could establish that the higher the judge's evaluation by her law school students and the higher the reputation of the school, the lower her opinions' count of words and citations. This would indicate that the focus of her attention is her teaching job, where the students' evaluations of her performance may be publicly posted, and it is merely as a secondary job for extra cash that she deals with her judgeship, where she is not evaluated by either litigants or her peers and the quality of her judicial performance has no positive or negative consequence on her tenure or salary. Yet, she, like the other 'teaching' judges, collects the same salary from taxpayers as non-teaching judges do. A similar analysis can be carried out to determine any correlation between judges that are prolific writers of articles in prestigious law journals and of books that receive public acclaim but scribble judicial decisions. After all, there are only so many hours in a day. Something has to give.

10) Product's arc of operation: input data > computerized analysis >output statistics

337. The **data sources** supporting the product will be of several types:
- a. the product for auditing a judge's decisions will be based only on the judge's case-intrinsic sources, that is, her decisions, which include:
 - 1) holdings and dicta in her published and "not for publication" as well as precedential and "not precedential" opinions(jur:43§1);
 - 2) concurrent and dissenting opinions;
 - 3) rulings written and signed by the judge;
 - 4) transcribed orders issued orally from the bench or elsewhere, such as in chambers, as well as all her comments made in such context;
 - 5) summary orders;
 - 6) letters relating to cases before the judge;
 - 7) per curiam decisions of panels on which the judge sat

- 8) the judge's voting on petitions for:
 - a) panel rehearing and hearing en banc(jur:45§2);
 - b) review of dismissals by the chief circuit judge of misconduct complaints against judges(jur:24§§b,c);
- b. the profiling of the judge will be based on the above case-intrinsic sources and also on:
 - 1) the judge's case-extrinsic sources, such as his:
 - a) books and articles in law journals, magazines, newsletters, and newspapers;
 - b) appearances and postings on the Internet, including emails, blogs, social media, websites, chat rooms;
 - c) financial disclosure reports^{213a} and documents filed with county clerks' offices and other public registries²⁴² of chattel, real, and time share property as well as land, sea, air vessels and rights, such as leases, patents, and contracts;
 - d) speeches, panel participation, comments, and statements at his or other judges' induction into the court and other court ceremonies, judicial conferences, hearings before Congress and other official federal or state bodies, seminars, bar association meetings, university or law school activities, charity board sessions, radio and TV appearances;
 - e) school where the judge held or holds an adjunct professorship;
 - f) submissions to commissions and committees tasked with recommending, nominating, and confirming candidates for judgeships and with reviewing judicial performance;
 - g) recommendations, including those in support of a job search, a lawyer's admission to the bar, or to a court pro hac vice;
 - h) letters unrelated to his cases, whether or not they are on his official letterhead;
 - i) previous private or public sector positions;
 - j) honorary titles and memberships;
 - k) department of vehicles driving licensing registration;
 - l) membership in clubs, charity boards, and law school committees;
 - m) photos and movie clips and journalistic footage²⁷⁶;
 - n) yearbooks and records of the judge's alma matter law school, college, and high school; etc.;
 - 2) judiciary sources that shed light directly or indirectly on the judge or on the

²⁷⁶ "Caperton sought rehearing, and the parties moved for disqualification of three of the five justices who decided the appeal. Photos had surfaced of Justice Maynard vacationing with Blankenship in the French Riviera while the case was pending. Justice Maynard granted Caperton's recusal motion." *Caperton v. A. T. Massey Coal Co.*, 129 S. Ct. 2252 (2009), at page 4 of the Opinion of the Court.

background of her activities or particular acts, such as

- a) dockets and judges' calendars;
 - b) memoranda, notes, and letters of the judge's law clerks and clerks of court;
 - c) court or court administration bodies' statistics, reports, newsletters, biographic notes on judges;
 - d) statements before Congress and other official bodies;
 - e) statements by third parties at the judge's induction in the court and similar court ceremonies;
 - f) a court's or peers' recognition of the judge's performance or public censure;
 - g) statements by other judges reflecting their opinion of the judge, such as those contained in concurrent and dissenting opinions⁶⁸;
 - h) the types of case-extrinsic sources, such as publications and media, listed at [jur:150¶337](#); etc.;
- 3) non-judiciary sources²⁷⁷ that directly or indirectly reflect the opinion on the judge:
- a) held by:
 - (1) lawyers;
 - (2) journalists;
 - (3) parties;
 - (4) academic superiors;
 - (5) peers;
 - (6) students where the judge studied or where he has taught;
 - (7) friends, family, and neighbors;
 - (8) other members of the public; etc.
 - b) contained in:
 - (1) motions and briefs, including amicus curie briefs;
 - (2) students' and peers' evaluation of the judge's performance as instructor;
 - (3) laudations accompanying prizes, awards, and other forms of recognition bestowed upon the judge;

²⁷⁷ "Canon 2: A Judge Should Avoid Impropriety And The Appearance Of Impropriety **In All Activities**; A. *Respect for Law*. A judge should respect and comply with the law and should act **at all times** in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary"; [fn123a](#). The words with emphasis added underscore the fact that the judges themselves state in their own Code of Conduct for U.S. Judges that it is fair to hold them to high standards even in the extra-judicial sphere of their lives. This justifies including in their profiles non-judiciary sources.

- (4) brochures and annual reports of law firms and companies;
 - (5) biographic notes on the judge found in Martindale-Hubbell and other legal directories;
 - (6) websites that rate or comment on judges;
 - (7) the type of case-extrinsic sources, such as publications and media, listed at [jur:151¶b.1](#)); etc.
- 4) public non-judiciary sources that can place the judicial and personal activities of the audited judge and of parties that have appeared or may appear before him in context ([jur:108¶244](#)), particularly those sources that can provide financial([jur:27§2](#)) information about them, such as:
- a) county clerk’s offices and similar property registries^{242, 243};
 - b) rosters of marinas, airports, and landing strips that register docking, maintenance services, and landing rights.
338. **Data entry** will be made by scanning print data sources to digitize and enter them into the computer system that will run the auditing program on them together with the sources already available in digital format. Spoken-to written transcribing software will be used to enter judges’ original spoken statements. Optical character recognition (OCR) software will be used to turn text digitized as picture into searchable text. Both OCR and transcribing software will be further developed by institute researchers as need be.
339. **Data mining** text will be performed using, in addition to Boolean terms and connectors and natural language, the auditing program developed by the institute. Face recognition software will be run on pictures and movies to establish who was where, when, and with whom.
340. **Data analysis** will rely on the most part on innovative application of artificial intelligence. Institute researchers will develop and run the algorithms of a computer-based expert system capable of auditing a judge’s decisions([jur:136§6](#)); performing linguistic and literary auditing([jur:140§b](#)); drawing up a judge’s profile([jur:145§7](#)); and to the extent necessary, calculation the proposed ratio, coefficients, and averages([jur:147§§8-9](#)))
341. The **output statistics** will consist in a set of metrics with predictive function on a judge’s profile and her judicial performance that will allow private users to devise their legal strategy regarding the case to be filed or already at bar; and will enable public users to determine whether there is probable cause to officially investigate a judge for wrongdoing and, if warranted, hold him accountable and liable to discipline.

c. As educator

342. As educator, the institute will offer courses, such as The *DeLano* Case Course([dcc:1](#)), and promote its offering by other educational institutions([dcc:7](#)). It will also journalistically explain^{256°} to the public, in general, and common-purpose entities([jur:155¶344a](#)), in particular:
- a. the forms that their unaccountability and wrongdoing take and the ways in which they manifest themselves;
 - b. the means, motive, and opportunity for judges to do wrong;

End Page

APPENDIXES

- [App.1.](#) Volumes of the study of judges and their judiciaries
- [App.2.](#) Offer of a presentation; and
Activities to support with donations and investment
- [App.3.](#) Number of subscribers to Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org
- [App.4.](#) Statement by LinkedIn that Dr. Cordero has “one of the top 5% most viewed LinkedIn profiles for 2012”
- [App.5.](#) Resume of Dr. Cordero
- [App.6.](#) Links to articles ready for review and publication; subjects for commissioned articles; and links to external sources of information
- [App.7.](#) Blocs of email addresses of the people to whom to send one’s story of judges’ abuse of power and financial criminality

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 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

Volume III:

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

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 II:

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

Volume I:

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

Volume III:

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

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

December 23, 2022

Table of Contents

of the sections laying out the main concepts in Volume I,
with references to articles in Volumes II and III, of the study:

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

This file contains only pages ggl:1-38. For a comprehensive list of articles, see Appendix 6. i.

Introduction: The goal is not only to expose judges' abuse of power, but also to enable *We the People*, the Masters of all public servants, to hold our judicial public servants accountable for their performance and liable to compensation, and thereby trigger history! jur:1

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_Intro_trigger_history.pdf

ii. Tables compiling judicial statistics, and graphs, all supporting probable cause to believe that judges have complicitly coordinated an agreement for their 100% dismissal of complaints against any of them and 100% denial of petitions to review those dismissals, thus mutually ensuring their survival and continued abuse of power to grab illegal, unethical, and rules-disregarding gains and convenience jur:9

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_complaint_dismissal_statistics&graphs.pdf

A. Means, motive, and opportunity of federal judges to engage in, and so to coordinate their, abuse of power as to make it their institutionalized modus operandi, thereby ensuring that the Federal Judiciary is a safe haven that they run as a racketeering enterprise..... jur:21

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_means_motive_opportunity_for_abuse.pdf

B. *In re DeLano*, Then-Circuit Judge Sonia Sotomayor presiding, and her nomination to the Supreme Court by President Barak Obama: evidence of a bankruptcy fraud scheme and her concealment of assets dismissed with knowing indifference and willful blindness to a bankruptcy mill operated by the bankruptcy judges appointed under 28 U.S.C. §152 by the circuit judges: the appointers cover for their appointees jur:65

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_bankruptcy_fraud_scheme_cover-up.pdf

C. Nature and forms of judges' abuse of power and strategy to expose their unaccountability and riskless abuse, e.g., auditing their decisions and other people's writings to detect their patterns, trends, and schemes of individual and coordinated abuse..... jur:81

http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_inform_outrage_abuse_notions.pdf

D. Multimedia public presentation made by judicial unaccountability reporters on:
i) the available evidence of judges' abuse of power and the *In re DeLano-J.* Sotomayor story;

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

† http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates2.pdf >OL3:394-1143

♣ http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates3.pdf >OL3:1144-1555+

ii) their own findings through their <i>Follow the money!</i> and <i>Follow the wire!</i> investigations; and	
iii) the <i>We accuse!</i> denunciation at a press conference, in articles, and through broadcast reportage.....	jur:97
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_abuse_investigation_&_presentation.pdf	
E. Multidisciplinary academic and business venture leading up to the creation of the Institute of Judicial Unaccountability Reporting and Reform Advocacy.....	jur:119-169
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_academic_biz_venture&Institute.pdf	
§§1-4. The academic and business venture that implements the business plan in activities that include the holding of unprecedented citizens hearings, and publications to inform the national public of, and outrage it at, judges' abuse of power	jur:119
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_marketing_brochures_Annual-Report_team.pdf	
§5. Creation of the Institute of Judicial Unaccountability Reporting and Reform Advocacy.....	jur:130
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_Institute_Judicial_Unaccountability_Reporting.pdf	
§§5-9. Establishment of an Inspector General for the Judiciary; proposed legislation; and precedent for a national, civic, apolitical movement for holding judges accountable and liable	jur:130-169
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_IG_legislation_civic_movement.pdf	
§§6-9. Establishment of an Inspector General for the Judiciary; proposed legislation; and precedent for a national, civic, apolitical movement for holding judges accountable and liable	jur:158-169
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_IG_legislation_civic_movement.pdf	
F. Offer to present <i>The Business of Justice</i> to expose judges' abuse of power, implement the business plan, and engage in actions to trigger history.....	jur:171
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_presentation_to_trigger_history.pdf	
G. Evidence of interference with Dr. Cordero's email accounts.....	ggl:1
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_email_accounts_interference.pdf	
H. Presentation at schools on judges' abuse of power and a plan for judicial reform.....	Lsch:1
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Deans_professors_students.pdf	
I. The <i>DeLano</i> case course: syllabus of classwork on investigating a case on judges' abuse of power and the organization of a conference to present its findings.....	DCC:1
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_Syllabus.pdf	
J. Creative Writings: using storytelling to persuade and inspire readers;	
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_Syllabus.pdf	CW:1
K. OL:1-393; first part of the OL series of articles; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_OL.1-393.pdf	OL:1

**Every meaningful cause needs resources for its advancement;
none can be continued, let alone advanced, without money**

Support Judicial Discipline Reform and its [business plan](#) to:

1. continue its professional law research and writing, and [strategic thinking](#), which has produced a three-volume study of judges and their judiciaries, titled and downloadable thus:

Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Abuse of Power:

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

2. turn the site at <http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org> –whose articles([Appendix 6§A](#)) have attracted so many webvisitors and they have reacted so positively that as of 20 Dec. 22, the number of those who had become subscribers was 45,874([App.3](#))– from an informational platform, into:
 - a. a clearinghouse for [complaints](#) against judges uploaded by anybody;
 - b. a [research center](#) for fee-paying clients [auditing](#) judges' decisions and searching many other writings from many sources that through [computer-assisted](#) statistical, linguistic, and literary analysis can reveal the most persuasive type of evidence: judges' [patterns](#), trends, and [schemes](#) of [abuse of power](#), e.g.; their [interception](#) of people's emails and mail; and
 - c. the digital portal of the plan's business venture leading up to the [Institute](#) of Judicial Unaccountability Reporting and Reform Advocacy at a university or news network;
3. organize and embark on a tour of [presentations](#) at law, journalism, business, and Information Technology [schools](#); media outlets; etc., via video conference or in person to form [local chapters](#) of a national movement to investigate and hold judges accountable and liable under *Strickland v. U.S.*;
4. hold together with academics, media outlets, and journalists, the proposed [UNPRECEDENTED CITIZENS HEARINGS](#), where people will be able to tell the national public [their stories](#) of judges' abuse;
5. [organize](#) the first-ever, and national conference on judges' abuse in [connivance](#) with politicians, who fear their power of retaliation, where the report on the citizens hearings will be presented;
6. publish an academics/journalists multidisciplinary [Annual Report](#) on Judicial Unaccountability and Riskless Abuse of Power-cum-citizens inspector general report on the judiciary;
7. launch an abuse [investigation](#) that attracts the media, for *Scandal sells & wins Pulitzer Prizes*;
8. promote the formation of a national, single issue, apolitical, civic movement for judicial abuse of power exposure, [compensation](#) of abusees, and reform through transformative change; etc.(¶57).

Put your money where your [outrage at abuse](#) and passion for justice are.

DONATE by making a deposit or an online transfer through either the Bill Pay feature of your online account or Zelle from your account into

Citi Bank, routing # 021 000 089, account # 4977 59 2001;
or TD Bank, routing # 260 13 673, account # 43 92 62 52 45.

Offer to present this article and the above-listed cause-advancing activities

9. I offer to present this article and the [business plan](#) to you and your guests via video conference and, if in NY City, in person. To assess my capacity to present you may view my [video](#) and follow it on its [slides](#). To set the terms and schedule it use my contact information in the letterhead above.

Dare trigger history!...and you may enter it.

- Dashboard
- Jetpack
- Posts
- Media
- Pages
- Portfolio
- Comments 128
- Feedback
- WooCommerce
- Products
- Payments
- Analytics
- Marketing
- Appearance
- Plugins 3
- Users**
 - All Users
 - Add New User
 - Profile
- Tools
- Settings 1
- Collapse menu

Users

[Add New User](#)

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](#) **51,945 items** [«](#) [<](#) 1 of 2,598 [>](#) [»](#)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Username	Name	Email	Role	Posts	SSO Status [?]
<input type="checkbox"/>	1970mdegcf	—	einarcruckshank1989@e.bengira.com	Subscriber	0	Send invite
<input type="checkbox"/>	1Barret1cuple	—	tornado102034@hotmail.com	Subscriber	0	Send invite
<input type="checkbox"/>	1oftheman	—	terree@comcast.net	Subscriber	0	Send invite
<input type="checkbox"/>	32350284247	—	s.dj.fhbnjew.31.5@gmail.com	Subscriber	0	Send invite



Richard Cordero <dr.richard.cordero.esq@gmail.com>

Congratulations! You have one of the top 5% most viewed LinkedIn profiles for 2012.

1 message

LinkedIn <linkedin@e.linkedin.com>
Reply-To: LinkedIn <donotreply@e.linkedin.com>
To: dr.richard.cordero.esq@gmail.com

Thu, Feb 7, 2013 at 4:02 PM

LinkedIn now has 200 million members.



Richard, congratulations!

You have one of the top 5% most viewed LinkedIn profiles for 2012.

LinkedIn now has 200 million members. Thanks for playing a unique part in our community!

[Read More](#)

This is an occasional email to help you get the most of LinkedIn. [Unsubscribe](#)
This email was intended for Richard Cordero (Lawyer, researcher-writer, and advocate of judicial accountability and discipline reform). [Learn why we include this.](#)
If you need assistance or have questions, please contact [LinkedIn Customer Service](#) .
© 2013, LinkedIn Corporation. 2029 Stierlin Ct., Mountain View, CA 94043, USA.



Hi Richard,

Recently, LinkedIn reached a new milestone: 200 million members. But this isn't just our achievement to celebrate — it's also yours.

I want to personally thank you for being part of our community. Your journey is part of our journey, and we're delighted and humbled when we hear stories of how our members are using LinkedIn to connect, learn, and find opportunity.

All of us come to work each day focused on our shared mission of connecting the world's professionals to make them more productive and successful. We're excited to show you what's next.

With sincere thanks,

Deep Nishar
Senior Vice President, Products & User Experience

P.S. What does 200 million look like? [See the infographic](#)

A stat this delightful
deserves to be shared

Share



256,112 250,388

Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

2165 Bruckner Blvd., Bronx, NY 10472-6506; tel. (718) 827-9521

Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net, DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_resume_publication_list_links.docx & ...pdf

BAR MEMBERSHIP AND SPECIAL SKILLS: • U.S. citizen; member of the NYS Bar; specialized in field and library research and writing of legal briefs and business and IT studies

- I would like to work for you as a lawyer and researcher-writer strategist in a position where I can contribute to your business or legal problem solution a talent that gives me a competitive advantage: I can gather seemingly unconnected pieces of information, select those relevant to the prioritized objectives to be pursued, and imaginatively integrate them into a coherent new structure -expressed clearly and concisely both orally and in writing- that renders those pieces meaningful and useful, like a mosaic that depicts a realistic and decorative scene of the ancient Romans, yet originates in insignificant stone fragments expertly sifted from dirt and artfully set together to appeal to the spirit and the mind while serving the practical purpose of making money.

ADVANCED KNOWLEDGE OF: • computers and their use for word processing, graphics composition, presentations, and research; and for developing IT products to audit cases through statistical, linguistic, and literary analysis of opinions to give lawyers an informational advantage

LANGUAGES: • I speak English, Spanish, and French; and converse in German and Italian.

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

FOUNDER OF JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE REFORM, 2008-to date New York City

- A non-partisan and non-denominational organization that advocates the study of the judiciary and the adoption of legislation to replace the inherently biased and ineffective judges-judging-judges system of judicial self-discipline with a system based on independent boards of citizens unrelated to the judges and empowered to publicly receive, investigate, and resolve complaints

RESEARCHER AND WRITER ATTORNEY, 1995-to date New York City

- Prosecution of cases from bankruptcy, district, and circuit courts to the SCt; practice in NY courts
- Developed the Euro Project, a 3-prong business package consisting of the Euro Conference, the Euro Consulting Services, and the Euro Newsletter; aimed at enabling firms to capitalize on their expertise in the euro by providing services for the adaptation of business practices and IT systems to the European Union's new common currency that replaced its national currencies

WAYNE COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICE, 1994 Detroit, MI

- Developed economic and marketing features of the master plan for the intermodal transportation and industrial complex of Willow Run Tradeport in Detroit
- Drafted and implemented proposals for increasing office productivity using IT and equipment

LAWYERS COOPERATIVE PUBLISHING, 1991-1993 Rochester, NY

- Member of the editorial staff of LCP, the foremost publisher of analytical legal commentaries.
- Researched and wrote articles on securities regulations, antitrust, and banking under U.S. law

COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES, 1984-1985 Brussels, Belgium

- Devised proposals for harmonizing supervisory regulations on mortgage credit and on reporting large loan exposures by one and all members of a banking system to one and related borrowers
- My proposals were adopted by the EEC Banking Division and negotiated with the national experts in the supervision of financial institutions of the Member States
- Drafted replies to financial questions put by the European Parliament to the Commission

EDUCATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE, Faculty of Law, Ph.D., 1988 Cambridge, England

- Doctoral dissertation analyzed the existing European legal and political environment and proposed a new system for harmonizing the regulation and supervision of financial institutions

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, Business School, MBA, 1995 Ann Arbor, Michigan

- Emphasis on corporate strategies to maximize profitability and competitiveness through the optimal use of IT expert systems using artificial intelligence, and telecommunications networks

LA SORBONNE, Faculty of Law and Economics, French law degree, 1982 Paris, France

- Was awarded a French Government scholarship
- Concentrated on the operation of a currency basket to achieve monetary stability and on the application of harmonized regulations & antitrust rules on companies with dominant positions

RESEARCH WORKS

1. Study of judges and their judiciaries, based on an original and innovative analysis of the Federal Judiciary' statistics submitted to Congress annually, reports, judges' statements and websites, etc

Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Wrongdoing:

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

2. List of articles on judges' unaccountability and riskless abuse of power offered for publication individually or as a series; †>[OL2:719§C](#);
3. Complaint against Judge Brett Kavanaugh, Chief Judge Merrick Garland, and their peers and colleagues of the District of Columbia Circuit (DCC), submitted to the DCC Court of Appeals and "Because of the exceptional circumstances related to this complaint", referred by it to Supreme Court Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., who assigned it to the 11th Circuit for disposition; includes the official letters of referral and the decision of the 11th Circuit chief judge; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-11Circuit.pdf>
4. The official statistics of the U.S. District of Columbia Circuit show that P. Trump SCt nominee Judge Brett Kavanaugh, P. Obama SCt nominee Chief Judge Merrick Garland, and their peers received during the 1oct06/30sep17 11-year period, 478 complaints against judges in their Circuit and dismissed 100% of them and denied 100% of the petitions for review of those dismissals, thus covering as a matter of policy for abusive judges regardless of the gravity of their abuse; 1jun18; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/publications/1DrRCordero_Judges_Unaccountability_Riskless_Abuse.pdf
5. Availability of an Implied Right of Action under the Tender Offer Provisions of §14d-f of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 USCS §78n(d)-(f)), added to the Exchange Act by the Williams Act of 1968, and Rules Promulgated thereunder by the SEC, **120 ALR Federal 145**; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/publications/2DrRCordero_120ALRFed145.pdf
6. Venue Provisions of the National Bank Act (12 USCS §94) As Affected By Other Federal Venue Provisions and Doctrines, **111 ALR Federal 235**; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/publications/3DrRCordero_111ALRFed235.pdf
7. Construction and Application of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 USCS §§ 3401-3422), **112 ALR Federal 295**; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/publications/4DrRCordero_112ALRFederal295.pdf

8. Exemption or Immunity From Federal Antitrust Liability Under the McCarran-Ferguson Act (15 USCS §§1011-1013) and the State Action and Noerr-Pennington Doctrines for the Business of Insurance and Persons Engaged in It, **116 ALR Federal 163**; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/publications/5DrRCordero_116ALRFed163.pdf
9. Who May Maintain an Action Under §11(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 USCS §77k (a)), in Connection With False or Misleading Registration Statements, **111 ALR Fed. 83**; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/publications/6DrRCordero_111ALRFed83.pdf
10. Judicial Conference's Reforms Will Not Fix the Problem of Abusive Judges Who Go Undisciplined, Letter to the Editor, National Law Journal, March 3, 2008; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/publications/7DrRCordero_Letters_To_Editor_NYLJ3mar8.pdf; <http://www.law.com/jsp/nlj/PubArticleNLJ.jsp?id=1204212424055>
11. The Creation of a European Banking System: A study of its legal and technical aspects, Peter Lang, Inc., NY, XXXVI, 390 pp., 1990; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/publications/8DrRCordero_Creation_European_Banking_System.pdf; this book earned a grant from the Commission of the European Communities and was reviewed very favorably in 32 Harvard International Law Journal 603 (1991), http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/Harvard_Int_Law_J.pdf; and 24 New York University Journal of International Law and Politics 1019 (1992), http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/NYU_JIntLaw&Pol.pdf
12. Competition Strategies Must Adapt to the Euro, 17 Amicus Curiae of the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, London, 27 (May 1999); http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/publications/9DrRCordero_Compensation_Strategies_&_euro.pdf
13. Why Business Executives in Third Countries and Non-participating Member States Should Pay Attention to the Euro, European Financial Services Law 140 (March 1999); http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/publications/10DrRCordero_6European_Financial_Services_Law93.pdf
14. Some Practical Consequences for Financial Management Brought About by the Euro, 5 European Financial Services Law 187 (1998); http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/publications/11DrRCordero_5European_Financial_Services_Law_187.pdf
15. Impending Conversion to the Euro Prompts New Guidelines from the IRS, New York Law Journal, pg. 1, Friday, October 2, 1998; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/publications/12DrRCordero_Conversion_to_the_Euro_&_IRS_NYLJ.pdf
16. The Development of Video Dialtone Networks by Large Phone and Cable Companies and its Impact on their Small Counterparts, 1 Personal Technologies no. 2, 60 (Springer-Verlag London Ltd., 1997); http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/publications/13DrRCordero_Dialtone_1Personal_Technologies2.pdf
17. Video Dialtone: Its Potential for Social Change, 15 Journal of Business Forecasting 16 (1996) http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/publications/14DrRCordero_Dialtone_&_Social_Change_15JBF16.pdf
18. Video Dialtone Network Architectures, by Richard Cordero and Jeffery Joles, 15 Journal of Business Forecasting 16 (Summer 1996); http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/publications/15DrRCordero_Dialtone_networks_15JBF16.pdf
19. A Strict but Liberalizing Interpretation of EEC Treaty Articles 67(1) and 68(1) on Capital Movements, 2 Legal Issues of European Integration 39 (1989); http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/publications/16DrRCordero_Strict_but_liberalizing_interpretation_2LIEI39.pdf

19 August 2024

APPENDIX 6
(of 7*)

**A study and articles already written on
abuse of power by judges and their judiciaries;
collective compensation for abusees; and
transformative judicial reform;
subjects for articles that may be commissioned; and
links to external sources of information useful for law research and writing†**

Table of Contents

A. The study and articles available for review and publication 1
B. Subjects for commissioning one or a series of articles..... 14
C. Links to external sources of information useful for law research and writing..... 17

A. The study and articles available for review and publication

1. The study

1. The three-volume study* † ♣ of judges and their judiciaries that supports the articles, which are downloadable as individual files:

**Exposing Judges' Unaccountability and Consequent Riskless Abuse of Power:
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# up to prefix OL:page393

† Volume 2: http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates2.pdf >from page
OL2:394-1143

♣ Volume 3: http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates3.pdf >from
OL3:1144-1860+

- i. Download the volume files using MS Edge, Firefox, or Chrome.
- ii. Open the downloaded files using [Adobe Acrobat Reader](https://acrobat.adobe.com/us/en/acrobat/pdf-reader.html), which is available for free at <https://acrobat.adobe.com/us/en/acrobat/pdf-reader.html>.
- iii. In each downloaded file, go to the Menu bar >View >Navigation Panels >Bookmarks panel and use its bookmarks, which make navigating to the contents' numerous(* † ♣ >blue footnote-like references) very easy.

2. Many of the articles have been posted to the website of **Judicial Discipline Reform** at <http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org>.

3. Visit the website and join its 51,941, + subscribers to its articles thus: [homepage](#) <left panel ↓Register or

♣ http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates3.pdf >OL3:1144-1555+ App.6:1

† http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_individual_files_links.pdf

♦ http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero_Appendixes1-7.pdf

+ New or Users >Add New.

2. The individual sections of Volume I of the study

4. jur:1; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_Intro_trigger_history.pdf
5. jur:10, 11; the official statistics that the federal courts produce and submit to the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and the latter aggregates and files with Congress as a public document in the Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§604(a)(3-4) and (h)(2), show that federal judges dismiss 100% of complaints against their fellow judges and deny 100% of petitions to review those dismissals; this betrays an implicit or explicit complicit agreement among the judges to cover for each other regardless of the nature, frequency, and gravity of their misconduct complained about; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_complaint_dismissal_statistics&graphs.pdf; see also OL2:546; 548; OL3:1253; 1176
6. jur:21§A; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_means_motive_opportunity_for_abuse.pdf
7. jur:65§B; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_bankruptcy_fraud_scheme_cover-up.pdf
8. jur:85§C; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_inform_outrage_abuse_notions.pdf
9. jur:97§D; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_presentation_to_launch_investigation.pdf
10. jur:119§§E1-4; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_marketing_brochures_Annual-Report_team.pdf
11. jur:130§E5; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_Institute_Judicial_Unaccountability_Reporting.pdf
12. jur:130§E5-9; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/DrRCordero_Institute_Judicial_Unaccountability_Reporting&agenda.pdf
13. jur:158§§E6-9; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_IG_legislation_civic_movement.pdf
14. jur:171§F; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_presentation_to_trigger_history.pdf
15. ggl:1; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_email_accounts_interference.pdf
16. jur:i-lix; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_jur_i-lix_summarizing_articles.pdf
17. Lsch:1; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/Lsch/DrRCordero_presentation_at_schools.pdf; see also http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Deans_professors_students.pdf
18. DCC:1; The *DeLano* Case Course, with two 15-week syllabi for classwork of case investigation and organization of findings presentation conference; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/DCC/DrRCordero_DeLano_Case_Course.pdf; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/DCC/DrRCordero_DeLano_docs.pdf
19. CW:1; Creative writings: blurbs, synopses of novels and movie scripts, drama scenes, and a short story by Dr Cordero; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/CW/DrRCordero_creative_writings.pdf
20. <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/a&p/DrRCordero-Agent&Publisher.pdf>

21. OL:1-393; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_OL.1-393.pdf

3. The articles written and available for review and publication

22. http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_collected_statistics_complaints_v_judges.pdf.
Cf.:

- a. jur:11: while Then-Judge, Now-Justice Sonia **Sotomayor** served on the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_complaint_dismissal_statistics.pdf
- b. OL2:546; while Then-Judge, Now-Justice Neil **Gorsuch** served on the Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_hearings_JGorsuch_complainants&parties.pdf
- c. OL2:748; Judge Brett **Kavanaugh**, Chief Judge Merrick **Garland**, and their peers and colleagues in the District of Columbia Circuit dismissed 478 complaints against them during the 1oct06-30sep17 11-year period; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_JJ_Kavanaugh-Garland_exoneration_policy.pdf;
http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_table_exonerations_by_JJ_Kavanaugh-Garland.pdf
- d. OL2:1176; official statistics of dismissal of complaints against fellow judges while Then-Judge, Now-Justice Amy Coney **Barrett** served on the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_JgACBarrett_condonation_judges_power_abuse.pdf
- e. OL3:1229; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-JudgeRPratt.pdf> and <https://www.iasd.uscourts.gov/content/senior-district-judge-robert-w-pratt>
- f. OL3:1237 on exposing attorney general designate Judge M. **Garland**; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_media_exposing_judges.pdf
- g. Template to be filled out with the complaint statistics on any of the 15 reporting courts: http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_template_table_complaints_v_judges.pdf

23. jur:32§§2-3; Congress's finding of **cronyism in the federal courts**, http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates.pdf

24. jur:65; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_abuse_by_justices.pdf

25. jur:72fn144d; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/journalists/CBS/11-5-18DrRCordero-ProdCScholl.pdf>

26. jur:122; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judicial_unaccountability_brochures_report.pdf

27. jur:130; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_Institute_judicial_unaccountability_reporting.pdf

28. Lsch:13; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_dynamic_analysis&strategic_thinking.pdf; the means of judges' retaliation: Lsch:17§C

29. http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/DoJ-FBI/9-2-3DrRCordero-FBI_Corruption_Unit.pdf

30. OL:3§F; Moral and material rewards for exposing abusers of power; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL/DrRCordero-ICIJ.pdf>

31. OL:42; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_law_research_proposals.pdf
32. OL:158; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_no_judicial_immunity.pdf
33. OL:180 http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_turning_judges_clerks_into_informants.pdf
34. OL:190; a plan for investigating federal judges based on the leads already gathered; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_institutionalized_judges_abuse_power.pdf
35. OL:215; former CBS reporter Sharyl Attkisson and her suit against the Department of Justice for illegal electronic surveillance of her home and CBS office computers; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-CBS_Reporter_SAttkisson.pdf
36. OL:255; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-university_law_research.pdf
37. OL:274; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_auditing_judges.pdf
38. OL:311; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-presidential_candidates.pdf
39. OL2:440; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-IT_investigate_interception.pdf
40. OL2:433; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_Yahogroups.pdf
41. OL2:452; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Deans_professors_students.pdf
42. OL2:453; analysis of official statistics of the U.S. Courts, which by law must be filed with Congress annually as a public document; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judicial_accountability_presentation.pdf
43. OL2:468; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_turning_court_clerks_into_informants.pdf
44. OL2:546; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_complaint_dismissal_statistics.pdf; see also infra OL2:792; see the supporting official statistical tables of the federal courts at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/statistics&tables/statistical_tables_complaints_v_judges.pdf
45. OL2:548; table of 100% complaint dismissal and a 100% dismissal review petitions denial while Then-Judge, Now-Justice Neil Gorsuch served on the 10th Circuit; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_hearings_JGorsuch_complainants&parties.pdf
46. OL2:567; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-The_Dissatisfied_with_Judicial_System.pdf
47. OL2:608, 760; article using official court statistics to demonstrate “the math of abuse”: neither judges nor clerks read the majority of briefs, disposing of them through 'dumping forms', which are unresearched, reasonless, arbitrary, ad-hoc fiat-like orders on a 5¢ rubberstamped form; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_do_not_read.pdf
48. OL2:614; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_how_fraud_scheme_works.pdf
49. OL2:687; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_clerks_as_judges_abusers_by_proxy.pdf
50. OL2:760; see OL2:608
51. OL2:768; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Congress.pdf>
52. OL2:773; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Harvard_Yale_prof_students.pdf
53. OL2:781; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_intercepting_emails_mail.pdf

54. OL2:792; Complaint filed with Supreme Court Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-SupCt_CJ_JGRoberts.pdf
55. OL2:799; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-RepJNadler.pdf>
56. OL2:821; Programmatic presentation on forming a national civic movement for judicial abuse of power exposure, redress, and reform; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_programmatic_presentation.pdf
57. OL2:840; <http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-LDAD.pdf>;
58. OL2:879; exposing judges who alone or with their cronies prey on parties and the public; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_Black_Robed_Predators_documentary.pdf
59. OL2:901; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-LDAD.pdf>
60. OL2:918; File on the complaint's journey –from OL2:792– until its final disposition in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-11Circuit.pdf>
61. OL2:929; interception of people's mail and emails to detect and suppress those critical of judges; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-IT_investigate_interception.pdf
62. OL2:932; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-ProfRPosner.pdf>
63. OL2:947; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-media.pdf>
64. OL2:951; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_citizens_hearings.pdf
65. OL2:957; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_video.mp4
66. OL2:957; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_slides.pdf
67. OL2:971; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Professors_students_journalists.pdf; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Professors_students_lawyers.pdf
68. OL2:983; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_introduction_video_slides_judges_abuse.pdf
69. OL2:991; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_on_SenEWarren.pdf
70. OL2:997; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_SenEWarren_plan_judges.pdf
71. OL2:1003; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-media_DARE.pdf
72. OL2:1006; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_pitch-Media.pdf
73. OL2:1022; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Capital_Investors.pdf
74. OL2:1027; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_SenEWarren_plan_judges.pdf
75. OL2:1032; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_international_exposure_judges_abuse.pdf
76. OL2:1037; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_out_of_court_inform_outrage_strategy.pdf
77. OL2:1040; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-parties_invoking_impeachment_trial.pdf
78. OL2:1045; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Professors_Students_Journalists.pdf;

- http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Professors_students_lawyers.pdf
79. >OL2:1051; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_citizen_hearings.pdf
 80. OL2:1056; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-reporters_clerks.pdf = http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_sham_hearings.pdf
 81. OL2:1066; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_adapting_to_new_legal_market.pdf, discussing a proposal to LexisNexis
 82. OL2:1073; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_inform_outrage_be_compensated.pdf
 83. >OL2:1081; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_intercepting_emails_mail.pdf = <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-LexisNexis.pdf>
 84. OL2:1084; Adapting to the Covid legal market by Making Money While Doing Justice; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Thomson_Reuters.pdf
 85. OL2:1090; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-SZarestky_Above_the_Law.pdf
 86. >OL2:1093; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Washington_Post.pdf
 87. OL2:1101; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-judicial_abusees&publishers.pdf
 88. OL2:1104; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Hiring_manager.pdf
 89. OL2:1108; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-International_Team.pdf
 90. OL2:1116; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_research_documents&sources.pdf
 91. OL2:1119; patterns of judges' abuse of power that journalists and lawyers can investigate; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judicial_abuse_forms.pdf
 92. OL2:1125; exposing the Federal Judiciary as a racketeering enterprise; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Reuters_judges_investigation.pdf
 93. >OL2:1134; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Talkshow_hosts_coalition.pdf
 94. OL3:1144; analysis of Thomson Reuters's report "The Teflon Robe"; which found "hardwired judicial corruption", i.e., corruption that is an integral element of state judiciaries and that intertwines their judges and the conniving state commissions on judicial conduct duty-bound to supervise them but in practice covering up their abuse of power by not even investigating, let alone punishing, them; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_your_story_for_Reuters.pdf
 95. OL3:1154; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-American_Thinker.pdf
 96. OL3:1164 and 1585; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Center_Public_Integrity.pdf; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_abuse_of_power.pdf
 97. OL3:1168; Joining forces with Reuters to extend its investigation of state commissions on judicial conduct to the Federal Judiciary and connect it with U.S. Senator Elizabeth Warren's denunciation of "unaccountable federal judges' abusive self-enrichment"; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_joining_forces_making_allies.pdf
 98. OL3:1172; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_judges_exposure_election_justice.pdf
 99. OL3:1176; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_JgACBarrett_condonation_judges_power_abuse.pdf
 100. OL3:1187; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-LDAD_repairing_democracy.pdf

101. OL3:1197; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_citizens_hearings.pdf
102. OL3:1205; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Reuters_Law_Firm_Council.pdf
103. OL3:1212; agenda for video conference; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_preparing_video_conference.pdf
104. OL3:1221; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-News_Directors_on_judges_abuse.pdf
105. OL3:1228; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_emails_mail_intercepted_by_judges.pdf
106. OL3:1229; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-JudgeRPratt.pdf> and <https://www.iasd.uscourts.gov/content/senior-district-judge-robert-w-pratt>
107. OL3:1237; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_media_exposing_judges.pdf
108. OL3:1243; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_talkshow_hosts_coalition.pdf
109. OL3:1246; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-CLEs_lawyers_media.pdf
110. <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-NYCBar.pdf>
111. OL3:1253; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_exposing_Judge_Garland&judges.pdf; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_actions_to_expose_judges_abuse.pdf
112. OL3:1257; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Guardianship_Abuse_Symposium.pdf; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_exposing_judges_power_abuse.pdf
113. OL3:1273; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Guardianship_Abuse_Symposium_slides.pdf
114. OL3:1283; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_facts_&_strategic_thinking.pdf
115. OL3:1291. http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-ProPublica_&_media.pdf
116. OL3:1301; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Biden_SCT_reform_Commission.pdf
117. OL3:1318; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_citizens_hearings_outrage_compensation.pdf
118. OL3:1323; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-politicians_v_Biden_SCT_Commission.pdf
119. OL3:1329; the two-phase method for writing in up to 500 words your story of judges' abuse of power that you have suffered or witnessed; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_method_for_writing_your_story.pdf
120. OL3:1338; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_joining_forces_to_tell_your_story.pdf
121. OL3:1342; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_citizens_hearings_by_students&journalists.pdf
122. OL3:1348; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_politicians-judges_connivance.pdf
123. OL3:1351; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_folly_of_pro_se.pdf
124. OL3:1367; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_becoming_teacher&leader.pdf
125. OL3:1371; proposal to apply to judges expertise in financial criminality investigations; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-media_to_investigate_judges_financial_criminality.pdf

126. http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/financially_conflicted_judges.pdf
127. OL3:1378; exposing the Federal Judiciary as a racketeering enterprise; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-media_to_investigate_judges_financial_criminality.pdf
128. OL3:1380; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_writing_reliable_stories&telling_national_public.pdf
129. OL3:1383; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_webinar_judges_abuse_compensation.pdf
130. OL3:1389; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_webinar&story_workshop_slides.pdf
131. OL3:1393; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_webinar_&_workshop_dates.pdf
132. OL3:1394; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_thinking_strategically_to_gain_result_allies.pdf
133. OL3:1399; analysis of *The Wall Street Journal* article exposing how “131 Federal Judges Broke the Law by Hearing Cases Where They Had a Financial Interest”; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-join_demand_for_compensation_from_judges.pdf
134. OL3:1407; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_reading_strategizing_taking_action.pdf
135. OL3:1411; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_plan_of_action_v_judges_abuse.pdf
136. OL3:1415; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_concrete_actions_by_advocates.pdf
137. OL3:1417; a joint venture proposal for Reuters to develop a law website with 49,763 subscribers at the most propitious time: when the attention of the national public has been focused on the impact of judges on national politics and the outcome of presidential elections; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Reuters_journalists_lawyers_on_judges_power_abuse.pdf
138. OL3:1426; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_forming_local_chapters&appealing_to_schools.pdf
139. OL3:1430; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-ABC_investigate_judges_abuse.pdf
140. OL3:1436; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-CLE_webinar_exposing_judges.pdf
141. OL3:1440; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_workshop_for_preparing_your_story.pdf
142. OL3:1445; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_your_story_for_media&citizens_hearings.pdf; also ↓OL3:1619¶6
143. OL3:1449; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_need_to_read&best_time_to_distribute.pdf
144. OL3:1451; to publishers to offer them my articles and describe a plan of action to enter jointly a multidisciplinary academic and business venture for judicial abuse exposure, compensation and reform; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_articles_actions_to_expose_judges.pdf
145. OL3:1457; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_reading&telling_knowledgeable_judicial_abuse_stories.pdf
146. OL3:1460; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-journalists_politicians_scooping_judges_racketeering.pdf

147. OL3:1470; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_Offshoot_Oases_Project.pdf
148. OL3:1473; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_offering_law_services&articles.pdf
149. OL3:1476; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-CIRS_&_trainees.pdf
150. OL3:1479; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_from_abortion_decision_to_new_constitution.pdf
151. OL3:1485; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-International_Commission_Jurists.pdf
152. OL3:1487; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_distributing_articles_exposing_judges.pdf
153. OL3:1489; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-ProfSRAckerman_ProfJSGersen.pdf
154. OL3:1491; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_presentation_to_professors&students.pdf
155. OL3:1493; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_recusal_principles.pdf
156. OL3:1495; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_presentation_The_Business_of_Justice.pdf
157. OL3:1497; letters to NYS Chief and Administrative Judges, NYPD Internal Affairs Bureau Chiefs, and Inspectors Generals; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/IAB/DrRCordero-Judges_IAB_IGs.pdf
158. OL3:1520; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-DAs_lawfirms_organizations_schools.pdf
159. OL3:1522; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Legal_Aid_Society.pdf
160. OL3:1525; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Commission_Judicial_Conduct.pdf
161. OL3:1527; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_proposal_for_class_actions.pdf
162. OL3:1530; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_assets_for_negotiating_table.pdf
163. OL3:1532; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_ReplyAll_read_write_your_story.pdf
164. OL3:1533; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_think_proceed_strategically_to_expose_abuse.pdf
165. OL3:1538; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_strategy_for_effective_action.pdf
166. OL3:1542; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_Medicare&HMO_class_action.pdf
167. OL3:1544; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Cybersecurity_experts.pdf
168. OL3:1550; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_strategy_for_IT_experts.pdf
169. OL3:1555; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Presentation_to_Honest_Judiciaries_Advocates.pdf
170. OL3:1558; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/IAB/DrRCordero-NYPDCommissioner.pdf>; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/IAB/DrRCordero-Commission_Judicial_Conduct.pdf
171. OL3:1578; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/IAB/23-3-30DrRCordero-Settle_or_Expose_Team.pdf
172. OL3:1579; containing a list of media outlets that have exposed judges' abuse in an unaccountable justice system; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/IAB/DrRCordero_holding_justice_system_accountable.pdf

173. OL3:1585; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/IAB/DrRCordero-ProfLTribe_AttrRKaplan.pdf
174. OL3:1587; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/IAB/DrRCordero-LegalAidSociety_DebevoisePlimpton.pdf
175. OL3:1588; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/IAB/DrRCordero-Center_Public_Integrity.pdf
176. OL3:1589; http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/IAB/DrRCordero-ExecDirGRoth_CoanchorGBennett.pdf
177. OL3:1593; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_class_actions-Duane_Morris_LL.P.pdf
178. OL3:1602; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-pro_ses.pdf
179. OL3:1604; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/IAB/DrRCordero-DA_Candidate_TCohen.pdf
180. OL3:1607; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_inform_outrage_to_expose_judges_abuse.pdf
181. OL3:1609; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-schools_&_media.pdf
182. OL3:1611; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/ALJ/23-8-28DrRCordero_class_action_v_Medicare.pdf
183. OL3:1618; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/IAB/DrRCordero_fabricated_indictments-public_officers.pdf
184. OL3:1623; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_defamation_specificity_analogy_distinction.pdf
185. OL3:1625; Complaint to New York State (NYS) Court of Appeals (CA) Chief Judge Rowan Wilson and Associate Judges about fabricated indictments based on false and insufficient evidence presented to a grand jury by prosecutors and NY Police Department (NYPD) officers with the support of judges of the NYS Unified Court System (UCS) and the cover-up by those CA judges, the NYS and NY City (NYC) administrative judges, the NYS Commission on Judicial Conduct, two NYPD Commissioners and two Chiefs of its Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB), and their appointer, i.e., a former NYPD captain and current mayor of NYC, and NYPD and UCS inspectors general (IG): the black robe over judges' holding each other unaccountable covers the NYPD officers' blue wall of complicit silence to make their enterprise corruption under NY law and racketeering organization under the federal RICO Act invisible and soundproof (see §C.10 *infra*); http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/IAB/DrRCordero-Judges_IAB_IGs.pdf
186. OL3:1630; To U.S. Senator Kirsten Gillibrand of New York to request assistance in dealing with a federal agency, namely, Medicare; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/ALJ/DrRCordero-SenKGillibrand_Medicare.pdf
187. OL3:1635; proposal to Moms for Liberty for jointly expanding the addressees of their message to people other than parents concerned about their children's education by holding unprecedented citizens hearings; cf. the blurb at OL3:1645; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-MomsforLiberty.pdf>;
188. OL3:1638; the folly of laypeople improvising themselves as lawyers given the complexities of procedural rules and substantive provisions and to propose that they promote the proposed unprecedented citizens hearings; cf. the blurb at OL3:1645; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero_folly_laypeople_as_lawyers.pdf
189. OL3:1640; proposal for homeowners and tenants to join forces to denounce abusive landlords and real estate investors and lenders by promoting the proposed unprecedented citizens hearings; cf. the blurb at OL3:1645; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-Stop_Wall_Street_Landlords_Acts.pdf;
190. OL3:1644; proposal for holding citizens hearings and law clinics at universities and media stations to expose judges' and their judiciaries' abuse of power; cf. the blurb at OL3:1645; <http://Judicial-Discipline->

Reform.org/IAB/24-2-1DrRCordero-ProfMHutter.pdf

191. OL3:1645; Blurbs of serial articles by top national media outlets exposing abuse of power by judges and their judiciaries; and blurbs of cases ripe for class action to hold those abusers accountable for their abuse and liable to collective compensation for their victims
192. OL3:1646; proposal to AI and GPT investors interested in "revolutionizing access to justice" on behalf of pro ses for a joint venture that would persuade media outlets and universities to hold unprecedented citizens hearings in their media stations and auditoriums, where pro ses and represented parties alike would tell their stories of judges' and their judiciaries' unaccountability and consequent riskless abuse of power; cause an informed and outraged national public to force politicians to discuss the issue as a decisive electoral one and investigate those abusers; and subsequently finance class actions to hold the abusers accountable for their performance and liable to compensate the victims of their abuse because if a former president and his top aides; lawyers and their law firms; police officers and their departments; doctors and their hospitals; clergy and their churches; pharmaceutical officers and their companies; pundits/moderators and their media outlets, can be prosecuted and ordered to compensate their victims, so can judges and their judiciaries given that in a democracy governed by the rule of law, which aims at administering "Equal Justice Under Law", it follows that "Nobody is Above the Law"; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/24-2-5DrRCordero-Pro-se_Pro.pdf
193. OL3:1647; proposal to the proponents of declaring the formerly incarcerated a protected class because upon their release they face discrimination when seeking a job or housing, which prevents their incorporation into the civil society and a productive and normal life; cf. the blurb at OL3:1645; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/24-2-10DrRCordero-formerly_currently_next_incarcerated.pdf
194. OL3:1648; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-joint_venture_with_lawyers&journalists.pdf
195. OL3:1650; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/IAB/DrRCordero-Court_of_Appeals_cover-up.pdf
196. OL3:1654; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-Reuters_joint_venture_proposal.pdf
197. OL3:1656; Letter from NYS Commission on Judicial Conduct of 26 February 2024, acknowledging receipt of Dr. Cordero's complaint of 24 January 2024; see next
198. OL3:1657; Letter to NYS Commission on Judicial Conduct Chair Joseph Belluck, Esq., about the Commission's failure to investigate his complaint against two judges of the NYS Unified Court System, received first on 23 September 2022, as per its acknowledgment of November 3, 2022; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero-Commission_Judicial_Conduct.pdf
199. OL3:1659; reply to a law student and proposal for her and her law school to hold unprecedented citizens hearings where people will tell their stories ([above, OL3:1329](#)) of the abuse of power by unaccountable judges that they have suffered or witnessed, which will inform the public of the nature, extent, and gravity of the abuse, and so outrage it at judges as to cause the public to force politicians to investigate judges officially; http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-schools_holding_citizens_hearings.pdf
200. OL3:1665; proposal to criminal defense lawyers to join forces to expose the fabrication of indictment on false and insufficient evidence by prosecutors and police officers and covered up by judges; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-criminal_defense_lawyers.pdf
201. OL3:1667; an eye-witness account of an indictment fabricated on false and insufficient evidence and a proposal to The Legal Aid Society to jointly expose it on behalf of thousands of 'fabricated' inditees; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-LAS_exposing_false_accusations.pdf

202. OL3:1673; general considerations for reviewing indictments and determining their validity; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero_reviewing_indictments.pdf
203. OL3:1680; Proposal to the American Civil Liberties Union to expose indictments fabricated with false and insufficient evidence; and seek compensation for thousands of 'fabricated' indictees; <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-ACLU.pdf>
204. OL3:1683; When Jews and pro-Palestinian advocates think strategically to form a coalition that organizes a 1963 MLK "March on Washington"-like demonstration at the Lincoln Memorial next June 16 at noon to force P. Biden to choose between a chance of reelection by supporting the coalition demands and appearing nationally and internationally as an unprincipled, hypocritical, and subservient non-leader incapable of asserting American values; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-Jews_Palestinians_demonstration_in_DC.pdf
205. OL3:1686; Neither pro ses nor abusees can afford to pay for a class action against judges and their cronies who work together to abuse their power. Nor do they have the technical knowledge to prosecute such a complex type of action in court. Instead, they should join forces to take affordable and strategic action by writing their story of the abuse that they have suffered or witnessed; distributing the article that proposes unprecedented citizens hearings at university auditoriums and media stations, where they will have the opportunity to tell their story; and promoting the proposed demonstration of Jews and pro-Palestinian advocates at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, DC, on September 29, 2024, where also the abuse by judges and their cronies can be brought to the attention of the public countrywide and turned into a decisive electoral and national debate issue; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-only_talking_v_acting_strategically.pdf
206. OL3:1690; proposal to Thomson Reuters's staff at *The Daily Docket* and the Business Development Department for a joint business venture to develop a law website with 51,829+ subscribers and to implement a plan of action to protect court employees and parties from risklessly abusive unaccountable judges and their judiciaries; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero_biz.venture.proposal-Thomson_Reuters.pdf
207. OL3:696; Proposal to *The Atlantic* for a joint venture that through a series of articles and *unprecedented citizens hearings* aims to enable *We the People* to exercise our sovereign power over a kingly judiciary and the politicians who have connivingly put it in office and cover-up its judges' abuse of power; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-joint_venture_proposal-The_Atlantic.pdf
208. OL3:1698; after *The Wall Street Journal* published its article "Insurers Pocketed \$50 Billion From Medicare for Diseases No Doctor Treated", on 9 July 2024, a proposal to it was made for a joint venture to investigate and prosecute through a class action Medicare and its providers of medical services and equipment for their coordinated abuse of millions of senior and disabled people out of the 67 million covered by the Medicare program who individually lack the health, knowledge, and money necessary to sue Medicare et al.; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-WSJ_on_Medicare.pdf
209. OL3:1700; on finding legal assistance from Thomson Reuters's Practical Law and Reference Attorney; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero_legal_help_from_Thomson_Reuters.pdf
210. OL3:1702; proposal for deans of top [law](#), [journalism](#), [IT](#) and [business](#) schools; officers of media outlets; as well as professors, journalists, and multidisciplinary experts to enter a multidisciplinary academic and journalistic joint business venture to organize a joint demonstration of Jewish and pro-Palestinian students at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, DC; citizens hearings; produce their report and a documentary; publish a series of articles to implement the inform and outrage strategy for exposing public officers' unaccountability and riskless abuse of power; embark on a tour of presentations; create the Institute for Judicial Unaccountability Reporting and Reform Advocacy; give rise to representative journalism; and carry

out many other actions; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-leaders_demonstration_citizens_hearings.pdf

211. 230 reserved; OL3:1704 next

NOTE: Section B:231 begins on the next page.

↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓

B. Subjects for commissioning one or a series of articles

231. judges' unaccountability(*>[OL:265](#)) and their riskless abuse of power(*>[jur:5§3](#); [OL:154§3](#));
232. statistical analysis for the public(† >[OL2:455§§B-E](#), 608§A) and for researchers([jur:131§b](#));
233. significance of federal circuit judges disposing of 93% of appeals in decisions "on procedural grounds [i.e., the pretext of "lack of jurisdiction"], unsigned, unpublished, by consolidation, without comment", which are unresearched, reasonless, ad-hoc, arbitrary, fiat-like orders, in practice unappealable([OL2:453](#));
234. to receive 'justice services'([OL2:607](#)) parties pay courts filing fees, which constitute consideration, whereby a contract arises between them to be performed by the judges, who know that they will in most cases not even read their briefs([OL2:608§A](#)), so that courts engage in false advertisement, fraud in the inducement, and breach of contract([OL2:609§2](#));
235. Justiceship Nominee Judge Neil Gorsuch said, "An attack on one of our brothers and sisters of the robe is an attack on all of us": judges' gang mentality and abusive hitting back([OL2:546](#));
236. fair criticism of judges who fail to "avoid even the appearance of impropriety"([jur:68^{123a}](#));
237. abuse-enabling clerks([OL2:687](#)), who fear arbitrary removal without recourse([jur:30§1](#));
238. law clerks' vision is fixated on the end of their clerkship, when they must ask the judge for whom they clerked for a glowing letter of recommendation ([OL2:645§B](#)) to a potential employer, which can bring in a signing-up bonus of hundreds of thousands of dollars; clerks are beholden to judges' power to write or not to write that letter, which morally blinds clerks to their being used by judges as executioners of their abuse;
239. judges dismiss 99.82% of complaints against them([jur:10-14](#); [OL2:548](#)), thus arrogating to themselves impunity by abusing their self-disciplining authority([jur:21§a](#));
240. escaping the futility of suing judges([OL2:713](#), [609§1](#)): the out-of-court inform and outrage strategy to stir up the public into holding them accountable and liable to compensation([OL2:581](#));
241. how law professors and lawyers act in self-interest to cover up for judges so as to spare themselves and their schools, cases, and firms retaliation([jur:81§1](#); [Lsch:17§C](#)): their system of harmonious interests against the interests of the parties and the public([OL2:635](#), [593¶15](#));
242. turning insiders into Deep Throats([jur:106§C](#)); outsiders into informants([OL2:468](#)); and judges into criers of 'Me Too! Abusers'([OL2:682¶¶7, 8](#)) that issue an *I accuse!*([jur:98§2](#)) denunciation of judges' abuse: thinking and acting strategically([OL2:635](#), [593¶15](#)) to expose judges' abuse by developing allies who want to become Workers of Justice([OL2:687](#)), as opposed to being enforcers of abuse or enablers by endorsement or willful ignorance or blindness;
243. two unique national stories, not to replace a rogue judge, but to topple an abusive judiciary:
 - a. *Follow the money!* as judges grab([OL2:614](#)), conceal([jur:65^{107a,c}](#)), and launder([105²¹³](#)) it;
 - b. The Silence of the Judges: their warrantless, 1st Amendment freedom of speech, press, and assembly-violative interception of people's emails and mail to detect and suppress those of their critics([OL2:582§C](#); [OL3:1228](#));
 - 1) made all the more credible by former CBS reporter Sharyl Attkisson's \$35 million suit against the U.S. Department of Justice for its illegal intrusion into her computers to spy on her ground-breaking investigation and embarrassing reporting([OL2:612 § b](#));

- 2) by using Information Technology examination and statistical analysis, such interception and contents-based suppression can be exposed, which will provoke a scandal graver than that resulting from Edward Snowden's revelations of NSA's massive illegal collection of only non-personally identifiable metadata(OL2:583 § 3);
 - 3) the exposure can be bankrolled as discreetly as Peter Thiel, co-founder of PayPal, bank-rolled the suit of Hulk Hogan against the tabloid Gawker for invasion of privacy and thereby made it possible to prosecute and win a judgment for more than \$140 million(OL2:528);
 - 4) principles can be asserted and money made by exposing judges' interception of people's emails and mail;
244. launching a Harvey Weinstein-like(jur:4¶¶10-14) generalized media investigation into judges' abuse of power as their institutionalized modus operandi; conducted also by journalists and me with the benefit of the numerous leads(OL:194§E) that I have gathered;
245. **Black Robed Predators**(OL:85) or the making of a documentary as an original video content by a media company or an investigative TV show, with the testimony of judges' victims, clerks, lawyers, faculty, and students; and crowd funding to attract to its making and viewing the crowd that advocate honest judiciaries and the victims of judges' abuse of power;
246. promoting the unprecedented to turn judges' abuse of power into a key mid-term elections issue and thereafter insert it in the national debate:
- a. the holding by journalists, newsanchors, media outlets, and law, journalism, business, and IT schools in their own commercial, professional, and public interest as *We the People's* loudspeakers of nationally and statewide televised citizens hearings(OL2:675§2, 580§2) on judges' unaccountability and consequent riskless abuse;
 - b. a forensic investigation by Information Technology experts to determine whether judges intercept the communications of their critics(OL3:1228; OL2:633§D, OL2:582§C);
 - c. suits by individual parties and class actions to recover from judges, courts, and judiciaries filing fees paid by parties as consideration for 'justice services'(OL2:607) offered by the judges although the latter knew that it was mathematically(OL2:608§A; 457§D) impossible for them to deliver those services to all filed cases; so the judges committed false advertisement and fraud in the inducement to the formation of service contracts, and thereafter breach of contract by having their court and law clerks perfunctorily dispose of cases by filling out "dumping forms"(OL2:608¶5);
 - d. suits by clients to recover from their lawyers attorneys' fees charged for prosecuting cases that the lawyers knew or should have known(jur:90§§b, c) the judges did not have the manpower to deliver, or the need or the incentive to deal with personally, whereby the lawyers committed fraud by entering with their clients into illusory contracts that could not obtain the sought-for 'justice services'; and
 - e. suits in the public interest to recover the public funds paid to judges who have failed to earn their salaries by routinely not putting in an honest day's work, e.g., closing their courts before 5:00 p.m., thus committing fraud on the public and inflicting injury in fact on the parties who have been denied justice through its delay(cf. OL2:571¶24a);
247. how parties can join forces to combine and search their documents for communality points (OL:274-280; 304-307) that permit the detection of patterns of abuse by one or more judges, which patterns the parties

can use to persuade journalists to investigate their claims of abuse;

248. the development of my website Judicial Discipline Reform at <http://www.Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org>, which as of 18 August 2024, had **51,941+** subscribers, into:
- a. a **clearinghouse** for complaints against judges uploaded by the public;
 - b. a **research center** for professionals and parties([OL2:575](#)) to search documents for the most persuasive evidence of abuse: patterns of abuse by the same judge presiding over their cases, the judges of the same court, and the judges of a judiciary; and
 - c. the **showroom and shopping portal** of a multidisciplinary academic and business venture ([jur:119§§1-4](#)). It can be the precursor of the institute of judicial unaccountability reporting and reform advocacy attached to a top university or established by a consortium of media outlets and academic institutions([jur:130§5](#));
249. a tour of presentations([OL:197§G](#)) by me sponsored by you on:
- a. judges' abuse([jur:5§3](#); [OL:154 ¶ 3](#));
 - b. development of software to conduct fraud and forensic accounting([OL:42, 60](#)); and to perform thanks to artificial intelligence a novel type of statistical, linguistic, and literary analysis of judges' decisions and other writings([jur:131§b](#)) to detect bias and disregard of the requirements of due process and equal protection of the law;
 - c. promoting the participation of the audience in the investigation([OL:115](#)) into judges' abuse; and their development of local chapters of investigators/researchers that coalesce into a Tea Party-like single issue, civic movement([jur:164§9](#)) for holding judges accountable and liable to their victims: *the People's Sunrise*([OL:201§J](#));
 - d. announcement of a Continuing Legal Education course, a webinar, a seminar, and a writing contest([*>ddc:1](#)), which can turn the audience into clients and followers;
250. a multimedia, multidisciplinary public conference([jur:97§1](#); [*>dcc:13§C](#)) on judges' abuses held at a top university([OL2:452](#)) to pioneer the reporting thereon in our country and abroad;
- the call of the constitutional convention([OL:136§3](#)) that 34 states have petitioned Congress to convene since April 2, 2014, satisfying the amending provisions of the [Constitution](#), Article V.

C. Links to external sources of information useful for law research and writing

1. Treatises

251. **Start your research here to gain an overview of the subject and proceed to the ever more specific:** <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Legal-Encyclopedias/American-Jurisprudence-2d/p/100027544>, covering state and federal, civil and criminal, substantive and procedural law.
- a. Also search using the keywords “encyclopedia”, “cyclopedia”, “jurisprudence”, “manual”, or “treatise” of your state law, e.g., <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Legal-Encyclopedias/New-York-Jurisprudence-2d/p/100029357>.
252. Corpus Juris Secundum, a restatement of the law as it has developed from reported cases and legislation; <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Legal-Encyclopedias/Corpus-Juris-Secundumreg-Westlaw-PROtrade/p/104934968>
253. https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Publication-Types/Treatises/c/20231?page=1&n=c%3d20231%3bcount%3d25%3bi%3d1%3bq1%3dFederal%3bsort%3dSC_Units%3bx1%3djurisdiction
254. https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Publication-Types/Treatises/c/20231?page=1&n=c%3d20231%3bcount%3d25%3bi%3d1%3bq1%3dFederal%3bq2%3dCriminal%2bLaw%2band%2bProcedure%3bsort%3dSC_Units%3bx1%3djurisdiction%3bx2%3dPracticeArea

2. Law reviews and journals

255. Gain a narrower and more specialized understanding of particular topics; <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Law-Reviews-and-Journals/Law-Reviews--Journals-Westlaw-PROtrade/p/104937407>

3. U.S. Constitution

256. U.S. Constitution, Preamble: “*We the People* of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice”; http://judicial-discipline-reform.org/docs/US_Constitution.pdf
257. U.S. Constitution, Article II, Section. 2. The President...shall have Power to grant Reprieves and Pardons for Offenses against the United States, except in Cases of Impeachment. http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/US_Constitution.pdf

4. U.S. Code (compilation of all federal, as opposed to state, laws)

258. <https://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml>; cf. Legal Information Institute (LII) of Cornell Law School; <https://www.law.cornell.edu/>
259. E.g., US Code, Title 11 (11 USC), Bankruptcy Code; *id.*; enhanced with bookmarks to facilitate navigation at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/11usc_Bankruptcy_Code.pdf
260. E.g., US Code, Title 18 (18 USC), Criminal Code, containing all federal criminal laws; *id.*; with bookmarks at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/18usc_Criminal_Code.pdf
261. E.g., US Code, Title 28 (28 USC), Judicial Code; *id.*; with bookmarks at <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/28usc.pdf>

5. The law organizing the Federal Judiciary

262. U.S. Code, Title 28 (28 USC), The Judicial Code; <https://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml>; enhanced with bookmarks to facilitate navigation at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/28usc_Judicial_Code.pdf

6. Federal procedural and evidentiary rules applicable in federal court

263. U.S. Code, Title 11, Appendix (11 USC Appendix) containing the Federal Rules of **Bankruptcy** Procedure; <https://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml>; enhanced with bookmarks to facilitate navigation at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/11usc_Bankruptcy_Rules.pdf
264. U.S. Code, Title 18, Appendix (18 USC Appendix) containing the Federal Rules of **Criminal** Procedure; <https://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml>; enhanced with bookmarks to facilitate navigation at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/18usc_Criminal_Rules.pdf
265. U.S. Code, Title 28, Appendix (28 USC Appendix) containing the Federal Rules of **Civil and Appellate** Procedure and **Evidence** (FRCP, FRAP, FRE); <https://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml>; enhanced with bookmarks to facilitate navigation at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/28usc_Civ_App_Evi_Rules.pdf
266. *Federal Civil Judicial Procedure and Rules*, 2022 ed.; 1,248 pages; Thomson Reuters; <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Statutes/Federal-Civil-Judicial-Procedure-and-Rules-2022-ed/p/106767284>
267. *Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rules and Commentary*, 2021 ed.; Steven S. Gensler and Lumen N. Mulligan; <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Treatises/Federal-Rules-of-Civil-Procedure-Rules-and-Commentary-2021-ed/p/106676872?trkcode=recspdpb&trktype=internal&FindMethod=recs>
268. *Federal Civil Rules Handbook*, 2022 ed.; Steven Baicker-McKee and William M. Janssen; <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Treatises/Federal-Civil-Rules-Handbook-2022-ed/p/106744908>
269. For the rules of the Supreme Court, see subsection 20 infra.

7. Rules of procedure specific to each federal court

270. E.g. Local rules and internal operating procedure of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit; https://www.ca2.uscourts.gov/clerk/case_filing/rules/rules_home.html

8. Code of Federal Regulations

271. Regulations adopted by the federal administrative agencies that implement and enforce the applicable law; <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/collection/cfr/>

9. Bills pending (in committees and on the floor of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives)

272. https://www.senate.gov/pagelayout/legislative/b_three_sections_with_teasers/active_leg_page.htm
273. <https://www.house.gov/legislative-activity>

10. Federal laws -and a state law version- of particular interest

274. The **Ethics** in Government Act of 1978, Appendix to 5 U.S.C. [the Code of the laws of the federal government]; <https://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml>; enhanced with bookmarks to facilitate navigation at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/5usc_Ethics_in_Government.pdf

275. **Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act(RICO)**; 18 U.S.C. §§1961 to 1968; <https://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml>; <http://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title18-section1961&num=0&edition=prelim>; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/18usc1961_RICO.pdf
- a. Enterprise Corruption; NY Consolidated Laws, Penal Law-PEN §460; <https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/PEN/460.00>; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/DrRCordero_Enterprise_Corruption_NY_RICO_version.pdf
276. 18 U.S.C. [Federal Criminal Code] §2511; <https://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml>; Interception and disclosure of wire, oral, or electronic communications prohibited: (1) ...any person who— (a) intentionally intercepts, endeavors to intercept, or procures any other person to intercept or endeavor to intercept, any wire, oral, or electronic communication;...shall be punished...or shall be subject to suit....; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/18_usc_11.pdf
277. Duty to report abuse, **18 USC §3057**; <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18/3057>
278. Supreme Court justices assigned to federal circuits and known as circuit justices, **28 U.S.C. §42**
279. bill S.1873, passed on October 30, 1979, and HR 7974, passed on September 15, 1980, titled The Judicial Councils Reform and Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980; Congressional Record, September 30, 1980; 28086; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/Jud_Councils_Reform_bill_30sep80.pdf (see also [jur:159²⁸⁰](#))
280. The Reform part of the bill included a provision for opening the meetings of the judicial councils, but was excluded from the version that was adopted; 28 U.S.C. §332(d)(1), http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/28usc331-335_Conf_Councils.pdf (see also [jur:75¹⁴⁸](#))
281. **Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980**; (**28 U.S.C. §§351-364**); <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/28usc.pdf> (see also [jur:24^{18a}](#)), setting forth a procedure for anybody to file a complaint about a federal judge with the chief circuit judge where the complained-about judge sits
282. **Rules for Processing Judicial Conduct and Disability Complaints** filed under **28 U.S.C. §§351-364**; <https://www.uscourts.gov/judges-judgeships/judicial-conduct-disability>
283. Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 11 on the duties of lawyers and pro ses who sign papers and make representations to the court; sanctions for non-compliance; https://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/frcp/rule_11
284. **Ethics** in Government Act of 1978; 5 U.S.C. Appendix; <https://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml>
285. Rule 23 on class actions of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/DrRCordero_Rule_23_Class_Actions_FRCP.pdf
286. **Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA)** 50 U.S.C §§1801-1885c; <https://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml>; enhanced with bookmarks to facilitate navigation at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/50usc_FISA.pdf
287. Section 1902(n)(3)(B) of the **Social Security Act**, https://www.ssa.gov/OP_Home/ssact/ssact-toc.htm, found in **Title 42** of the U.S. Code of federal laws, <https://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml>, as modified by Section 4714 of the **Balanced Budget Act of 1997**, <https://www.cbpp.org/sites/default/files/archive/908mcaid.htm>, prohibits Medicare providers from balance billing Medicaid QMBs [Qualified Medicare Beneficiaries] for Medicare cost-sharing. The provider must submit its bill to Medicaid and accept as full payment what Medicaid pays. See also Overview of Medicaid Provisions in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, P.L. 105-33;

<https://www.cbpp.org/sites/default/files/archive/908mcaid.htm>.

11. U.S. Supreme Court cases, rules of procedure, and case statistics

288. <https://www.supremecourt.gov/>
289. https://www.supremecourt.gov/filingandrules/rules_guidance.aspx
290. The annual report of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who discusses the key issues of the Federal Judiciary and statistics on the cases filed with it and those handled by its judges during the reported year:
- a. <https://www.supremecourt.gov/publicinfo/year-end/2021year-endreport.pdf>
 - b. <https://www.supremecourt.gov/publicinfo/year-end/2020year-endreport.pdf>
291. Cf. Workload of the Courts, Appendix to the Year-end Report of the Chief Justice;
<https://www.supremecourt.gov/publicinfo/year-end/2020year-endreport.pdf>
292. Table 1

Federal cases disposed of or terminated in the fiscal year to September 30, 2020		
Supreme Court		69
Courts of appeals (12 regional circuit courts)	48,300	
Federal circuit	1,568	
94 District courts (civil cases)	271,256	
94 District courts (criminal cases)	58,589	
90 Bankruptcy courts	721,251	
U.S. Court of International Trade	631	
U.S. Court of Federal Claims	1,742	
Totals		1,103,337

12. Landmark cases in the federal courts

320. *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254 (1964); <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/376/254/>
321. *Strickland v. U.S.*, No. 21-1346, <https://www.ca4.uscourts.gov/opinions/211346.p.pdf>, a federal civil case decided on April 26, 2022, by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 4th Circuit, <https://www.ca4.uscourts.gov/>, held that the Federal Judiciary itself and its officers, including judges in their official and individual capacities, can be held accountable for their performance and liable to compensation.

13. Forms

322. E.g., District Courts—Civil (Vols. 2-4A, West's® Federal Forms); <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Forms---Topical/District-CourtsmdashCivil-Vols-2-4A-Westsreg-Federal-Forms/p/100001667>
323. Bankruptcy Courts (Vols. 6-6C, West's® Federal Forms); <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Forms---Topical/Bankruptcy-Courts-Vols-6-6C-Wests174-Federal-Forms/p/100001669>

14. Judicial Conference of the U.S. (the highest policy-making and disciplinary body of the Federal Judiciary)

- 324. 28 USC §331. Judicial Conference; <https://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml>
- 325. <https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/governance-judicial-conference>, which contains a list of its 20 committees
- 326. The Chief Justice appoints the members of the Judicial Conference committees; <https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/governance-judicial-conference/about-judicial-conference>
- 327. Reports of the Judicial Conference’s biannual meetings, <https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/reports-proceedings-judicial-conference-us>
- 328. Regulations on judges’ annual mandatory financial disclosure reports, <https://www.uscourts.gov/rules-policies/judiciary-policies/ethics-policies/financial-disclosure-report-regulations>

15. Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts (federal, as opposed to state, courts)

- 329. **Administrative Office** of the U.S. Courts (AO); <https://www.uscourts.gov/>
- 330. <https://www.uscourts.gov/federal-court-finder/search>
- 331. Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, <https://www.uscourts.gov/>; established as provided for in **28 USC §§601-613**, <http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/28usc.pdf>
- 332. <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports>
- 333. <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/analysis-reports>
- 334. Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, filed with Congress as a public document(28 USC §604(a)(3-4)); the Director is appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court(§601); <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/analysis-reports/directors-annual-report>
- 335. <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/caseload-statistics-data-tables>
- 336. U.S. Federal Courts - Complaints Filed and Action Taken Under 28 U.S.C. §§ 351-364 in Table S-22; <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/s-22/judicial-business/2023/09/30>
- 337. <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/analysis-reports/judicial-facts-and-figures>
- 338. http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/statistics&tables/num_jud_officers.pdf
- 339. Table 2

Number of federal judicial officers			
https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2020			
Categories of federal judicial officers	30sep18	30sep19	30sep20
Supreme Court justices	9	9	9
circuit judges	166	175	179
senior circuit judges (semi-retired)	96	100	99

district judges id.	562	585	621
senior district judges	412	423	419
bankruptcy judges (including recalled judges)	350	344	334
magistrates (including recalled judges)	664	671	680
Totals	2259	2307	2341

381. <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2020-tables>; and
382. <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/annual-report-2019>
383. <https://www.uscourts.gov/judicial-business-2019-tables>
384. AO's 1997-2019 judicial business reports, containing the statistics on complaints about federal judges in Table S-22(28 USC §604(h)(2)); <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/analysis-reports/judicial-business-united-states-courts>
385. <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics-reports/judicial-business-2019>;
386. Judicial misconduct procedure, e.g., in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; <https://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/home.nsf/Content/Judicial+Misconduct>
387. <https://www.uscourts.gov/services-forms/fees/court-appeals-miscellaneous-fee-schedule>

16. Federal Judicial Center (for research; and education of judges)

388. <https://www.fjc.gov>
389. List of the 8 impeached federal judges since the creation of the Federal Judiciary in 1789; <https://www.fjc.gov/history/judges/impeachments-federal-judges>

17. PACER and other and other case and court finders

390. Public Access to Court Electronic Records (PACER); <https://pacer.uscourts.gov/>
391. Case Management/Electronic Case Filing (CM/ECF); <https://www.uscourts.gov/court-records/electronic-filing-cmef>
392. Cf. <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Publication-Types/Statutes/c/20196>
393. To find the website of each federal court, where its cases are posted go to <https://www.uscourts.gov/federal-court-finder/search>

18. Other federal entities and people

394. White House press release of April 9, 2021, “**President Biden to Sign Executive Order Creating the Presidential Commission on the Supreme Court of the United States**”; <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/04/09/president-biden-to-sign-executive-order-creating-the-presidential-commission-on-the-supreme-court-of-the-united-states/>
395. Presidential Commission on the Supreme Court of the United States (PCSCOTUS): Commission charge and public comment policy; 14 June 2021; <https://www.regulations.gov/document/PCSCOTUS-2021-0001-0003/comment>
396. Office of Professional Responsibility of the U.S. Department of Justice; <https://www.justice.gov/opr>

397. Judges' annual mandatory financial disclosure reports, collected by, and downloadable from, JudicialWatch.org; <https://www.judicialwatch.org/documents/categories/financial-disclosure/>

398. <https://www.iasd.uscourts.gov/content/senior-district-judge-robert-w-pratt>

19. United States Postal Service

399. <https://facts.usps.com/#:~:text=For%2055%20cents%2C%20anyone%20can%20send%20a%20letter%2C,mail%20pieces%20each%20day.%20Zero%20tax%20dollars%20used>

20. Sources of state legal authority

a. Treatises

400. E.g., <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Publication-Types/Treatises/c/20231>

b. State constitutions and laws

401. https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/en/products/law-books/jurisdictions?gclid=EAlaIqobChMImbuX1sHh8glVh9zICh0mTgt-EAAYASACEgl0nfD_BwE&searchid=TRPPCSOL/Google/PrintUS_PP_Law-Books_Main_Search_Brand-Phrase_US/TRLegalBooks-Phrase&chl=ppc&cid=9015549&sfdccampaignid=7014000000vZOgQAM&ef_id=EAlaIqobChMImbuX1sHh8glVh9zICh0mTgt-EAAYASACEgl0nfD_BwE:G:s&s_kwid=AL!7944!3!440994957489!p!!g!!thomson%20reuters%20legal%20books

402. Search for a compilation of all state codes, laws, rules, and regulations; <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Publication-Types/Statutes/c/20196>

c. Uniform laws (the product of agreements among the states)

403. Uniform Laws Annotated; <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Uniform-Laws-Annotated/Uniform-Laws-Annotated/p/100028543>

404. Uniform Commercial Code; <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Uniform-Laws-Annotated/Uniform-Commercial-Code-2020-2021-ed/p/106675446?trkcode=recspdpb&trktype=internal&FindMethod=recs>

d. Restatement of laws

405. <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/search?r=13001&s=KEYWORDSEARCH&q=restatement+of+laws>

e. Omnibus site collecting the law materials of a state or the links to them

1) Illustrated with New York materials; for materials of your state go to the website of your state legislature; your department of state; or Thomson Reuters and search for its **law books on you state**

406. NY State Law, Cases & Legislation | NYCOURTS.GOV; <https://ww2.nycourts.gov/lawlibraries/nycodesstatutes.shtml>

f. Rules of procedure applicable in the courts of a state (the equivalent of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure at 28 U.S.C. Appendix; <https://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml>)

407. The Consolidated Laws of New York; <https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/CONSOLIDATED>; McKinney's **Consolidated Laws of New York Annotated**® (Annotated Statute & Code Series); <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/search?r=13001&s=KEYWORDSEARCH&q=consolidated+laws+of+new+york>
408. In New York, the judicial procedural rules adopted by the state legislation to regulate the procedural aspects of lawsuits in New York state courts -and in federal courts when diversity of citizenship jurisdiction is asserted- are codified to the Consolidated Laws of NY, Chapter 8, Civil Practice Law and Rules; <https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/CVP>; annotated in <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Court-Rules/McKinneys-New-York-Civil-Practice-Law-and-Rules-2023-ed/p/106962400?trkcode=recrserp&trktype=internal&FindMethod=recs>
- a. From the Internet: “The **New York Civil Practice Law and Rules (CPLR)** is chapter 8 of the *Consolidated Laws of New York*^[1] and governs **legal procedure** in the NY **Unified Court System** such as **jurisdiction**, **venue**, and **pleadings**, as well as certain areas of **substantive law** such as the **statute of limitations** and **joint and several liability**.^[2] The CPLR has approximately 700 individual sections and rules which are divided into 70 articles.”
- b. The CPLR can be composed piecemeal for free by going to <https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/CVP>, downloading each provision of each article, and pasting them in their official order of appearance in a Word document so as to end up with one searchable file; otherwise, the one volume of the CPLR published by Thomson Reuters can be bought for \$383; <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Court-Rules/McKinneys-New-York-Civil-Practice-Law-and-Rules-2023-ed/p/106962400?trkcode=recrserp&trktype=internal&FindMethod=recs>
- c. NY Civil Practice Law and Rules, CVR, **Civil Practice Law & Rules (West's®... | Legal Solutions (thomsonreuters.com))**; “The hundreds of official and authored forms provided in *Civil Practice Law and Rules* help you comply with the various New York civil practice laws and court rules while saving you research and drafting time. Comprehensive commentary guides you through every stage of a case from commencement of an action to judgment, enforcement, and appeal.” <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Forms/Civil-Practice-Law--Rules-Westsg-McKinneys-Forms/p/100028288>. The price of this set of volumes is \$5,033 as of 9 February 2024.
409. Developments in the application of the NY Civil Practice Law and Rules (CPLR) in 2023; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/NYSATL_2024_CPLR_Update.pdf

g. Law regulating a judiciary (the equivalent of the code regulating the federal judiciary at 28 U.S.C.; <https://uscode.house.gov/download/download.shtml>)

410. Consolidated Laws of New York, Chapter 30, Judiciary; <https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/laws/JUD>

h. Treatises on state law or topics of it

411. E.g.: Carmody-Wait, 2d, *Cyclopedia of New York Law* | Legal Solutions (thomsonreuters.com); <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Forms/Carmody-Wait-2d-Cyclopedia-of-New-York-Practice-with-Forms/p/100027436>
412. **Modern New York Discovery**, 2d, a reference that discusses significant cases on discovery; **Book (Full**

Set) \$773.00, ProView eBook [its digital version] \$773.00 as of 9 February 2024;
<https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Treatises/Modern-New-York-Discovery-2d/p/100001845>

i. Rules of the state administrative judges

413. The rules issued by the state office of court administration, such as those found in PART [#]. Uniform Civil Rules For The Supreme Court & The County Court | NYCOURTS.GOV; <https://ww2.nycourts.gov/rules/trialcourts/>; and Rules of the Chief Administrative Judge - HOME | NYCOURTS.GOV; <https://ww2.nycourts.gov/rules/chiefadmin/index.shtml>
414. Rules of the Chief Administrative Judge (Parts 100 to 154), <http://ww2.nycourts.gov/rules/chiefadmin/index.shtml>
415. Uniform Rules of the New York State trial courts (Parts 200 to 221), <http://ww2.nycourts.gov/rules/trialcourts/index.shtml>; e.g., the supreme and the county courts; <http://ww2.nycourts.gov/rules/trialcourts/202.shtml>.
- Rules of the First Department Supreme Court [of four departments], which in NY is a trial court; <http://ww2.nycourts.gov/courts/1jd/supctmanh/Commencement-of-Cases-2.shtml>
 - There are uniform rules (Parts 205 to 221) for specialized courts, e.g., family and surrogate, capital cases, and particular activities, e.g., jury selection, depositions

j. Rules of the court where a case or motion is being filed

416. E.g., in New York; <https://www.nycourts.gov/courts/index.shtml>
417. Rules of the Chief Judge, <http://ww2.nycourts.gov/rules/chiefjudge/index.shtml>, of the Court of Appeals, <https://www.nycourts.gov/courts/courtofAppeals.shtml>, the highest NY State court (Parts 1 to 81)
418. Joint Rules of the Departments of the Appellate Division (partial: 22 NYCRR Parts 1200-1400); <http://ww2.nycourts.gov/rules/jointappellate/index.shtml>
- Rules of the Appellate Division, First Judicial Department, of the Supreme Court of the State of New York; <https://nycourts.gov/courts/AD1/Practice&Procedures/index.shtml>
419. Each court may have supplementary rules of its own as well as rules of specific judges...so much for a New York State Unified Court System.

k. Regulations of state administrative agencies

420. Go to your state's department of state website; Google the state administrative agency in question; or search for a compilation of the state codes, laws, rules, and regulations
421. E.g., Description from the Internet: "**The New York Codes, Rules, and Regulations (NYCRR)** contains the exact wording of the codes, rules, and regulations adopted by more than 100 New York state departments and agencies to implement state statutes¹. The NYCRR primarily contains state agency rules and regulations adopted under the State Administrative Procedure Act (SAPA)². The 23 Titles include one for each state department, one for miscellaneous agencies and one for the Judiciary³."
- New York Codes, Rules, and Regulations, published digitally by the New York Department of State, Division of Administrative Rules, and Thomson Reuters Westlaw; <https://govt.westlaw.com/nycrr/index?contextData=%28sc.Default%29&transitionType=Default>

- b. Title 22 of NYCRR concerns the rules of the Judiciary and its several courts;
[https://govt.westlaw.com/nycrr/Browse/Home/NewYork/NewYorkCodesRulesandRegulations?guid=151e975e0ac3d11dd9f72c1eb90efe723&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextData=\(sc.Default\)](https://govt.westlaw.com/nycrr/Browse/Home/NewYork/NewYorkCodesRulesandRegulations?guid=151e975e0ac3d11dd9f72c1eb90efe723&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=Default&contextData=(sc.Default))

422. E.g.,
<https://govt.westlaw.com/nycrr/Index?bhcp=1&transitionType=Default&contextData=%28sc.Default%29>
423. E.g., <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Statutes/New-York-Codes-Rules-and-Regulations-NYCRR/p/100019553>

L. Bills pending in the state legislatures

424. E.g.: <https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation>

m. State laws of particular relevance

425. E.g.: http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/DrRCordero_Enterprise_Corruption_NY_RICO_version.pdf

n. Sources of state cases

426. For information on state cases Google the highest court in the state, which may have a state court locator or a “Links of interest”; otherwise, Google the lower state court in question, which may have a website and post its cases to it; e.g., <https://nycourts.gov/courts/>
427. E.g., Court of Appeals of the State of New York (the highest court in New York State),
<https://www.nycourts.gov/ctapps/index.htm>
428. E.g., <https://nycourts.gov/courts/cts-NYC-SUPREME.shtml> (the supreme courts in NYS are trial courts)
429. E.g., Supreme Court for the County of New York (Manhattan and Bronx)
<http://ww2.nycourts.gov/courts/1jd/supctmanh/index.shtml>
430. When a court issues a decision, it is first published in ‘slip form’ or ‘advanced sheets’, that is, separate from any other decision
- Thereafter the decisions issued during a period of months are published in a pamphlet’
 - Finally, the pamphlets are bound in a hardcover volume. A set of such volumes containing the decisions for a number of years is normally referred to as a ‘reporter’ or ‘reports’. One set can cost tens of thousands of dollars.
 - Normally, reporters are enhanced editorially by the publisher, rather than the writing judge or their courts, with a summary; headnotes summarizing the key point of law of a section of the decision; key numbers identifying the same point everywhere in any law book published by the same publisher; historical notes; and references to other cases, pertinent laws and regulations; etc. Those enhancements are practically indispensable to conduct cost-efficient law research. They save an enormous amount of research and reading time.
 - Reporters -or reports- may be available online on a subscription basis. They may also be accessible, whether online or physically, in the library of a court, a law school, a bar association, a law firm, a public library, or a law institute or service, e.g., Legal Information Institute of Cornell Law School (LII), <https://www.law.cornell.edu/>, and Findlaw, <https://www.findlaw.com/>, provided you are a member; have been granted or have purchased a temporary pass; or there is some measure of

public access.

- c. The decisions for a given court may be published together in their own reporter, such as the U.S. Supreme Court, e.g., <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/search?r=13001&s=KEYWORDSEARCH&q=Supreme+Court+reporter>; or
- d. the highest state court, such as the New York State Court of Appeals, <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Case-Law/New-York-Court-of-Appeals-Reports-2d-and-3d/p/100001560>; or
- e. the courts of a state, e.g., New York Supplement, <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Reporters/New-York-Supplement-2d-and-3d/p/100030135>; search for your state here: <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/search?r=13001&s=KEYWORDSEARCH&q=reporters>; or
- f. the courts of a region comprising several states, e.g., <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Reporters/Atlantic-Reporterreg-3d/p/100024131>.
- g. The decisions on a particular area of the law may be published in a reporter; e.g., commercial law, <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Forms/Commercial-Litigation-in-New-York-State-Courts-5th-Vols-2-4H-New-York-Practice-Series/p/106667772>; or bankruptcy, <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Case-Law/Westsreg-Bankruptcy-Reporter-National-Reporter-Systemreg/p/100002692>
- h. The decisions of the federal courts are normally published in volumes separate from the state court decisions. However, there are online subscription plans that provide access to the federal and state decisions concerning a state or a federal circuit; e.g., call Thomson Reuters Customer Service at (800)328-4880 and ask about its plans.

o. Forms

- 431. E.g.: Carmody-Wait, 2d, Cyclopedia of New York Law | Legal Solutions (thomsonreuters.com); <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Forms/Carmody-Wait-2d-Cyclopedia-of-New-York-Practice-with-Forms/p/100027436>
- 432. E.g., Domestic Relations (Volume 7, West's Legal Forms); <https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Forms---Topical/Domestic-Relations-Vol-7-Westsreg-Legal-Forms/p/100001671>

21. Entities representing state courts and compiling their statistics

- 433. Conference of **Chief Justices** of the states; <https://ccj.ncsc.org>
- 434. National Center for State Courts; www.ncsc.org/services-and-experts/areas-of-expertise/court-statistics
- 435. Court Statistics Project; <https://www.courtstatistics.org/court-statistics> <https://www.courtstatistics.org/court-statistics>
- 436. Conference of State Court **Administrators** (COSCA); <https://cosca.ncsc.org>
- 437. National Association for Court **Management** (NACM); <https://nacmnet.org>
- 438. National Conference of Appellate **Court Clerks** (NCACC); www.appellatecourtclerks.org
- 439. Number of cases filed in state courts annually; http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/num_state_cases_07.pdf

22. Rules and codes of conduct for judges

440. Code of Conduct for U.S. Judges; <https://www.uscourts.gov/judges-judgeships/code-conduct-united-states-judges>
441. American Bar Association Model **Rules** of Professional Conduct; https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/publications/model_rules_of_professional_conduct/model_rules_of_professional_conduct_table_of_contents/
442. American Bar Association Model **Code** of Judicial Conduct; https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/publications/model_code_of_judicial_conduct/
443. Rules of the NYS Chief Administrative Judge, Part 100. Judicial Conduct; <https://ww2.nycourts.gov/rules/chiefadmin/100.shtml>
- a. E.g.: Section 100.2 A judge shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all of the judge's activities; <https://ww2.nycourts.gov/rules/chiefadmin/100.shtml#02>

23. Rules of conduct for lawyers

444. Joint Rules of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of each of the four Judicial Departments, Rules of Professional Conduct [for lawyers] Part 1200 – (22 NYCRR [Compilation of Codes, Rules, and Regulations] Part 1200); <https://ww2.nycourts.gov/rules/jointappellate/index.shtml> New York Rules of Professional Conduct; <https://nysba.org/attorney-resources/professional-standards/>

24. Reports by media outlets and VIPs that have exposed judges

a. Reports exposing judges

445. Enhancing Efforts to Coordinate Best Workplace Practices Across the Federal Judiciary; Federal Judicial Center and National Academy of Public Administration; July 2024; <https://www.fjc.gov/content/388247/enhancing-efforts-coordinate-best-workplace-practices-across-federal-judiciary>
446. The Teflon Robe; Michael Berens and John Shiffman; Thomson Reuters. They journalists found “hardwired judicial corruption”, i.e., corruption that is an integral element of state judiciaries and that intertwines their judges and the conniving state commissions on judicial conduct. Although the latter are duty-bound to supervise the judges, in practice the commissions cover up the judges’ abuse of power by not even investigating, let alone punishing or holding, them liable to the victims of their fraud and dereliction of duty.
- a. Part 1, 30jun20; <https://www.reuters.com/investigates/special-report/usa-judges-misconduct/>
- b. Part 2, 9july20; <https://www.reuters.com/investigates/special-report/usa-judges-deals/>
- c. Part 3, 14july21; <https://www.reuters.com/investigates/special-report/usa-judges-commissions/>
- d. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-judges-commissions-snapshot-idUSKCN24F1E4>
- e. 30jun20; <https://www.reuters.com/investigates/special-report/usa-judges-methodology-qanda/>
- f. <https://www.reuters.com/investigates/special-report/usa-judges-data/>
447. In the secret courts of Massachusetts – A Globe Spotlight report; Jenn Abelson, Nicole Dungca, and Todd Wallack; edited by Patricia Wen; The Boston Globe; 30sep18
- a. <https://apps.bostonglobe.com/spotlight/secret-courts/>

448. *The Wall Street Journal*; James.Grimaldi@wsj.com; <https://www.wsj.com/news/author/james-v-grimaldi>; Coulter.Jones@wsj.com; <https://www.wsj.com/news/author/coulter-jones>; reach Mr. Jones at 212-416-3778; Joe.Palazzolo@wsj.com; <https://www.wsj.com/news/author/joe-palazzolo>
- a. 131 Federal Judges Broke the Law by Hearing Cases Where They Had a Financial Interest; https://www.wsj.com/articles/131-federal-judges-broke-the-law-by-hearing-cases-where-they-had-a-financial-interest-11632834421?fbclid=IwAR17veisSou0tQJdrn4VM9Ssvk_JYFqCY-Foselbnkb1SsNx2ia1Fji1GAQ; 28sep21;
 - 1) updated under the title "Federal Judges Heard Cases Despite a Financial Interest"; 29sep21; https://www.wsj.com/articles/how-the-journal-found-judges-violations-of-law-on-conflicts-11632833775?mod=Searchresults_pos11&page=1
 - 2) updated under the title: Dozens of Federal Judges Had Financial Conflicts: What You Need to Know: A Wall Street Journal investigation finds more than 130 federal judges unlawfully ruled in cases involving companies in which they or their families held shares; *Michael Siconolfi, Coulter Jones, Joe Palazzolo, and James V. Grimaldi*; WSJ; April 27, 2022; <https://www.wsj.com/articles/dozens-of-federal-judges-broke-the-law-on-conflicts-what-you-need-to-know-11632922140>

"A Wall Street Journal investigation found that 152 federal judges around the nation have violated U.S. law and judicial ethics by overseeing 1,076 [court cases](#) involving companies in which they or their family owned stock.

As a result of the Journal's reporting, judges in 883 cases have notified courts that they presided in the lawsuits improperly and that the cases are eligible to be reopened."
 - b. Texas Judge Leads Tally of Cases With Financial Conflicts --- Gilstrap didn't recuse in 138 suits involving firms in which he or his wife had an interest; 30sep21
 - c. Judges or Their Brokers Bought And Sold Stocks of Litigants --- 61 report trades made while they oversaw suits involving the companies; 16oct21
 - d. U.S. News: Bill Would Toughen Stock-Trading Rules for Federal Judges; 26oct21
 - e. Hidden Interests - Federal Judge Files Recusal Notices in 138 Cases After WSJ Queries. Rodney Gilstrap initially argued he didn't violate financial-conflicts law; 2nov21
 - f. U.S. News: Judge Acknowledges Possible Recusal Errors; 3nov21
 - g. U.S. News: Bill on Judge Disclosures Passes House Panel; 18nov21
 - h. U.S. News: Bill Gains To Speed Disclosure by Judges; 2dec21
449. Insurers Pocketed \$50 Billion From Medicare for Diseases No Doctor Treated; Christopher.Weaver@wsj.com, Tom.McGinty@wsj.com, Mark.Maremont@wsj.com, Anna.Wilde.Mathews@wsj.com; *The Wall Street Journal*; 9 July 2024; https://www.wsj.com/health/healthcare/medicare-health-insurance-diagnosis-payments-b4d99a5d?%20mod=Searchresults_pos1&page=1
450. Friends of the Court: SCOTUS Justices' Beneficial Relationships With Billionaire Donors; ProPublica; <https://www.propublica.org/series/supreme-court-scotus>; <https://www.propublica.org/article/clarence-thomas-scotus-undisclosed-luxury-travel-gifts-crow>; <https://www.pulitzer.org/winners/propublica-work-joshua-kaplan-justin-elliott-brett-murphy-alex-mierjeski-and-kirsten-berg>;

451. Federal Judges Admit Conflicts Of Interests, Leaving Litigants Reeling; HuffPost Latest News; Henry Kerali contributed to this report; Center For Public Integrity; Apr 28, 2014, 12:50 PM; https://www.huffpost.com/entry/judges-conflicts-of-interest_n_5227031
452. House panel to explore impeachment, judicial ethics in wake of Ginni Thomas texts; Emily Brooks; *The Hill*; April 2, 2022; [https://thehill.com/news/house/3466200-house-panel-to-explore-impeachment-judicial-ethics-in-wake-of-ginni-thomas-texts/?email=dcd9182650c7057d9562f94b9683d2cb21956491&email=196e19bbfcda79590d53fee9f4e29783&emailb=3ec1a5012e1dfb515ec80cc7ab0f7d18aedc7608c79a990da27e4e0908e91fd4&utm_source=Social&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=04.26.22%20RZ%20The%20Hill%20News%20Alert%20SCOTUS%20impeachments&utm_term=News%20Alerts](https://thehill.com/news/house/3466200-house-panel-to-explore-impeachment-judicial-ethics-in-wake-of-ginni-thomas-texts/?email=dcd9182650c7057d9562f94b9683d2cb21956491&email=196e19bbfcda79590d53fee9f4e29783&emailb=3ec1a5012e1dfb515ec80cc7ab0f7d18aedc7608c79a990da27e4e0908e91fd4&utm_source=Social&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=04.26.22%20RZ%20The%20Hill%20News%20Alert%20SCOTUS%20impeachments&utm_term=News%20Alertshttps://thehill.com/news/house/3466200-house-panel-to-explore-impeachment-judicial-ethics-in-wake-of-ginni-thomas-texts/?email=dcd9182650c7057d9562f94b9683d2cb21956491&email=196e19bbfcda79590d53fee9f4e29783&emailb=3ec1a5012e1dfb515ec80cc7ab0f7d18aedc7608c79a990da27e4e0908e91fd4&utm_source=Social&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=04.26.22%20RZ%20The%20Hill%20News%20Alert%20SCOTUS%20impeachments&utm_term=News%20Alerts)
453. Senator Elizabeth Warren’s “I have a plan for the Federal Judiciary too”; <https://elizabethwarren.com/plans/restore-trust?source=soc-WB-ew-tw-ro>
454. Several of the above-listed reports are collected at http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/financially_conflicted_judges.pdf

b. Reports with leads and methodology useful for investigating judges

455. Pandora Papers; International Consortium of Investigative Journalists, Washington, D.C.; 3oct21; <https://www.icij.org/investigations/pandora-papers/>

25. Journalists and media outlets

456. CBS news anchor Norah O'Donnell interviews Candidate Joe Biden on October 22, 2020, on 'packing the Supreme Court'; <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=enEzm-QL5RY>
457. *Biden's court-reform commission hears from experts on term limits and judicial review*; Mitchell Jagodinski; SCOTUSblog (July 1, 2021, 8:45 AM); <https://www.scotusblog.com/2021/07/bidens-court-reform-commission-hears-from-experts-on-term-limits-and-judicial-review/>
458. **The Associated Press**; <https://www.ap.org/about/>

26. Entities accrediting educational institutions (and serving as portals to them)

459. (**journalism** schools) <http://www.acejmc.org/accreditation-reviews/accredited-programs/accreditedreaccredited/>
460. https://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/resources/aba_approved_law_schools/
461. (**business** schools) <https://acbsp.org/page/contact-event>
462. [https://www.academia.edu/upgrade?feature=searchm&stm_copy=a+thesis+chapter&trigger=stm](https://www.academia.edu/upgrade?feature=searchm&stm_copy=a+thesis+chapter&trigger=stm;); consortium of 16,941+ universities to enable the storage and retrieval of professional articles and reports)

27. Law book publishers

463. Thomson Reuters is the largest publisher of law books and related materials in the U.S.; <https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/en/products/law-books>
464. <https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/en/support#contact>
465. https://store.legal.thomsonreuters.com/law-products/Jurisdictions/New-York/c/20075?elq_mid=23169&elq_cid=15386188&elq_ename=P_PRNT_PRD_9030215_EMUSNPR1REMNyTitles_em1_20201209&cid=9030215&email=drrcordero%40judicial-discipline-reform.org&sfidccampaignid=7014000000vZOgQAM&campaignCode=&chl=Em&utm_medium=email&utm_source=eloqua&utm_campaign=P_PRNT_PRD_9030215_EMUSNPR1REMNyTitles_20201209&utm_content=9030215
466. <https://www.lexisnexis.com/en-us/home.page>

28. Other private entities and people

467. American Association of University Professors, <https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics>
468. American Association of Retired People; <https://press.aarp.org/?intcmp=FTR-LINKS-PRO-PRESS2-EWHERE>
469. Judicial Watch, <https://www.judicialwatch.org>
- a. Judicial Watch's repository of judges' financial disclosure reports, <https://www.judicialwatch.org/documents/categories/financial-disclosure/>
 - b. Judicial Watch representing former CBS reporter Sharyl Attkisson in her suit against the U.S. Department of Justice for hacking her office and home computers, for which she is demanding \$35 million in damages; <https://www.judicialwatch.org/cases/sharyl-attkisson-judicial-watch-v-u-s-department-justice-no114-cv-01944/>
470. 5 Young Women in Montana's Climate Case on How They Pulled Off Their Historic Win; Rachel Janfaza; Cosmopolitan; 18 August 2023; <https://www.yahoo.com/news/lifestyle/5-young-women-montana-climate-173600590.html>
- 471.

Appendix 7

Two blocs of email addresses of journalists, media outlets, professors, and students who can be persuaded to hold **UNPRECEDENTED CITIZENS HEARINGS** on judges' unaccountability and consequent riskless abuse of power.

Place each in the To: box of separate emails containing your story of abuse that you have suffered or witnessed. You can easily write it in up to 500 words by applying the [two-phase method](#). By so doing, your story will be informative, accurate, and verifiable by those who can enable you to tell it at the hearings. ‡

To: [journalists and media officers]

john.shiffman@thomsonreuters.com, cjc@cjc.ny.gov, michael.berens@thomsonreuters.com,
blake.morrison@thomsonreuters.com, tips@thomsonreuters.com, contact@go.reuters.com,
marketresearch.thomsonreuters@thomsonreuters.com, patricia.wen@globe.comrs.com,
twallack@gmail.com, newstip@globe.com, spotlight@globe.com, brian.mcgrory@globe.com,
charles.ornstein@propublica.org, tracy.weber@propublica.org, gpdf@aol.com,
jimwdean@aol.com, investigate@ap.org, ajaffe@thehill.com, Thehill@email.thehill.com,
ijerr@spectacularjournals.org, newsletters@abovethelaw.com, NTotenberg@npr.org,
drew@americanthinker.com, tips@publicintegrity.org, mderienzo@publicintegrity.org,
watchdog@publicintegrity.com, emily.holden@theguardian.com, tips@latimes.com,
ryan.grim@theintercept.com, andrea@americanthinker.com, tips@propublica.org,
Laura.Crimaldi@globe.com, inytletters@nytimes.com, info@elizabethwarren.com,
Evan.Allen@globe.com, causecollector@msn.com, Elizabeth_Warren@warren.senate.gov,
ginger.thompson@propublica.org, mcnulaj@nytimes.com, MCoyle@alm.com,
communication@lexisnexis.com, aglantz@stanford.edu, joepatrice@abovethelaw.com,
info@mail.huffpost.com, tips@thedailybeast.com, aturturro@alm.com, Opencourt@cnn.com,
letters@nytimes.com, contact_us@spectacularjournals.org, Matt.Rocheleau@globe.com,
oped@nytimes.com, jmaxeiner@ubalt.edu, Jackie.Botts@thomsonreuters.com,
Vernal.Coleman@globe.com, hello@propublica.org, Jaimi.Dowdell@thomsonreuters.com,
Brendan.McCarthy@globe.com, info@AP.org, Andrew.Chung@thomsonreuters.com,
Lawrence.Hurley@thomsonreuters.com, Andrea.Januta@thomsonreuters.com,
CorderoRic@yahoo.com, sarah.childress@washpost.com, david.fallis@washpost.com,

To: [lawyers and professors]

jsg@law.harvard.edu, tribe@law.harvard.edu, awhite36@gmu.edu, kewhitt@princeton.edu,
cristina.rodriquez@yale.edu, robert.bauer@nyu.edu, kandrias@law.columbia.edu,
jack.balkin@yale.edu, RBauer@perkinscoie.com, baude@uchicago.edu, madams@yu.edu,
charles@law.duke.edu, acrespo@law.harvard.edu, wdellinger@omm.com,
ecb95@law.rutgers.edu, justin.driver@yale.edu, rfallon@law.harvard.edu,
heather.k.gerken@yale.edu, ngertner@law.harvard.edu, jgoldsmith@law.harvard.edu,
tgriffith@law.harvard.edu, tgrove@law.ua.edu, bhuang@law.columbia.edu,
mkang@northwestern.edu, ojohns@law.columbia.edu, lacroix@uchicago.edu,
lemos@law.duke.edu, levi@law.duke.edu, staff@pscotus.gov, trevor.morrison@nyu.edu,
cnelson@law.virginia.edu, rick.pildes@nyu.edu, mramsey@SanDiego.edu,
michael.waldman@nyu.edu, caroline.fredrickson@georgetown.edu, development@naacpldf.org,
krooseve@law.upenn.edu, DABMODHotline@hhs.gov, d-strauss@uchicago.edu,
bross@law.virginia.edu, Medicare.Appeals@hhs.gov, Dr.Richard.Cordero_Esq@verizon.net

End Page

‡ http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_individual_files_links.pdf

* http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates3.pdf >OL3:1143-1555+

End Page

‡ http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL2/DrRCordero_individual_files_links.pdf

* http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/OL3/DrRCordero-Honest_Jud_Advocates3.pdf >OL3:1143-1602+

Blank