**Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.**

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

**59 Crescent Street, Brooklyn, NY 11208-1515**
**DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org**
**tel. (718) 827-9521**

# Model Case
# For the Watergate-like Follow the money! investigation of Coordinated Wrongdoing and Fraud in the Judiciary
# by
# Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq.

Why would a federal judge apply the law at the risk of facing a sentence to 20 years imprisonment under 18 U.S.C. §1519 (pg. 108 of the exhibits) for having covered up his or her support or toleration of the bankruptcy fraud scheme described in the 10-page Statement of Facts (5) concerning 12 federal cases (15). (This document may be downloaded with all its exhibits through http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/docs/Joining_forces_for_effectiveness_15nov6.pdf.)

That Statement shows that a 39-year veteran of the banking and financing industries, who is still employed precisely in the bankruptcy department of a mayor bank, filed with his wife for bankruptcy relief in January 2004. (16) In Schedule B they declared that at the time of filing they had only $535 in cash and on account. (24) But using their Statement of Financial Affairs, their 1040 IRS forms for 2001-03, and the few mortgage documents that they had produced (40, 63, 66), I showed that they had earned $291,470 in that period; and also received $382,187 through a string of mortgages.

Actually, when in 1975 they bought a home, they took on it a $26,000 mortgage, their first one (67); yet 30 years later, they declared in Schedule A that they still live in the same home, that it is their only real estate asset, and that they owe on it $77,084! (23) Moreover, they declared in Schedule F that that they owed $98,092 on 18 credit card accounts (31), though the services bought with that money remain unaccounted for as do the goods given that the value of household goods declared in Schedule B, accumulated over at least 30 years of work, is $2,810! (24)…less than 1% of what they earned in the previous 3 years.

The whereabouts of their $673,657in earnings and receipts plus $98,092 in credit card borrowing (62) are still unknown because the bankruptcy, the district, and the circuit judges denied the requests under 11 U.S.C. 704(4) and (7) and §1325(a)(3) (109, 110) for an investigation of the debtors' financial affairs. Then they disallowed or affirmed the disallowance of the claim of the only creditor requesting such investigation, thus removing both him from the case and the risk that he might expose them. Indeed, from these facts, as detailed in the Statement (6§II), one can draw the conclusion, as the creditor did, that there is a bankruptcy fraud scheme. It involves the debtors in concealment of assets to the detriment of creditors and a cover up by the private and the U.S. trustees and the judges for a quid pro quo benefit as yet undetermined.

The judges supporting or tolerating such bankruptcy fraud:

1. confirmed the debtors' debt repayment plan providing for the discharge of 78% of their debt (51);
2. denied ***every single document*** that the creditor requested them to order produced by the debtors? (115);
3. denied the motion to disallow;
4. failed to discharge their duty under 18 U.S.C. §3057(a) by not referring the debtors to the U.S. attorney for investigation. (111) Had they done so, the debtors would have ended up

indicted, an ominous event that would have given them an incentive to trade up in a plea bargain by incriminating the judges and the trustees;

5. disregarded the judges' blatant contempt for due process (203; cf. 207) in order to affirm the motion to disallow (117, cf. 141)

If based on these facts the Reader believes that the judges are supporting or tolerating a bankruptcy fraud scheme, I invite you to engage in a Watergate-like *Follow the money!* investigation of the judges' web of financial and personal relationships. It is aimed to fight their coordinated judicial wrongdoing and put pressure on lawmakers to take the needed action, namely; to repeal the useless statute providing for judges to apply self-discipline upon misconduct complaints filed with them (28 U.S.C. §351 et seq. (212)) and pass the proposed Judicial Discipline and Auditing Commission Act (234).

The investigation should focus its search on evidence of judges' involvement in criminal activity. Under no interpretation of the doctrine of judicial immunity can such evidence be dismissed as relating to judicial acts or as disgruntlement of losing parties. What is more, it would be reported on by the media because it makes good copy, thereby causing public outrage and giving rise to a call on Congress for an investigation of coordinated wrongdoing in the judiciary and proper remedial legislation. (239)

The case described above illustrates the type of case that would allow the investigators to look for both assets concealed by the debtors with the judges' knowledge and those in the judges' possession and in excess of their known income. If we then proved that the justices of the Supreme Court knew of their fellow judges' criminal activity, but looked the other way (235), not to mention if they benefited from it, the public outrage, fueled by the demand for revision of cases by losing parties, would make Congress seriously consider new laws to bring integrity to the judiciary. This outcome is plausible now because the presumptive new Speaker of the House, Rep. Nancy Pelosi, who chastised the outgoing Congress as "dominated by a culture of corruption", pledged that she would take action to make the incoming Congress "the most honest in American history".

Therefore, I respectfully submit to the Reader to:

1. engage in a Watergate-like *Follow the money!* investigation of the judges' web of financial and personal relationships in search of evidence of criminal activity; (251)
2. spread the word to bloggers, citizens' newspapers, and any other investigative journalists that if they joined the search and uncovered such evidence they could participate in a historic event that could bring down the top judges of the federal judiciary and in the process make a name for themselves either during their 15 minutes of fame or by winning a Pulitzer Prize, in other words, they could become the Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward of the Internet era by unleashing the power of the new media on corrupt judges (237); and
3. consider the Programmatic Proposal to unite those who complain about judicial corruption in order for all of us to be effective in eliminating it by engaging in specific and realistically manageable activities that would enable all to achieve concrete objectives. (241)

# Table of Contents

(To open the PDFs Adobe Acrobat Reader 7 or higher must be used, which can be downloaded from www.Adobe.com.)