

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
tel. (718) 827-9521

DrRCordero@Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org

For immediate release, 9/26/07

2nd PRESS RELEASE on The Hearing on Draft Rules Governing Judicial Misconduct Complaints

The Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability of the Judicial Conference of the United States has released for public comment its Draft Rules Governing Judicial Conduct and Disability Proceedings under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act (28 U.S.C. §351-364), which confers upon any person the right to file a complaint against a federal judge. The Draft Rules aim at implementing the recommendations contained in the Breyer Report issued by the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act Study Committee, chaired by Justice Stephen Breyer and appointed by the Late Chief Justice William Rehnquist. Chief Justice Roberts “asked that the report’s recommendations be referred to the appropriate committees of the Judicial Conference for thorough consideration and prompt action.” (pr:42-43 infra) The Draft Rules ensued.

A hearing on the Draft Rules is planned to commence at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, September 27, 2007, in the U.S. Courthouse at 225 Cadman Plaza East, Brooklyn, NY, tentatively in courtroom 8a South. Your attendance is encouraged in view of the importance of determining whether the only rules for disciplining complained-about federal judges, written and to be applied by their own peers, will work any better than the current ones. Under the latter, the judges took disciplinary action against their peers in only 9 cases out of the 7,462 complaints filed in the 10-year period between October 1996 and September 2006, according to the statistics of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. (reproduced with links to the originals in the link above)

Given that the current rules have been applied so biasedly by federal judges for the protection of their own, it is no wonder that the judges would not want to draw attention to the Draft Rules that simply mirror them. Consequently, they announced their release on only one website and are holding only one single hearing in the whole nation, only from 10:00 a.m. to mid-afternoon, not at the Supreme Court or where the Judicial Conference holds its two annual meetings and the Administrative Office sits, i.e. the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, in Washington, D.C., not even at the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in New York City, but rather in a district court courthouse in Brooklyn. As a result, even many members of the media are unaware of this hearing or its importance. (see announcement in the link above).

Indeed, through the systematic dismissal of judicial misconduct complaints, judges have misused the mechanism of self-discipline to effectuate in practice the abrogation of a federal statute and the deprivation of the rights conferred by it upon every person. Having exempted themselves from any discipline, they have perpetuated another inherently suspicious record: in the 218 years since the adoption of the U.S. Constitution only seven federal judges have been removed from the bench, according to the statistics of the Federal Judicial Center. (see link above)

Unchecked judicial power turns into absolute power...has it bred absolute corruption too? That question will be discussed after the hearing by Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org at a press conference where Dr. Richard Cordero, Esq., and other judicial reform advocates will propose to the media to engage in a Watergate-like *Follow the money!* investigation to determine whether a federal judgeship has become a safe haven for coordinated judicial wrongdoing. (see proposal in link above)

(see also http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/judicial_complaints/transcript_27sep7.pdf and http://Judicial-Discipline-Reform.org/judicial_complaints/sham_rules_JMukasey.pdf)