This form should be completed and mailed to the above address to the attention of the "Circuit Executive". The envelope should be marked "JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT COMPLAINT" or "JUDICIAL DISABILITY COMPLAINT". Do not put the name of the judge on the envelope.

The "Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings", adopted by the Judicial Conference of the United States, contain information on what to include in a complaint (Rule 6), where to file a complaint (Rule 7), and other important matters. Your complaint (this form and the statement of facts) should be typewritten and must be legible. Only the original form and up to a five page statement of facts should be submitted. No copies are required.

1. Name of Complainant:
   Address:
   Telephone:

2. Name(s) of Judge(s) complained about: Judge Brett Kavanaugh
   Court: DC Circuit Court of Appeals

3. Does this complaint concern the behavior of the judge(s) in a particular lawsuit or lawsuits?
   ○ Yes ○ No

   If "yes" give the following information about each lawsuit (use reverse side if more than one):
   Court: __________________________
   Case number: __________________________

   Are (were) you a party or lawyer in the lawsuit?
   ○ Party ○ Lawyer ○ Neither

   If you are (were) a party and have (had) a lawyer, give the lawyer's name, address, and telephone number:

   __________________________

   Docket number(s) of any appeals of above case(s) to the Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit:
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4. Have you filed any lawsuits against the judge?
   - Yes  - No

   If "yes" give the following information about each lawsuit (use the reverse side if more than one)

   Court:
   
   Case number:
   
   Present status of lawsuit:
   
   Your lawyer's name:
   
   Address:
   
   Telephone: ( ) ___ - ___

   Court to which any appeal has been taken in the lawsuit against the judge:

   Docket number of the appeal:

   Present status of the appeal:

5. **Brief Statement of Facts.** Attach a brief statement of the specific facts on which the claim of judicial misconduct or disability is based on up to five double-sided pages (8.5 x 11"). Include what happened, when and where it happened, and any information that would help an investigator check the facts. If the complaint alleges judicial disability, also include any additional facts that form the basis of that allegation. See Rule 6 (a) for further information on what to include in your statement of facts.

**Declaration and Signature:**

I declare under penalty of perjury that the statements made in this complaint are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Signature: ____________________________

Date: 9/9/18

Judge Brett Kavanaugh LIED to Congress FIVE (5) times and MUST withdraw SCOTUS nomination before it goes to vote.

Also, he must be either censored OR removed from DC Circuit Court of Appeals.

(please see attached incl. Sens. Leahy + Durbin's facts)
The following facts were taken from a 9/6/18 article from Mother Jones, written by Pema Levy + Dan Friedman & "Five Times

In 2002, a GOP aide on the Senate Judiciary Committee, Manuel Miranda, stole thousands of documents belonging to the committee’s Democratic staff. At the time, Kavanaugh was a White House lawyer working on judicial nominations, which included working alongside Miranda. In 2003, President Bush nominated Kavanaugh to his current position on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals and his confirmation hearing was held in 2004—though he was not confirmed until two years later. During his 2004 hearing, Kavanaugh denied ever receiving any of the documents Miranda stole. Asked if he “ever come across memos from internal files of any Democratic members given to you or provided to you in any way?” he replied, “No.” In 2006, also under oath, he again denied ever receiving stolen documents.

But newly released documents show that Miranda had indeed sent Kavanaugh information from the stolen internal documents. The nominee continues to deny he knew the information was stolen. But he can no longer deny he received it.

From Senator Leahy’s Twitter:
BREAKING: Kavanaugh testified he never received any docs that even “appeared to ... have been drafted or prepared by Democratic staff.” Well, he got 8 pages of material taken VERBATIM from my files, obviously written by Dem staff, LABELED “not [for] distribution”.

---

From: Miranda, Manuel (Frist) <Manuel_Miranda@frist
BCC: Brett M. Kavanaugh ( Brett M. Kavanaugh/WHO.
Sent: 3/18/2003 10:53:29 AM
Subject: : For use and not distribution
Attachments: P_2CBSE003_WHO.TXT_1.html

##### Begin Original APMS Header #####
RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)
CREATOR:"Miranda, Manuel (Frist)" <Manuel_Miranda@frist
(Frist)" <Manuel_Miranda@frist senate.gov> [ UNKNOWN ]
CREATION DATE/TIME:18-MAR-2003 15:53:29.00
SUBJECT: : For use and not distribution.
Please see information below. Also, Kennedy speech about legal memos from the Kleindeinst nomination. Also, a Robert Jackson quote from 1941 and Kuhl's memos to University which were disclosed by the Justice Department Committee in the 1980s.

In response to this morning's letter, Dem staffers say confidential information that you all have reviewed the

Points they make:

- Rather than face the facts of past precedent and begin negotiating the terms of the release to the Senate of K by Miguel Estrada, Republicans insist on asserting, with baseless claim, that the appeal memos written by attorneys to the General were stolen or leaked. This claim is very misleading. They alternatively claim that only a few documents were disclosed but only in narrow circumstances related to criminal misconduct or malfeasance. Again, that is false. Justice Department claims that not even it has reviewed the correspondence, implying that this is how sensitive such documents are. Department acted much more responsibly and responsive

- Here are just five examples that clearly refute the incorrect claims. Correspondence from the Senate Judiciary clearly shows that memos by attorneys have been requested by prior Administrations that were far more cooperative in nominations.

- Past examples include the nominations of Robert Bork Court, William Rehnquist to the Supreme Court, Bradford, term-appointment as Associate Attorney General, Stephen Ninth Circuit, and Ben Civiletti to be Attorney General.

First, it is clear that the Reagan Justice Department memos to the Senate in the Bork nomination regarding school desegregation cases.

In a letter dated August 16, 1987, then-Chairman Biden, Justice Department and requested numerous memos. Inclusion request was what was identified as request number 9. To the Justice Department to provide to the Senate, at that paragraph in its entirety:

"All documents constituting, describing, referring or:  

Committee Confidential
Points they make:

- Rather than face the facts of past precedent and begin negotiating the terms of the release to the Senate of a similar character by Miguel Estrada. Republicans insist on asserting, without basis, that the appeal memos written by attorneys to the General were stolen or leaked. This claim defies the facts and is very misleading. They alternatively claim that only a few were stolen or leaked but only in narrow circumstances. It is criminal misconduct or malfeasance. Again, the Justice Department claims that not even it has reviewed the correspondence for sensitivity. If these documents are that sensitive, why has the Department acted much more responsibly and responsive for higher offices.

- Here are just five examples that clearly refute the false and incorrect claims. Correspondence from the Senate Judiciary clearly shows that memos by attorneys have been requested and reviewed only in narrow circumstances: general misconduct or malfeasance. Again, that is false. Justice Department claims that not even it has reviewed the correspondence for sensitivity. If these documents are that sensitive, why has the Department acted much more responsibly and responsive for higher offices.

- Past examples include the nominations of Robert Bork, William Rehnquist to the Supreme Court, Bradford Clement appointment as Associate Attorney General, Stephen Ninth Circuit, and Ben Civiletti to be Attorney General.

First, it is clear that the Reagan Justice Department:
Committee Confidential

In part to protect H. Bank and any other affected parties involved by the Executive Branch of the Federal government in the capacity of government researcher in relation to the report of the government investigation of the subject matter of this report, please provide any reports, proceedings, or evidence related to the subject matter of the report by the affected agency or any relevant document related they thereof.

That we can all agree that this was a very odd event. All is clear on initial investigation, but unexplained gap period from 1967 to 1973. It is also apparent that alteration of waivers or evidence at the previous request.

The report for these shocks will purely as effort to understand the government's position on the report, due to his involvement in suggesting or taking initiative, it was in response to recommendations by Department of information from the client agency in whole the group of they known as the Seneca, Federal, and Welfare in 1960.

What was the former administration's response?

In the administration since the start, any such document to the report of, because that

It's clear that past documents were viewed for understanding the, because that

It's clear that the would clear the, besides the number of serial expiration that 13,000 is

It's clear that they could not exist at this

What did they say that they said they 74. 100,000.
BREAKING: Kavanaugh testified he never received any docs that even "appeared to ... have been drafted or prepared by Democratic staff." Well, he got 8 pages of material taken VERBATIM from my files, obviously written by Dem staff, LABELED "not for] distribution".
1:24 PM - Sep 6, 2018

17.8K people are talking about this

**Warrantless wiretapping:** At a 2006 confirmation hearing, Kavanaugh told Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) that he knew nothing of the NSA's warrantless wiretapping program, launched under President George W. Bush, until the *New York Times* revealed publicly in 2005. Kavanaugh insisted he'd heard “nothing at all” about the program before that, even though he was a senior administration aide. But a September 17, 2001 email provided to the *New York Times* this week shows that Kavanaugh was involved in at least initial discussions about the widespread surveillance of phones that characterized the NSA program. In the email to John Yoo, then a Justice Department lawyer, Kavanaugh asked about the Fourth Amendment implications of “random/constant surveillance of phone and e-mail conversations of non-citizens who are in the United States when the purpose of the surveillance is to prevent terrorist/criminal violence?” Kavanaugh said Wednesday that his 2006 testimony was “100 percent accurate.” But the email, which describes the gist of the wiretapping program, which Bush approved in 2002, calls Kavanaugh’s claims of ignorance into question.

**Torture:** During the same 2006 confirmation hearing, Kavanaugh told Sen. Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) that he “was not involved” in legal questions related to the detention of so-called enemy combatants. But Durbin said Thursday that records show that there are at least three recorded examples of Kavanaugh participating in discussions of Bush administration detainee policy. Kavanaugh stood by his prior answer.
support for William Pryor’s nomination to the 11th Circuit, given that Pryor had called *Roe v. Wade* “the worst abomination of constitutional law in our history.” Kavanaugh responded, “That was not one that I worked on personally.” Newly released *documents* suggest otherwise. *Emails* from the Bush White House show that Kavanaugh was involved in selecting Pryor, interviewing him, and shepherding his nomination through the Senate.

**Sen. Patrick Leahy**

In 2004, Judge #Kavanaugh distanced himself from the controversial Judge Pryor nomination. He testified—repeatedly—that he “was not involved in handling his nomination.” Thanks to documents released at 3AM this morning, we now know that’s not true.

3:42 PM - Sep 6, 2018

•

12.3K

• 8,289 people are talking about this

*Twitter Ads info and privacy*

**The nomination of Charles Pickering:** During his 2006 confirmation hearing, Kavanaugh downplayed his role in the nomination of Charles Pickering, a controversial judicial appointee. (For instance, Pickering once reduced the sentence of a man who burned a cross in front of an interracial couple’s house.) “This was not one of the judicial nominees that I was primarily handling,” Kavanaugh said. But *new emails* show he may have been more involved than he let on.
Torture Amendment. But he still claims his 2006 testimony was accurate.

Senator Dick Durbin

Judge Kavanaugh says he is a textualist. But he is twisting the plain meaning of the word “detention” to serve his own interests. It’s simply not credible.

pic.twitter.com/fBrekeK3yv
5:10 PM - Sep 5, 2019

Senator Durbin: What was your role in the Haynes nomination and decision to make him? And at the time of the nomination, do you know about Mr. Haynes’s role in the administration’s detention and interrogation policies?

Mr. Kavanaugh: Senator, I did not have a role in that nomination and am not involved in the decision-making process. And with respect to Mr. Haynes’s role, I’ve—I know Jim Haynes, but it was not a role in the nominations that I handled.

The nomination of Judge William Pryor: In Kavanaugh’s 2004 confirmation hearing, Sen. Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.) asked the nominee about his