November 9, 2018

Chief Judge Timothy M. Tymkovich
U.S. Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit
1823 Stout Street, Room 102G
Denver, CO 80257-1823

Dear Chief Judge Tymkovich,

1. I and the people assembled with me, exercising our 1st Amendment “freedom of speech, of the press, and the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances” which no statute or self-interested required ‘confidentiality’ can abrogate, file publicly this complaint under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980 (the Act), 28 U.S.C. §§351-364, about Judge Brett Kavanaugh, in the U.S. District of Columbia Circuit (the complained-about judges or the judges; DCC) for dismissing 100% of the 478 complaints about them filed under the Act in DCC, and denying 100% of petitions for review of such dismissals during at least the 10ct 06-30sep17 11-year period. This is a fact established by the statistics that they were required under 28 U.S.C. §604(h)(2) to submit and did submit to Congress and the public.

2. The Act is to be construed broadly: It does not require complainants to show standing to file a complaint about a judge, whether by having suffered injury in fact as a result of the judge’s misconduct or disability complained about; meeting any residence requirement relative to the judge’s workplace or residence; or otherwise. Rather, it provides under §351(a) that “Any person alleging that a judge has engaged in conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts, or alleging that such judge is unable to discharge all the duties of office by reason of mental or physical disability, may file with the clerk of the court of appeals for the circuit a written complaint containing a brief statement of the facts constituting such conduct”.

3. The 15 complaints filed with DCC about Judge Kavanaugh in the wake of his confirmation hearings in September 2018 were transferred under Rules 25 and 26 of the Rules for Judicial Conduct and Disability Proceedings by Chief Judge Garland, who disqualified himself, to DCC Judge Karen Henderson, who in turn transferred them to Chief Justice John Roberts, Jr., who assigned them to you on October 10. We respectfully petition you and all other officers to process this complaint together with the other 15 so that their processing may be informed by each other; all be used to detect judges’ patterns and trends of misconduct, and the Federal Judiciary’s institutionalized policy of misconduct as modus operandi; and their processing may lead to the independent investigation of judges’ interception of their critics’ communications.

A. The facts of the complained-about judges’ prejudicial conduct

4. Through their 100% dismissal of the 478 complaints about them and 100% denial of the petitions for review, the judges have “engaged in §351(a) prejudicial conduct”. Indeed, they have:
a. arrogated to themselves the power to abrogate in effect that Act of Congress, which it is
“the business of the courts” and its judges [redacted] to enforce together with its other acts;

b. abused the self-disciplining power entrusted to them under the Act by exonerating themselves from all complaints so as to evade any disciplinary action, thereby resolving in their favor the conflict of interests arising from being the target and the judges of the complaints;

c. breached their oath of office under 28 U.S.C. §453 whereby they “solemnly swear (or affirm)
that [we] will administer justice without respect to persons [like our peers, colleagues, and
friends as opposed to other parties to complaints], and do equal right to the poor [in connec-
tions to us] and to the rich [in IOUs on us that we gave the peers, colleagues, and
friends who dismissed complaints about us], and that [we] will faithfully and impartially
discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon [us] as judges under the Constitution
and laws of the United States”. Instead, they administered “unequal protection from the law”
with respect to relationship to them by being 100% partial toward their peers, colleagues,
and friends when they became the target of complaints, all of which they dismissed;

d. disregarded their duty under the Code of Conduct, Canon 1, which requires them to “uphold
the independence and integrity of the judiciary”. They have shown that how they “discharge
and perform all the duties incumbent upon [them] as judges under the...laws [such as the
Act]” depends upon whether the person whose conduct they are judging is their peer, col-
league, or friend, on whom they dependent for cover-up of their misconduct and disability;

e. prejudiced through reciprocal partiality “the integrity of the judiciary”, of whose essential
character for the “effective...administration of the business of the courts” they have im-
pumed knowledge because the Commentary to Canon 1 provides that “Deferece to the judg-
ments and rulings of courts depends on public confidence in the integrity and independence
of judges. The integrity and independence of judges depend in turn on their acting without
fear or favor. Although judges should be independent, they must comply with the law and
should comply with this Code. Adherence to this responsibility helps to maintain public
confidence in the impartiality of the judiciary. Conversely, violation of this Code diminishes
public confidence in the judiciary and injures our system of government under law”;

f. failed to maintain the “good Behaviour” required of them under Article III, Section 1, of the
Constitution “to hold their Offices”; defined by what their oath singles out, i.e., their pledge
to “faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties [under the] laws”, such as
the Act; and reiterated by Canon 1 in its Commentary “they must comply with the law”;

g. committed “impropriety and the appearance of impropriety” prohibited by Canon 2, for
under Canon 2A “reasonable minds with knowledge of the relevant circumstances after
reasonable inquiry would conclude” that it is “beyond reasonable doubt” impossible for all
the judges to independently deem that 100% of the 478 complaints about them filed over 11
years were properly dismissible but for a complicit reciprocal complaint dismissal agreement;

h. denied complainants the benefit intended for them under the Act of redress for the prejudice
that they had suffered or witnessed relating to the judges’ misconduct or disability;

i. deprived complainants and the rest of the public of the working mechanism for complaining
that the Act had provided for their protection from misconducting and disable judges;

j. showed reckless disregard for 100% of the nature, extent, frequency, and gravity of the mis-
conduct and disability complained about in the 478 complaints filed about, and dismissed
by, them, whose recklessness was aggravated by their systematic failure to investigate the
complaints through the appointment of special committees, provided for under §353;
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C. Links to official court statistics on complaints about judges and their analysis

Dare trigger history! and you may enter it.

Sincerely,