

THE HON. JOHN G. ROBERTS JR.'S ILLEGAL POLICY MAKING AND FRAUDULENT CONDUCT AT THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE US

1. WHEREAS, on October 15, 1980, in the aftermath of the Watergate scandal, during the Second Session of the 96th US Congress, which convened on January 3, 1980, Jimmy Carter, the 39th President of the United States, signed the “Judicial Councils Reform and Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980 (Act).” The Act has become the Judicial Conduct Act and the Conference and Councils Law.¹

2. WHEREAS, the Act ended voluntary unsupervised self-regulation and impeachment as the only two methods of controlling and disciplining the federal judges. It did so by authorizing *any person* to file a complaint against a federal judge or federal judges. The Act created the position of *presiding officer of the Judicial Conference of the United States* (Conference) to supervise and control the processing of these complaints and review their resolution. The Act requires that the complainant be treated with respect and be provided with access to the subject judge or judges required to conduct a full and speedy investigation, that the investigation be transparent, that the complaint be fairly and promptly resolved, and that the subject matter of all complaints be reported to allow meaningful review by Congress, the president, and the public.

3. WHEREAS, the Hon. John G. Roberts Jr. (Roberts) is the presiding officer of the Conference. Roberts is therefore the individual who is authorized and obligated to discipline the federal judges. Roberts is required to regulate and supervise the processing of complaints filed by *any person*, or by a federal judge against another federal judge, or by his own processes and executive actions as a sole investigator, prosecutor, judge, and jury. Roberts’s conduct and performance in regulating and disciplining the federal judges is subject to review by *any person* through the Conference, and by the president, and Congress.

4. WHEREAS, the federal judges have no discretion, authority, right, power, or jurisdiction to use deliberate violations of the canons of good conduct, truth, and reason; to deliberately, maliciously, dishonestly, or fraudulently conceal, ignore, or refuse to consider any fact, factor, or circumstance, or law or right, relevant to a ruling, decision or judgment; to act without clear authority or violate the Constitution’s separation of powers doctrine; to fabricate fictitious narratives in order to manufacture a fictitious reason for making a decision, ruling, order, or judgment that will “*abridge, enlarge, or modify any substantive right*” [28 US Code Chapter 131 §2072(b)], or that can be “*construed, administered, and employed*” to delay, obstruct, impair, or interfere with the right to secure a “*just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of [any] action and proceeding*” in US (and state) courts. [Federal Rules of Civil Procedure §2017 Rule 1].

5. WHEREAS, no federal judicial policy can authorize any of the conduct that violates §2072(b) or §2017 Rule 1 for any reason or purpose. Neither the Roberts or any federal judge, nor Conference has any discretion, authority, right, power, or jurisdiction to engage in any form of policy making that remotely affects or infringes any right, evidence, or judgment, or that is not based on a codifiable *neutral principles*.

1. Public Law 96–458 (S 1873), October 15, 1980, 94 Stat 2035, 18 USC. The “Judicial Council Reform and Judicial Conduct and Disability Act” of 1980 (US Code, Title 28 Judiciary and Judicial Procedure, Part I: Organization of Courts, Chapter 16, titled “Complaints against Judges and Judicial Discipline” [§§ 351–364]). The “Conferences and Councils of Judges Law” and the “21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act” enacted under Pub. L. 107-273 and incorporates the “Judicial Improvements Act of 2002,” which enacts USC Title 28 Chapter 16 and amends §§ 331, 332, 372, 375, and 604. For the legislative history, see H.R. Rep. 107-459 (2002).

6. WHEREAS, at the top of its “About the Judicial Conference”² page on the Conference’s website in large italic letters, between two lines, the Conference boldly declares and asserts that it is “*the national policy-making body for the federal courts.*” In fact, the Conference’s constitutive function is to regulate, limit, control, and discipline the conduct of the federal judges in order to protect the Constitution and nation from federal judges making policy. In fact, the federal judiciary is the weakest branch and has no political, legislative, or executive discretion, authority, right, power, or jurisdiction to legislate or execute.

7. WHEREAS, any policy making by Roberts or the Conference is a colossal violation of the Constitution and canons of reason. It would authorize the federal judges to act outside of their authority, maliciously, dishonestly, fraudulently, and criminally, and still be protected by the presiding officer at the Conference, and under the doctrines of judicial interpretation, independence and immunity in court. It would also authorize federal judges to authorize state judges to act outside of their authority.

8. WHEREAS, Roberts has authorized a policy called the “*domestic relations [and domestic violence] exception [DRE] to federal subject matter jurisdiction,*” and authorized the federal judges to use the DRE policy to dismiss all constitutional actions involving private property, freedom of religion, speech and political expression, and private morals based on the false predicate that the DRE policy is a “*legitimate judicial doctrine of deference to federalism in family law.*” Roberts has done so being consciously aware that the DRE is an illegal act that authorizes state judges to assert jurisdiction over the America people’s most protected, substantial and unassailable freedoms, liberties and rights without neutral principles or due process, and. Roberts did this knowing the DRE illegally abrogates the American people’s power to petition government for redress without fear of punishment or reprisals at the state and federal level.

9. WHEREAS, Roberts is authorizing the use of fictitious and fraudulent processes in US court and conduct proceedings to protect the DRE in the federal case against DRE in New York State. Roberts is covering-up court and conduct complaints in order to cover up his DRE policy making and his authorization of fraudulent nationwide federal and state judicial conduct under the cover of the DRE.

10. WHEREAS, the DRE in New York State case against Roberts exposes his illegal and fraudulent policy making at the Conference conduct, and his authorizing federal judges to fabricate and manufacture fraudulent orders and decisions based on his DRE policy and policy making. Roberts has gone to the extent of authorizing five federal judges engaged with him in the DRE cover up to violate Title 28 of the US Code Chapter 16 §§359 and 455(b) (iii), Canon 3(C)(1)(d)(i) and (iii) of the Code of Conduct for U.S. Judges, and Conference Advisory Opinion No. 103 so they can continue to assert jurisdiction and to operate the cover up under Roberts’s authority. This is not the only inexorable evidence that proves beyond a reasonable doubt that Roberts’s is consciously and deliberately engaged in lawbreaking to cover up the DRE criminal indifference to civil rights legal and conduct matters.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it RESOLVED, on this the 15th day of June 2020 that under the authority of the Institute of Judicial Conduct’s (IJC) May 15, 2020 DRE Resolution that IJC calls for President Donald J. Trump to instruct White Counsel, Pasquale A. Cipollone, and the US Attorney General, William P. Barr, to meet with representatives of the IJC to discuss the factors, facts and circumstances set forth herein.

2. <https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/governance-judicial-conference/about-judicial-conference>