

## **Roberts’s Duty and Responsibility for the DRE Fraud under the Judicial Conduct Act of 1980**

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.<sup>1</sup>

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.

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.

Neither federal nor state judges have any 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].

---

<sup>1</sup>. 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).