

Aug 29, 2018

**From:**

Walter Tuvell (PhD, Mathematics, MIT & U.Chicago)  
836 Main St.  
Reading MA 01867  
(781)944-3617 (h); (781)475-7254 (c)  
[walt.tuvell@gmail.com](mailto:walt.tuvell@gmail.com)  
<http://JudicialMisconduct.US>

**To:**

Judicial Conference Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability  
Attn: Office of the General Counsel  
Administrative Office of the United States Courts  
One Columbus Circle NE  
Washington D.C. 20544  
[JCD\\_PetitionForReview@ao.uscourts.gov](mailto:JCD_PetitionForReview@ao.uscourts.gov)

**Via:**

U.S. Mail; Email; Webform (<http://www.uscourts.gov/contact-us>); Website (<http://judicialmisconduct.us/drupal/sites/default/files/2018-05/JConfPetition.pdf>)

**Re:**

Seventh Circuit Judicial Misconduct Complaint, №07-18-90037<sup>1</sup>

## **PETITION(/“APPEAL”) FOR REVIEW OF SEVENTH CIRCUIT JUDICIAL COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS**

Pursuant to the JCDA,<sup>2</sup> and to JCDR<sup>3</sup> Rules 21(a) (“review ... for abuse of discretion”),<sup>4</sup> 21(b)(2) (“Committee’s initiative”), and most especially 2(b)

---

1 • The instant Complaint №07-18-90037 (“Wood Complaint”) is very closely affiliated/intertwined with the related-but-separate companion Complaint №07-18-90014 (“Easterbrook Complaint,” already/currently in the hands of this Judicial Conference Committee). These two Complaints *can/should/must* be considered/treated jointly by this Committee, lest overall/contextual injustice result.

2 • **Judicial Conduct & Disability Act** (28 USC §332(d)(1),351-364); <http://judicialmisconduct.us/Introduction#jcda>.

3 • **Judicial Conduct & Disability Rules**; <http://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/guide-vol02e-ch03.pdf>; <http://judicialmisconduct.us/Introduction#jcd>.

4 • This clause of JCDR 21(a) is interpreted herein as applied — not to the underlying litigation (*Ryan v. U.S.*) — but rather to the Seventh Circuit Judicial Council’s (false, bad-faith) interpretation/implementation of the JCDR rules themselves. Namely, the “(abuse of) discretion” complained-of herein is: the Judicial Council’s blind/silent “see/hear/speak/do-nothing attitude,” in the face of clear abridgment (by both Judges Wood and Easterbrook, see f1 *supra*) of “what’s-right-for-the-judiciary” (“conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts,” JCDA §351(a), JCDR 1,3(h)(1), ↓<sub>φ</sub>2

(all other JCDR Rules need/do/must not apply, under “[exigent] exceptional circumstances ... manifestly unjust or contrary to the purposes of” the JCDA/JCDR), Complainant/Petitioner Walter Tuvell hereby petitions/prays this Judicial Conference Committee for review of the blind/silent lack-of-action of the Seventh Circuit Judicial Council, regarding the above-captioned Complaint. Namely, Petitioner’s *thesis* is this:<sup>5</sup>

***In toto (this Complaint №07-18-90037, together with №07-18-90014, see f1 supra), the Seventh Circuit lower judges, including Judicial Council members involved, (and their clerks,) have “engaged in conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts.”***

— *cf.* JCDA §351(a); JCDR 1,3(h)(1)

Speaking *specifically* to the *reasons* supporting this thesis, Petitioner hereby states/avers as follows, *passim infra* (of course under penalty of perjury, as with all of Petitioner’s writings).

## **RECORD/DOCUMENTATION/“EVIDENCE”**

It is assumed that this Committee has (authenticated) access to all relevant official judicial proceedings/records associated with this case: (i) the Judicial Council proceedings themselves (they can be found online, on Petitioner’s website, see *infra*); (ii) the underlying Civil Action, *Ryan v. U.S.*, including the documentation involving it, together with (iii) *Ryan’s* associated Appellate proceedings (including Supreme Court Proceedings). If this is not the case, Petitioner stands ready to provide it to the Committee, in whatever format the Committee requires/desires, upon request/order (though, that would be irregular, because unauthenticated).

**Most importantly:** (iv) Petitioner owns/maintains the website <http://JudicialMisconduct.US> (esp. its webpage at [http://judicialmisconduct.us/CaseStudies/RyANvUS\(ALSCHULERvEASTERBROOK\)](http://judicialmisconduct.us/CaseStudies/RyANvUS(ALSCHULERvEASTERBROOK))), which is the *best possible comprehensive/exhaustive/“long-form” study/documentation* of the entire case) — which he **hereby submits** to this Committee as an integral component of this Petition,<sup>6</sup> pursuant to JCDR 22(b): “petitioner may attach any documents or correspondence arising in the course of the proceeding before the judicial council or its special committee” (noting that the website

---

↑ ¶1 quoted at ¶2 *infra*).

5 • This is the very *definition/purpose* of “Judicial Misconduct.”

6 • If this Committee would prefer other electronic softcopy (e.g., PDF) or hardcopy versions of Petitioner’s website (instead of, or in addition to, its Internet reference URL, <http://JudicialMisconduct.US>), Petitioner here declares his willingness to provide it, upon request/order.

was indeed proffered as documentation to the Judicial Council in the course of its proceedings, see <http://judicialmisconduct.us/sites/default/files/2018-05/NoticeWithSample.pdf>, and it has not changed substantively/relevantly since that time). (v) As mentioned *supra* f1, explicitly/integrally included/encompassed within *this* Petition is the proceedings of the *companion* Judicial Council/Conference case (№07-18-90014) (available on Complainant/Petitioner’s website, just cited).

## **BASIS/SUMMARY/CONCLUSION OF THIS PETITION FOR REVIEW**

**Nothing new needs to be added at this point.** Complainant/Petitioner’s case for Judicial Misconduct by the Seventh Circuit is now complete, resting upon all the materials/record/documentation/“evidence” submitted to this Committee (as just cited in the preceding section *supra*).

We simply add this comment, by way of summary: The *mere publication* in 2015 of the **Alschuler Memoir** (<http://judicialmisconduct.us/sites/default/files/2017-06/HowFrankEasterbrookKeptGeorgeRyanInPrison.pdf>, together now with its “amazing exegesis” annotated version at <http://judicialmisconduct.us/sites/default/files/2018-05/MemoirAnnotated.pdf>), constitutes an indelible/damning blot/besmirchment on the reputation of the Seventh Circuit. Its *very existence* is *prima facie* “**prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts**” (quoting the definition/purpose of “Judicial Misconduct,” f5 *supra*).

Therefore, the Federal Judiciary (embodied now by this Committee) **owes** (by law, ethics, charter, core American Constitutional idealism, and even simple/common human decency) to itself specifically, and to the American public generally, a true/serious explanation/reckoning (not the trivial/frivolous/flippant/false hand-waving wishing-it-to-go-away proffered by the Seventh Circuit). One way or the other. Either Alschuler (and all attentive/intelligent/unbiased observers, such as the instant Complainant/Petitioner) are abject/objective/unrepentant liars — or Easterbrook/Wood (and now, with the latest denial of review, the balance of the Seventh Circuit)<sup>7</sup> are.

Which is it?

---

7 • By name, these are: Judges Bauer, Ripple, Manion, Kanne, Rovner, Sykes, Hamilton, Barrett, Brennan, Scudder, St. Eve (Flaum having recused himself, for reasons unknown).

Petitioner's complaints/arguments/prayer now being thus concluded (and hereby sworn truthful under penalty of perjury), he commends the fate/resolution/adjudication of this Petition №07-18-90037 (and its companion, №07-18-90014) to this Committee's good offices.

Sincerely,



Walter E. Tuvell