

Subject: Re: Please acknowledge receipt
From: Walt Tuvell <Walt.Tuvell@gmail.com>
Date: 07/11/2018 06:56 AM
To: AOdb_Internal_Control_and_Audit@ao.uscourts.gov, Judicial Conference
<JCD_PetitionforReview@ao.uscourts.gov>

I hereby repeat my note from yesterday (included below). PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE!

In addition, in looking over the Petition in question (mentioned below), I have found two typographical errors that I have now corrected (available online in the usual place, <http://judicialmisconduct.us/sites/default/files/2018-05/JConfPetition.pdf>). (Some other, more minor/trivial corrections have also been made in-passing [I can point them out explicitly if you want me to].)

These are:

#1: From:

[ALSCHULERvEASTERBROOK\)#phonecall](#)). The nub of that story is that the Seventh Circuit decided to simply ignore Petitioner's (first) Complaint (*illegally* not-acknowledge it, and throw it into the trash can) — and it was (illicitly) enabled to do that because the **First Circuit** **refuses to acknowledge receipt of Complaints (even though JCDR 8(a) requires it)**. That story

To:

[ALSCHULERvEASTERBROOK\)#phonecall](#)). The nub of that story is that the Seventh Circuit decided to simply ignore Petitioner's (first) Complaint (*illegally* not-acknowledge it, and throw it into the trash can) — and it was (illicitly) enabled to do that because the **Seventh Circuit** **refuses to acknowledge receipt of Complaints (even though JCDR 8(a) requires it)**. That

#2: From:

Such arbitrary/whimsical/meaningless/trivial variations in timeliness of our laws/rules **serves no reasonable/rational purpose than obfuscation**. And we have no-one other than the law/rule-makers to thank/blame for that.³⁰ **Trapping/catching litigants (pro se or not) in "time-traps" like this is nothing but a naked swindle, perpetrated by an unscrupulous judiciary on an unsuspecting public.** That's an obscenity, which we all "know it when we see it."³¹

To:

Such arbitrary/whimsical/meaningless/trivial variations in timeliness of our laws/rules **serves no reasonable/rational purpose (it only serves obfuscation)**. And we have no-one other than the law/rule-makers to thank/blame for that.³⁰ **Trapping/catching litigants (pro se or not) in "time-traps" like this is nothing but a naked swindle, perpetrated by an unscrupulous judiciary on an unsuspecting public.** That's an obscenity, which we all "know it when we see it."³¹

--- Walter Tuvell (PhD, MIT & U.Chicago, Math & CompSci -- hence, "not-a-crank")
--- <http://JudicialMisconduct.US> (esp., .../CaseStudies/WETvIBM#smokinggun and environs)
*** Contact me, publicly or privately (walt.tuvell@gmail.com). "Ask Me Anything." ***

On 07/10/2018 05:04 PM, Walt Tuvell wrote:

Please: Send me an EMAIL (or, U.S. Mail) acknowledgment of receipt of Petition (see below for details).

Reason: I don't trust the Federal Judiciary (for the reasons PROVED in the very Petition mentioned under discussion). And hence, I don't trust you.

Copy of above-mentioned Petition (which was sent to you via U.S. Mail plus 2 other mechanisms) is available online at: <http://judicialmisconduct.us/sites/default/files/2018-05/JConfPetition.pdf>

Here's a screenshot of the just-mentioned online copy of Petition ([http://judicialmisconduct.us/CaseStudies/RyANvUS\(AlSchulervEasterbrook\)](http://judicialmisconduct.us/CaseStudies/RyANvUS(AlSchulervEasterbrook))) — just click on the highlighted link):

Judicial Conference Proceedings

On May 28 2018, **Petition for Review by the Judicial Conference (of Easterbrook Complaint)** was filed √ √ √ √ √.

⌘TBD⌘

A copy of that Petition is also ATTACHED HERETO.

Why is this so hard for you — given that it's REQUIRED BY LAW for you to acknowledge receipt (as cited below)???

--- Walter Tuvell (PhD, MIT & U.Chicago, Math & CompSci -- hence, "not-a-crank")
--- <http://JudicialMisconduct.US> (esp., .../CaseStudies/WETvIBM#smokinggun and environs)
*** Contact me, publicly or privately (walt.tuvell@gmail.com). "Ask Me Anything." ***

On 07/02/2018 03:09 PM, Walt Tuvell wrote:

Hello again. This is a follow-up to my note set to you last week (included below). I REPEAT again my request that you acknowledge receipt of my Petition for Review. As authority for my request, I draw your attention to rule JCDR 22(d) (<http://judicialmisconduct.us/sites/default/files/2018-04/JudicialConductAndDisabilityRules%2C2016.pdf>):

Action on Receipt of Petition. When a petition for review of a judicial-council decision on a reviewable matter, as defined in Rule 21(b)(1), is submitted in accordance with this Rule, the Administrative Office shall acknowledge its receipt, notify the chair of the Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability, and distribute the petition to the members of the Committee for their deliberation.

Why is it so hard to get the Federal Court System to do its job??

--- Walter Tuvell (PhD, MIT & U.Chicago, Math & CompSci -- hence, "not-a-crank")
--- <http://JudicialMisconduct.US> (esp., .../CaseStudies/WETvIBM#smokinggun and environs)

*** Contact me, publicly or privately (walt.tuvell@gmail.com). "Ask Me Anything." ***

On 06/28/2018 03:22 PM, Walt Tuvell wrote:

Hello —

I sent you a Petition for Review, on May 28 (by several transport mechanisms, including Certified U.S. Mail). However, I have not yet received an acknowledgment of receipt directly from you.

As we know (and is PROVEN in my very Petition to you), the Federal Judiciary is known for "failing (falsely/illegally) to receive/acknowledge receipt of communications." Therefore, I am now fearful that you are now doing exactly that.

Therefore: Please do now acknowledge receipt of my Petition. ASAP.

--- Walter Tuvell (PhD, MIT & U.Chicago, Math & CompSci -- hence, "not-a-crank")
--- <http://JudicialMisconduct.US> (esp., .../CaseStudies/WETvIBM#smokinggun and environs)

*** Contact me, publicly or privately (walt.tuvell@gmail.com). "Ask Me Anything."

|

|