

March 19, 2004

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Setting forth a COMPLAINT UNDER 28 U.S.C. §351 ABOUT

The Hon. John M. Walker, Jr., Chief Judge

of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

addressed under Rule 18(e) of the Rules of the Judicial Council
of the Second Circuit Governing Complaints against Judicial Officers

to the Circuit Judge eligible to become the next chief judge of the circuit

On August 11, 2003, Dr. Richard Cordero filed a complaint about the Hon. John C. Ninfo, II, U.S. Bankruptcy Judge, who together with court officers at the U.S. Bankruptcy Court and the U.S. District Court for the Western District of New York has disregarded the law, rules, and facts so repeatedly and consistently to the detriment of Dr. Cordero, the sole non-local party, who resides in New York City, and to the benefit of the local parties in Rochester as to form a pattern of non-coincidental, intentional, and coordinated acts of wrongdoing and of bias against him. The wrongful and biased acts included Judge Ninfo's and other court officers' failure to move the case along its procedural stages. The instances of failure were specifically identified with cites to the FRCivP. They have not been cured and the bias has not abated yet (5, *infra*)¹.

Far from it, those failures have been compounded by the failure of the Hon. John M. Walker, Jr., Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, to take action upon the complaint. Indeed, six months after the submission of the complaint, which as requested (11, *infra*) was reformatted and resubmitted on August 27, 2003 (6, 3, *infra*), the Chief Judge had still failed to discharge his statutory duty under §351(c)(3) to "**expeditiously**" review the complaint and notify the complainant, Dr. Cordero, "by written order stating his reasons" why he was dismissing it. He had also failed to comply with §351(c)(4), which provides that, in the absence of dismissal, the chief judge "shall **promptly**...(C) provide written notice to the complainant and the judge or magistrate whose conduct is the subject of the complaint of the action taken under the paragraph". (emphasis added)

Consequently, on February 2, 2004, Dr. Cordero wrote to Chief Judge Walker to ask about the status of the complaint (1, *infra*). To Dr. Cordero's astonishment, his letter of inquiry and its four accompanying copies were returned to him immediately on February 4 (4, *infra*). One can hardly fathom why the Chief Judge, who not only is dutybound to apply the law, but must also be seen applying it, would not even accept possession of a letter inquiring what action he had taken to comply with such duty.

To make matters worse, there are facts from which one can reasonably deduce that Chief Judge Walker has not even notified Judge Ninfo of any judicial misconduct complaint filed against him. The evidence thereof came to light last March 8. It relates directly to the case in which Dr. Cordero was named a defendant, that is, *Pfuntner v. Gordon et al*, docket no. 02-

¹ Evidentiary documents in a separate volume support this complaint. Reference to their page number # appears as (E-#) or (A-#); if (#, *infra*), a copy of the document is there and here too.

2230, which was brought and is pending before Judge Ninfo. The facts underlying this evidence are worth describing in detail, for they support in their own right the initial complaint and its call for an investigation of the suspicious relation between Judge Ninfo and the trustees.

After being sued by Mr. Pfuntner, Dr. Cordero impleaded Mr. David DeLano. On January 27, 2004, Mr. DeLano filed for bankruptcy under Chapter 13 of the Bankruptcy Code –docket no. 04-20280- a most amazing event, for Mr. DeLano has been a bank loan officer for 15 years! As such, he must be held an expert in how to retain creditworthiness and ability to repay loans. Yet, he and his wife owe \$98,092 to 18 credit card issuers and a mortgage of \$77,084, but despite all that borrowed money their equity in their house is only \$21,415 and the value of their declared tangible personal property is only \$9,945, although their household income in 2002 was \$91,655 and in 2003 \$108,586. What is more, Mr. DeLano is still a loan officer of Manufacturers & Traders Trust Bank, another party that Dr. Cordero cross-claimed.

Dr. Cordero received notice of the meeting of creditors required under 11 U.S.C. §341 (12, *infra*). The business of the meeting includes “the examination of the debtor under oath...”, pursuant to Rule 2003(b)(1) FRBkrP. After oral and video presentations to those in the room, the Standing Chapter 13 Trustee, George Reiber, took with him the majority of the attendees and left there his attorney, James Weidman, Esq., with 11 people, including Dr. Cordero, who were parties in some three cases. The first case that Mr. Weidman called involved a couple of debtors with their attorney and no creditors; he finished with them in some 12 minutes.

Then Mr. Weidman called and dealt at his table with Mr. DeLano, his wife, and their attorney, Christopher Werner, Esq. Mr. Michael Beyma, attorney for both Mr. DeLano and M&T Bank in the Pfuntner v. Gordon case, remained in the audience. For some eight minutes Mr. Weidman asked questions of the DeLanos. Then he asked whether there was any creditor. Dr. Cordero identified himself and stated his desire to examine the debtors. Mr. Weidman asked Dr. Cordero to fill out an appearance form and to state what he objected to. Dr. Cordero submitted the form as well as his written objections to the plan of debt repayment (14, *infra*). No sooner had Dr. Cordero asked Mr. DeLano to state his occupation than Mr. Weidman asked Dr. Cordero whether he had any evidence that the DeLanos had committed fraud. Dr. Cordero indicated that he was not raising any accusation of fraud, his interest was to establish the good faith of a bankruptcy application by a bank loan officer. Dr. Cordero asked Mr. DeLano how long he had worked in that capacity. He said 15 years.

In rapid succession, Mr. Weidman asked some three times Dr. Cordero to state his evidence of fraud. Dr. Cordero had to insist that Mr. Weidman take notice that he was not alleging fraud. Mr. Weidman asked Dr. Cordero to indicate where he was heading with his line of questioning. Dr. Cordero answered that he deemed it warranted to subject to strict scrutiny a bankruptcy application by a bank loan expert, particularly since the figures that the DeLanos had provided in their schedules did not match up. Mr. Weidman claimed that there was no time for such questions and put an end to the examination! It was just 1:59 p.m. or so and the next meeting, the hearing before Judge Ninfo for confirmation of Chapter 13 plans, was not scheduled to begin until 3:30. To no avail Dr. Cordero objected that he had a statutory right to examine the DeLanos. After the five participants in the DeLano case left, only Mr. Weidman and three other persons, including an attorney, remained in the room.

Dr. Cordero went to the courtroom. Mr. Reiber, the Chapter 13 trustee, was there with the other group of debtors. When he finished, Dr. Cordero tried to tell him what had happened. But he said that he had just been informed that a TV had fallen to the floor and that, although no person had been hurt, he had to take care of that emergency. Dr. Cordero managed to give

him a copy of his written objections.

Judge Ninfo arrived in the courtroom late. He apologized and then started the confirmation hearing. Mr. Reiber and his attorney, Mr. Weidman, were at their table. When the DeLano case came up, Mr. Reiber indicated that an objection had been filed so that the plan could not be confirmed and the meeting of creditors had been adjourned to April 26. Judge Ninfo took notice of that and was about to move on to the next case when Dr. Cordero stood up in the gallery and asked to be heard as creditor of the DeLanos. He brought to the Judge's attention that Mr. Weidman had prevented him from examining the Debtors by cutting him off after only his second question upon the allegation that there was no time even though aside from those in the DeLano case, only an attorney and two other persons remained in the room.

Judge Ninfo opened his response by saying that Dr. Cordero would not like what he had to say; that he had read Dr. Cordero's objections; that Dr. Cordero interpreted the law very strictly, as he had the right to do, but he had again missed the local practice; that he should have called to find out what that practice was and, if he had done so, he would have learned that the trustee would not allow a creditor to go on asking questions until 8 in the evening, particularly when he had a room full of people.

Dr. Cordero protested because he had the right to rely on the law and the notice of the meeting of creditors stating that the meeting's purpose was for the creditors to examine the debtors. He also protested to the Judge not keeping his comments in proportion with the facts since Dr. Cordero had not asked questions for hours, but had been cut off by Mr. Weidman after two questions in a room with only two other persons.

Judge Ninfo said that Dr. Cordero should have done Mr. Weidman the courtesy of giving him his written objections in advance so that Mr. Weidman could determine how long he would need. Dr. Cordero protested because he was not legally required to do so, but instead had the right to file his objections at any time before confirmation of the plan and could not be expected to disclose his objections beforehand so as to allow the debtors to prepare their answers with their attorney. He added that Mr. Weidman's conduct raised questions because he kept asking Dr. Cordero what evidence he had that the DeLanos had committed fraud despite Dr. Cordero having answered the first time that he was not accusing the DeLanos of fraud, whereby Mr. Weidman showed an interest in finding out how much Dr. Cordero already knew about fraud committed by the DeLanos before he, Mr. Weidman, would let them answer any further questions. Dr. Cordero said that Mr. Weidman had put him under examination although he was certainly not the one to be examined at the meeting, but rather the DeLanos were; and added that Mr. Weidman had caused him irreparable damage by depriving him of his right to examine the Debtors before they knew his objections and could rehearse their answers.

Yet, Judge Ninfo came to the defense of Mr. Weidman and once more said that Dr. Cordero applied the law too strictly and ignored the local practice...

That's precisely the 'practice' of Judge Ninfo together with other court officers that Dr. Cordero has complained about!: Judge Ninfo disregards the law, rules, and facts systematically to Dr. Cordero's detriment and to the benefit of local parties and instead applies the law of the locals, which is based on personal relationships and the fear on the part of the parties to antagonize the judge who distributes favorable and unfavorable decisions as he sees fit without regard for legal rights and factual evidence (20.IV, *infra*). By so doing, Judge Ninfo and his colleague on the floor above in the same federal building, District Judge David Larimer, have become the lords of the judicial fiefdom of Rochester, which they have carved out of the territory of the Second Circuit and which they defend by engaging in non-coincidental,

intentional, and coordinated acts of wrongfully disregarding the law of Congress in order to apply their own law: the law of the locals. (A-776.C, A-780.E; A-804.IV)

By applying it, Judge Ninfo renders his court a non-level field for a non-local who appears before him. Indeed, it is ludicrous to think that a non-local can call somebody there—who would that be?- to find out what “the local practice” is and such person would have the time, self-less motivation, and capacity to explain accurately and comprehensively the details of “the local practice” so as to place the non-local at arms length with his local adversaries, let alone with the judges and other court officers. Judge Ninfo should know better than to say in open court, where a stenographer is supposed to be keeping a record of his every word, that he gives precedence to local practice over both the written and published laws of Congress and an official notice of meeting of creditors on which a non-local party has reasonably relied, and not any party, but rather one, Dr. Cordero, who has filed a judicial misconduct against him for engaging precisely in that wrongful and biased practice.

But Judge Ninfo does not know better and has no cause for being cautious about making complaint-corroborating statements in his complainant’s presence. From his conduct it can reasonably be deduced that Chief Judge Walker has not complied with the requirement of §351(c)(4), that he “shall **promptly**...(C) provide written notice to...**the judge** or magistrate whose conduct is the subject of the complaint of the action taken”. (emphasis added) Nor has he complied with Rule 4(e) of the Rules Governing Complaints requiring that “the chief judge will **promptly** appoint a special committee...to investigate the complaint and make recommendations to the judicial council”. (emphasis added) The latter can be deduced from the fact that on February 11 and 13 Dr. Cordero wrote to the members of the judicial council concerning this matter (25, infra). The replies of those members that have been kind enough to write back show that they did not know anything about this complaint, let alone that a special committee had been appointed by the Chief Judge and had made recommendations to them.

If these deductions pointing to the Chief Judge’s failure to act were proved correct, it would establish that he “has engaged in conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts.” Not only would he have failed to discharge his statutory and regulatory duty to proceed promptly in handling a judicial misconduct complaint, but by failing to do so he has allowed a biased judge, who contemptuously disregards the rule of law (A-679.I), to continue disrupting the business of a federal court by denying parties, including Dr. Cordero, fair and just process, while maintaining a questionable, protective relationship with others, including Trustees Gordon (A-681.2) and Reiber and Mr. Weidman.

If the mere appearance of partiality is enough to disqualify a judge from a case (A-705.II), then it must a fortiori be sufficient to call for an investigation of his partiality. If nobody is above the law, then the chief judge of a circuit, invested with the highest circuit office for ensuring respect for the law, must set the most visible example of abiding by the law. He must not only be seen doing justice, but in this case he has a legal duty to take specific action to be seen doing justice to a complainant and to insure that a complained-about judge does justice too.

Hence, Chief Judge Walker must now be investigated to find out what action he has taken, if any, in the seven months since the submission of the complaint; otherwise, what reason he had not to take any, not even take possession of Dr. Cordero’s February 2 status inquiry letter.

Just as importantly, it must be determined what motive the Chief Judge could possibly have had to allow Judge Ninfo to continue abusing Dr. Cordero by causing him an enormous

waste of effort², time³, and money⁴, and inflicting upon him tremendous emotional distress⁵ for a year and a half. In this respect, Chief Judge Walker bears a particularly heavy responsibility because he is a member of the panel of this Court that heard Dr. Cordero's appeal from the decisions taken by Judge Ninfo and his colleague, Judge Larimer. In that capacity, he has had access from well before the submission of the judicial misconduct complaint in August 2003 and since then to all the briefs, motions, and mandamus petition that Dr. Cordero has filed, which contain very detailed legal arguments and statements of facts showing how those judges disregard legality⁶ and dismiss the facts⁷ in order to protect the locals and advance their self-interests. Thus, he has had ample knowledge of the solid legal and factual foundation from which emerges the reasonable appearance of something wrong going on among Judge Ninfo⁸, Judge Larimer⁹, court personnel¹⁰, trustees¹¹, and local attorneys and their clients¹², an appearance that is legally sufficient to trigger disqualifying, and at the very least investigative, action. Yet, the evidence shows that the Chief Judge has failed to take any action, not only under the spur of §351 on behalf of Dr. Cordero, but also as this circuit's chief steward of the integrity of the judicial process for the benefit of the public at large (A-813.I).

The Chief Judge cannot cure his failure to take 'prompt and expeditious action' by taking action belatedly. His failure is a consummated wrong and his 'prejudicial conduct' has already done substantial and irreparable harm to Dr. Cordero (A-827.III). Now there is nothing else for the Chief Judge to do but to subject himself to an investigation under §351.

The investigators can ascertain these statements by asking for the audio tape, from the U.S. Trustee at (585)263-5706, that recorded the March 8 meeting of creditors presided by Mr. Weidman; and the stenographic tape itself, from the Court, of the confirmation hearing before Judge Ninfo –not a transcript thereof, so as to avoid Dr. Cordero's experience of unlawful delay and suspicious handling of the transcript that he requested (E-14; A-682). Then they can call on the FBI's interviewing and forensic accounting resources to conduct an investigation guided by the principle *follow the money!* from debtors and estates to anywhere and anybody (21.V, infra).

Dr. Cordero respectfully submits this complaint under penalty of perjury and requests that expeditious action be taken as required under the law of Congress and the Governing Rules of this Circuit, and that he be promptly notified thereof.

March 19, 2004

59 Crescent Street
Brooklyn, NY 11208

Dr. Richard Cordero

Dr. Richard Cordero
tel. (718)827-9521

² **effort**: Mandamus Brief=MandBr-55.2; ■59.5; ■ =documents separator-E-26.2, ■33.5; ■ A-694.6.

³ **time**: MandBr-60.6; ■ 68.6; ■ E-29.1, ■=page numbers separator-34.6, ■47.6; ■ A-695.E.

⁴ **money**: MandBr-8.C; ■ E-37.E; ■ A-695.E.

⁵ **emotional distress**: MandBr-56.3; ■61.E; ■ E-28.3, ■36.7; ■ A-690.3, ■695.7.

⁶ **disregard for legality**: Opening Brief=OpBr-9.2; ■21.9 MandBr-7.B; ■25.A; MandBr-12.E; ■17.G-23.J; ■ E-17.B, ■25.1; ■ E-30.2, ■41.2; ■ A-684.B, ■775.B; ■ 6.I.

⁷ **disregard for facts**: OpBr-10.2; ■13.5; MandBr-51.2; ■53.4; ■65.4; ■ E-13.3, ■20.2, ■22.4.

⁸ **J. Ninfo**: OpBr-11.3; ■ A-771.I, ■786.III.

⁹ **J. Larimer**: OpBr-16.7; Reply Brief-19.1; MandBr-10.D; ■53.D; ■ E-23.C; ■ A-687.C.

¹⁰ **court personnel**: OpBr-11.4; ■15.6; ■54.D; MandBr-14.1; ■25.K-26.L; ■69.F; ■ E-14.4, ■18.1, ■49.F; ■ A-703.F.

¹¹ **trustees**: OpBr-9.1; ■38.B; ■ E-9; ■ A-679.A

¹² **local attorneys and clients**: OpBr-18.8; ■48.C; MandBr-53.3; ■57.D; ■65.3; ■ E-21.3, ■29.D, ■31.4, ■42.3; ■ A-691.D.