

3/29/2022 11:14 AM

**FIRST AMENDMENT
TO DEMAND FOR CONSIDERATION
BEFORE THE JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE
UNITED STATES UNDER THE
JUDICIAL CONDUCT ACT OF 1980**

Amendment Filing Date: March __ 2022

Filing Date of Original Consideration: Father's Day (June 21, 2021)

Name and Address of Claimants:

Manuel P. Asensio and his minor daughter, Eva Asensio

Phone: (917) 515-5200

Email: mpa@asensio.com

Respondents

- (1) The Honorable Anthony Scirica, Chair of Judicial Conduct Committee¹
- (2) The Honorable Jose Cabranes
- (3) The Honorable Robert A. Katzmann (deceased)
- (4) The Honorable Deborah A. Livingston
- (5) The Honorable Laura T. Swain
- (6) The Honorable Colleen McMahon
- (7) The Honorable Ronnie Abrams
- (8) The Honorable Katherine Failla
- (9) The Hon. Roslynn R. Mauskopf

Petition Served Upon

- (1) Hon. Roslynn R. Mauskopf, Director of the Administrative Office of the US Courts
- (2) Lee Ann Bennett, Deputy Director of the Administrative Office of the US Courts
- (3) Katherine H. Simon, Office of Judicial Conference Secretariat

1. The chairs of the US Judicial Conference's Executive, Judicial Branch, Federal-State Jurisdiction, Judicial Conduct, and Codes of Conduct Committees are all under Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr.'s absolute direct control and all engage in fabricating and enforcing rules that allow fraudulent and criminal federal judicial conduct that the Conference calls "national policy-making."

NOTICE TO THE MEMBERS OF THE US JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

This Consideration is the most important document that the United States Judicial Conference (the “Conference”) has reviewed in its history. From inflation and WOKE mentality to our presidential elections, America’s future prosperity, our place in the world, and the opportunities for our children – and our children’s children – all depend on getting this Consideration right. Complainant Manuel P. Asensio² (Mr. Asensio or Complainant) began this Consideration on March 4, 2019 by personal service on Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr. (Roberts) at the Conference and joined US Attorney General William P. Barr (Barr) in the Consideration on December 19, 2019 also by personal service at the Department of Justice.

If the Conference does not act, the consequences for America and the rights of individual citizens across this country will be significant. Ignoring the issues found by Mr. Asensio means our country will be unprincipled and become even weaker, poorer, and less stable.

But if the Conference accepts the importance of these issues and acts properly, America will reappear from this dark period of judicial malfeasance and launch itself into the future with great prosperity and success.

The simple truth is that this Consideration exposes organized federal judicial fraudulent and criminal conduct. Mr. Asensio is a candidate for the Republican Party’s nomination for membership in the 118th Congress. He has drafted legislation that will resolve this issue. A copy of this legislation appears here after the Complainant’s “Demand for Referral of Consideration to Congress.”

2. Mr. Asensio is a patriot and the recognized Pioneer of Informational Arbitrage. The IJC is the nation’s only authority on jurisprudence and judicial conduct that is independent of the judiciary, judiciary policy organizations, law school professors, and members of the bar who are lawyers with interest in common with the federal judges and who defer to the federal judges. Mr. Asensio founded the Institute of Judicial Conduct, Inc. (“IJC”) based on common sense and ordinary intelligence is all that should be and must be necessary to rightful discern what is lawful and unlawful federal judicial conduct.

Members of Congress charged with regulating the federal judges may be guilty of acting as agents for private attorneys. Congress itself may be guilty of looking the other way. But the greatest guilt lies in the chief justice who has allowed the federal judges to bastardize the Judicial Council Reform and Judicial Conduct Act of 1980 (Act),³ which Congress created in the Watergate period to address corruption in the federal judges, and the US attorney general Office who collaborates with the chief justice and Conference to organize federal judicial fraudulent and criminal conduct.

Every single day in courtrooms around the country, judges are depriving American citizens of their inalienable rights without notice, process, or authority. This Consideration contains Mr. Asensio's plan for a stronger America and a prosperous future. It is a declaration of intent: a commitment to deal head-on with the great challenge of corruption in the Federal judiciary and to fix our damaged democratic institutions.

Mr. Asensio has worked tirelessly to find the bad actors and excise the malevolent institutions that are destroying our democracy. In 2016, Mr. Asensio formed the IJC,⁴ the nation's only independent authority on matters related to the Act and the Act itself, and the rules that govern the Act's administration of this law.

In 2019, Mr. Asensio put Roberts on notice of his legal claims against him and the Conference and started the Consideration proceedings. In the summer of

3. The Judicial Conduct and Disability Act, US Code, Title 28 Judiciary and Judicial Procedure, Part I: Organization of Courts, Chapter 16, titled "Complaints against Judges and Judicial Discipline" [§§ 351–364]) 94 Stat. 2035; Pub. L. 96-458 (October 15, 1980). For the legislative history, *see* S. Rep. No. 362, 96th Cong., 1st Sess. 5 (1979) *and* H.R. Rep. No. 1313, 96th Cong. 2d Sess. 2 (1980). *See* <https://judicialconduct.org/legislative-and-implementation-record-of-the-judicial-conduct-act/> The judges did not publish rules to administer this law until 2008.

4. Mr. Asensio was originally incorporated IJC under the name of Every Violation Admonished, Inc. or EVA, in honor of his daughter, Eva Asensio.

2020, Mr. Asensio collaborated with Pastor Stephen Broden, a member of the Republican Party of Texas State for Republican Executive Committee and others to pass a resolution at the party's annual convention to petition President Donald J. Trump to confront Barr. Pastor Borden single-handedly tried to inform President Trump of resolution, the Consideration, and its issues backstage after the conclusion of the "Roundtable on Transition to Greatness: Restoring, Rebuilding, and Renewing" at the Gateway Church's North Dallas campus in Dallas, Texas.

On August 26, 2020, Mr. Asensio published the first edited of a cartoon story book titled "*Trump Unites All Americans!*" that illustrates exactly how Roberts and the Conference engage in lawless "national policy-making." The comic book stars Mr. Asensio's daughter, Eva Asensio and President Trump, and features Barr as the Emperor (from the "Emperor's New Clothes" fable), and Roberts as the Wizard (from the Wizard of Oz story). In 2021, Mr. Asensio incorporated this cartoon into the June 21, 2021 Consideration. The events catalogued in this First Amendment show how the core principles and values of our great nation are under attack by "national policy-making" at the Conference.

On June 2, 2021, Mr. Asensio became the first American to file a Consideration seeking a remedy for organized fraudulent and criminal conduct against parental rights by the Federal judiciary. Mr. Asensio's Consideration of the Domestic Relations and Domestic Violence Exemption (DRE)⁵ and this First Amendment to this Consideration (Consideration) look to end the federal judges' intrusion into his own family's liberty and freedom of religion.

5. The June 21, 2021 Consideration deals with "national policy-making" called the Domestic Relations Exception (DRE), which also functions as a domestic violence exception. It is a way to protect state rules that infringe on religious and political liberty under the cover of a judicially fabricated jurisdictional rule. The federal judges assert that the rule is a legitimate judicial doctrine of deference to federalism in family law. This assertion is ludicrously false. The DRE is the reverse of federalism. It protects violations of legal and civil rights by the states and violates US law related to freedom of speech and religion, and the family.

This Consideration shows the chief justice of the Supreme Court organizing “national policy-making”⁶ in contravention of the United States Constitution. This “national policy-making” creates sham causes of action in Federal Courts while at the same time lawlessly disposing of legitimate causes of action to enforce basic rights and liberties. This is what the Conference did to Mr. Asensio. It is what the Conference is doing to President Trump and his political supporters.

“National policy-making” is enforced through raw will and coercion (See a(iii) below) that violates free speech, encroach on religious freedoms, and infringes on parental and presidential power to “take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.”

The chief justice has been able to perpetrate these immoral acts by exerting absolute control over the Act and Conference the chief justice summons the Conference into session annually at the Supreme Court building, controls the Conference’s authority and legal existence, and all appointments to the Conference’s committees. The committees and their chairs have no independent authority apart from those conferred upon them by the chief justice. The chief justice controls the Conference serving not as chief justice but as:

- a. The presiding officer of the Conference who calls the session to order and exercises absolute legal and administrative control over the Conference and all its committees including
 - i. The Executive Committee, which is the chief justice’s control body over the Conference and its committees
 - ii. The Judicial Branch and Federal-State Jurisdiction Committees, which function as the federal judges’

⁶ At the top of its “About the Judicial Conference” 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.*” The Conference’s constitutive function is to regulate and discipline the district court federal judges to protect the Constitution and the people’s will and freedoms from federal judicial policy-making. The federal judiciary branch and has no legitimate political, legislative, or executive authority.

congressional lobbying bodies on separation of powers and federalism doctrines

- iii. The Code of Conduct and Rules of Practice and Procedure Committees to engage in “national policy-making,” which provides the federal judges the opportunity to conceal complaints under the Act and thereby to use raw will to enforce “national policy-making” through criminal and fraudulent conduct by federal and state judges;
- b. The chief executive officer of the Administrative Office of the US Courts⁷, which keeps records of the Conference’s proceedings under the Act against the federal judges confidential;
- c. The chief executive officer of the Federal Judiciary Center, which is the federal judges’ propaganda office;
- d. The chief executive officer of the Federal Judiciary Center Foundation, which is the federal judges’ lobbying organization that allows private lawyers to make tax deductible contributions directly to judges; and
- e. The Chancellor of the Smithsonian, and as an ex officio member of the Smithsonian's Board of Regents, which is provides the chief justice with the prominence and power including to appoint committee members and the administration of an investment portfolio worth over \$2 billion.⁸

7. The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts serves as Secretary to the Judicial Conference and is also an ex-officio member of the Executive Committee, coordinates administrative support to the Conference itself and its Executive Committee, and also coordinates the activities of senior Administrative Office professional staff who dedicate all or a substantial portion of their time to the work of the Judicial Conference and its committees.

8. In 2021 the portfolio earned 40.7%.

DEMAND FOR REFERRAL OF CONSIDERATION TO CONGRESS

This Consideration has evidence showing that the Conference has turned the Act upside-down by converting the Conference from a body charged with regulating and impeaching judges into a “national policy-making”⁹ body of the federal courts.

As originally conceived, the Act authorizes any person to impeach a sitting federal judge or group of federal judges at a regional Circuit Judicial Council and subjects the Circuit Judicial Council’s review and resolution to consideration by the Judicial Conference. However, lawyers and judges have bastardized the Act that is supposed to regulate judicial misconduct, and proceedings at the Conference are now wrongfully disposed or buried rather than heard, reviewed, and considered. The 2020 Presidential Election Fiasco, the legal and regulatory status of the DRE, and abortion are examples of “national policy-making” controlling judicial conduct in US courts.

According to its plain language, the Act subordinates the Conference’s regulatory authority to Congress by expressly requiring the Conference to report to Congress. Failure to report a full recitation of the allegations of each judicial misconduct to Congress complaint creates absolute power in district courts. The Conference has failed to report the Consideration because the Chief Justice is determined to cover up the truth about misconduct throughout the Federal judiciary.

The Chief Justice has ultimate authority over the Conference and the Act. Roberts is responsible for allowing deliberate and malicious federal judicial conduct and “national policy-making,” which by its very nature is treasonous [See Endnote A].

9. *See supra* note 3.

WHEREAS the chief justice has absolute control over the US courts' propaganda machinery, congressional lobbying organization, and enforcement of law against the federal judges;

WHEREAS the chief justice controls the Conference and its committees;

WHEREAS the Consideration shows how federal judges and establishment politicians have not been faithful to the Constitution on issues such as the 2020 presidential election results or the legal and regulatory status of parental rights and abortion nationwide; and

WHEREAS the Conference has concealed this Consideration by failing to provide Congress with a full recitation of the allegations and a discussion of its resolution.

THEREFORE, the petitioner, Manuel P. Asensio, and his minor daughter, Eva Asensio, demand that the Conference referred their Consideration to Congress.

118th Congress
1st Session

H.R. 1

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

January 3, 2023

AN ACT

To amend title 28, United States Code, to establish standards and mechanisms for review of the US Judicial Conference Considerations filed under the Judicial Conduct Act of 1980 and the impeachment of federal justices and federal judges of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This act may be cited as the “Judicial Anti-Corruption Act of 2023”.

SECTION 2. ABOLITION OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER FOUNDATION

(A) Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code, Section 629 is abolished, repealed, vacated, and removed in its entirety.

SECTION 3: TRANSPARENCY IN THE CONFERENCE

(A) Section 351 of Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code is amended by adding the following subsection:

“(e) Notification Requirements When Substituting Chief Judge – Should the Chief Judge transfer authority to review a complaint to another circuit judge, the transfer is not valid unless and until the complainant is provided written notification of the transfer and the reasons for the transfer.”

(B) Section 352(b)(2) of Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code is amended by adding the following language:

“The chief judge shall personally serve copies of the written order to the complainant and to the judge whose conduct is the subject of the complaint within five business days. No order of the chief judge is effective unless and until personal service is completed during this timeframe.”

(C) Section 352 of Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code is amended by repealing subsection (c) and replacing it with the following subsection:

“(c) Review of Orders of Chief Judge. – A complainant or judge aggrieved by a final order of the chief judge under this section may petition directly to the full Judicial Conference.”

(D) Section 352 of Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code is amended by adding the following subsection:

“(e) Filing of Consideration in the District Court Docket. – In the event a complainant seeks review of a final order of the chief judge, the complaint and full record of the investigation shall be filed in the electronic docket of the case in the United States District Court that gave rise to the judicial complaint.

SECTION 4: REMOVAL OF CONFIDENTIALITY PROVISIONS

(A) In General – Section 360, Chapter 16 of Title 28, United States Code is amended by repealing subsection (a) and replacing it with the following subsection:

“(a) Confidentiality of Proceedings. – No papers, documents or records of proceedings related to investigations conducted under this chapter shall be confidential.”

SECTION 3. MECHANISMS FOR IMPEACHMENT OF JUSTICES AND JUDGES

(A) In General – Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following section:

“Sec. 365. Mechanism for Impeachment

“(a) Creation of the Commission to Regulate Use of Judicial Raw Will and Coercion in US Courts –

- (1) On the first day of the legislative session of each new Congress, the President shall select five members from his Executive staff, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall select five members of the House of Representatives, and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate shall select five members from the Senate to serve on the Joint Executive and Congressional Commission to Regulate Use of Judicial Raw Will and Coercion in US Courts (Commission).
- (2) Each member of the Commission will serve a maximum period of two years or one term of Congress. Each member serves at the pleasure of the President, the House of Representative, and Senate and can be removed and replaced by them for any reason. Replacement members will serve shortened terms that end on the last day of the Congress for which they are appointed.
- (3) The Commission shall have jurisdiction to review any and all complaints of judicial misconduct filed by any person with the Judicial Council and Judicial Conference.
- (4) The Judicial Conference shall have 90 days to resolve a Consideration and report a full recitation of the allegations the Commission.
- (5) No complaints or Considerations may be filed directly with the Commission.

(6) The Commission shall have the authority to investigate any Consideration filed at the Judicial Conference and remove any justice or judge from office under the standards set forth in Section 366 of this Act.

(7) Not later than 100 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall publish written rules and procedures for the review of reports of judicial conduct complaints filed and Consideration with the Commission under this Act.

SECTION 4. STANDARDS FOR IMPEACHMENT OF JUSTICES AND JUDGES

(A) In General – Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following sections:

“Sec. 366. Standards for Impeachment

“(a) Constitutional Basis –

“(1) A justice or judge of the United States shall be removed from office upon impeachment for, and conviction of, the infringement on individual liberties and inalienable rights, the creation of fabricated judge-made national policies that have no textual basis in the United States Constitution, or other high crimes and misdemeanors, as provided in Article II, section 4 of the United States Constitution.

“(2) A justice or judge of the United States shall hold office during good behavior as provided in Article III, section 1 of the United States Constitution. As justice or judge failing to act with good behavior shall be removed from office by the Commission to Regulate Use of Judicial Raw Will and Coercion in US Courts.”

[End]

**CONSIDERATION OF THE IMPACT OF THE US JUDICIAL CONFERENCE’S
AUTHORIZATION AND ORGANIZATION OF FRAUDULENT AND CRIMINAL
CONDUCT BY FEDERAL JUDGES IN THE 2020 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION
RESULTS AND CERTIFICATION OF THE ELECTRAL VOTES
AND THE
CONSIDERATION OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL OPPOSITION AND INTERFERENCE
WITH THE PEOPLE’S POWER AND WILL TO TRANSFER TAKE CARE OF LAW
PROSECUTORIAL POWERS TO PRESIDENT DONALD J. TRUMP, AND THE
LEGAL AND SOCIETAL STATUS OF PARENTAL RIGHTS¹⁰,
AND CANCEL CULTURE.¹¹**

Under Article II, Section 3, of the United States Constitution, the President of the United States is bound to “take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.” It is well proven¹² that the Take Care Clause is by far the single most major source of presidential power. The people democratically elected the President Donald J. Trump, and therefore President Trump was bound to Take Care of Law and remain faithful to the will of the people. President Trump’s obligation was not to the Conference, Federal Judges, or lawyers – his obligation was to every citizen in the United States. The text of Article II makes clear that the President has broad authority to take whatever action is necessary to stay faithful to the Constitution and to exercise supremacy over the federal judges to protect the Constitution.

10. In family law the Conference has bastardized justice to such an extent that states have dropped juries, evidence rules, codified charges with neutral principles, neutral judging, and the right to confront an accuser. This end of due process and equal protection has taken over parental rights, religion and speech, and private property, and allowed the use of absolute government power against Americans.

11. The June 21, 2021 Consideration and this First Amendment does not deal the effect of the Conference’s authorization of fraudulent and criminal conduct to enforce Leftist and Marxist social ideologies in the US. Rather, it focused on parental rights and the 2020 Election that makes this conduct obvious to all.

12. Leah M. Litman, Taking Care of Federal Law, 101 VA. L. REV. 1289, 1297 (2015) and THE PROTEAN TAKE CARE CLAUSE. Henry L. Shattuck, Professor of Law, Harvard Law School. Bruce Bromley Professor of Law and Deputy Dean, Harvard Law School. Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, Los Angeles v. Lyons, Simon v. E. Ky. Welfare Rights Org., Allen v. Wright, Massachusetts v. Mellon.