

OFFICE OF THE CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

UNITED STATES COURTS OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Elizabeth H. Paret
Circuit Executive
202.216.7340

Room 4726
E. Barrett Prettyman U.S. Courthouse
333 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20001

October 4, 2023

Dennis Brewer
1210 City Place
Edgewater, NJ 07020

Re: Judicial Complaint Nos. DC-23-90050 (Contreras)
DC-23-90051 (Sentelle)
DC-23-90052 (Katsas)
DC-23-90053 (Wilkins)

Dear Mr. Brewer:

Your complaint dated September 23, 2023, alleging judicial misconduct by United States judges, was received on September 27, 2023, and filed on September 29, 2023. It has been assigned Judicial Complaint Nos. DC-23-90050 through DC-23-90053. Please use these numbers on any future correspondence pertaining to your complaint.

Sincerely,



Steven Gallagher
Deputy Circuit Executive

OFFICE OF THE CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE
UNITED STATES COURTS
FOR THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT
E. BARRETT PRETTYMAN U.S. COURTHOUSE
333 CONSTITUTION AVE., N.W., ROOM 4826
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-2866

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

CAPITAL DISTRICT 208

5 OCT 2023 PM 3 L

NEOPOST

FIRST-CLASS MAIL

10/04/2023


US POSTAGE \$000.63⁰



ZIP 20001
041M11283068

Dennis Brewer
1210 City Place
Edgewater, NJ 07020

07020-314310



OFFICE OF THE CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

UNITED STATES COURTS OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Elizabeth H. Paret
Circuit Executive
202.216.7340

Room 4726
E. Barrett Prettyman U.S. Courthouse
333 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20001

March 28, 2024

Dennis Brewer
1210 City Place
Edgewater, NJ 07020

Re: Judicial Complaint Nos. DC-23-90050 through DC-23-90053

Dear Mr. Brewer:

The Chief Judge of the District of Columbia Circuit has dismissed Judicial Council Complaint Nos. DC-23-90050 through DC-23-90053. The Order and Memorandum are enclosed.

You may file a petition for review by the Judicial Council of the District of Columbia Circuit under Rule 18 of the *Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings*. A copy of Rule 18 is enclosed for your convenience. Any such petition must be received in the Office of the Circuit Executive at the above address within 42 days of the date of the Chief Judge's order.

Sincerely,



Steven Gallagher
Deputy Circuit Executive

Enclosures

JUDICIAL COUNCIL
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

In the Matter of
A Complaint of Judicial
Misconduct or Disability

Complaint No. DC-23-90050
No. DC-23-90051
No. DC-23-90052
No. DC-23-90053

Before: Srinivasan, Chief Judge

ORDER

Upon consideration of the complaint herein, filed against a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and three judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, it is

ORDERED that the complaint be dismissed for the reasons stated in the attached Memorandum.

The Circuit Executive is directed to send copies of this Order and accompanying Memorandum to the complainant, the subject judges, and the Judicial Conference Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability. See 28 U.S.C. § 352(b); JUD. CONF. U.S., RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS (2019), RULE 11(g)(2).



Sri Srinivasan, Chief Judge

Date: 3/28/24

No. DC-23-90050
No. DC-23-90051
No. DC-23-90052
No. DC-23-90053

MEMORANDUM

The complainant has filed a complaint of judicial misconduct against a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and three judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. For the following reasons, the misconduct complaint will be dismissed.

The complainant sued dozens of defendants, ranging from federal government entities to corporations and individuals. The complaint was 1,543 pages in length and contained an additional 628 pages of exhibits. The subject district court judge *sua sponte* dismissed the complaint without prejudice on the ground that the complaint was frivolous, and the judge also denied the complainant's motions for an injunction and to certify a class. The complainant appealed, and a panel of the court of appeals, consisting of the subject appellate judges, affirmed the district court.

In a separate action, the complainant sought leave to file a complaint via a flash drive because the complaint consisted of approximately 20,000 pages. The subject district judge denied the motion to file the nonconforming pleading and the complainant's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. The complainant sought reconsideration, which was denied.

The complainant has now filed a judicial misconduct complaint against the subject district court judge and subject appellate judges. The complainant alleges that the district court "wrongfully . . . excluded 86% of case evidence to be filed." The complainant further states that

the “printing [of the evidence] was precluded by a hack of defendants one week before filing by defendants who remotely disabled my inkjet printer, first disabling the black ink only, and later all colors of ink.” He additionally claims that the judge’s dismissal of the complaint two weeks after filing demonstrates a “timeframe [that] did not even allow sufficient [time] for a professional competent reader.” Finally, the complainant alleges that the judge improperly attached to his dismissal order an “unrelated prior memorandum opinion . . . [which] included irrelevant analysis and citations.”

As to the subject appellate judges, the complainant asserts that the district court’s “wrongful decisions were themselves affirmed by the Circuit panel *sua sponte* without reference to specific *Denton* ‘intelligent appellate review’ test specified but never incorporated in any compliant memorandum opinion relevant to the instant complaint.” The complainant concludes his judicial misconduct complaint by noting that “this specific document was itself hacked during preparation by the continuing acts of the police powers defendants in the underlying case and long-running fact pattern.”

The complainant appears to be challenging the district court’s decisions to dismiss his complaint and to deny leave to file a nonconforming pleading and the court of appeals’ affirmance of the dismissal order. Those allegations, however, are direct challenges to the merits of the judges’ decisions. “Any allegation that calls into question the correctness of an official decision or procedural ruling of a judge – without more – is merits-related.” JUD. CONF. RULES FOR JUDICIAL-CONDUCT AND JUDICIAL-DISABILITY PROCEEDINGS, Rule 4(b)(1) Commentary ¶ 12. Such allegations do not constitute “[c]ognizable misconduct” under the Judicial-Conduct

Proceedings Rules or the applicable statute. *Id.* Rule 11(c)(1)(B); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii).

Accordingly, because the complaint “is directly related to the merits of [the judges’] decision[s],” the complaint will be dismissed. JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 11(c)(1)(B); *see* 28 U.S.C. § 352(b)(1)(A)(ii).¹

¹ Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 352(c) and JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 18(a), the complainant may file a petition for review by the Judicial Council of the District of Columbia Circuit. Any petition must be filed in the Office of the Circuit Executive for the D.C. Circuit within 42 days after the date of the dismissal order. JUDICIAL-CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS RULE 18(b).

Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings

Excerpt, Rule 18 Review by Judicial Council

Adopted March 11, 2008 by the Judicial Conference of the United States

Effective April 10, 2008

As amended September 17, 2015 and March 12, 2019

With

D.C. Circuit Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Rules

Adopted December 23, 2020 by the Judicial Council of the D.C. Circuit

Effective January 1, 2021

Rule 18. Petition for Review of Chief-Judge Disposition Under Rule 11(c), (d), or (e)

- (a) **Petition for Review.** After the chief judge issues an order under Rule 11(c), (d), or (e), the complainant or the subject judge may petition the judicial council of the circuit to review the order. By rules promulgated under [28 U.S.C. § 358](#), the judicial council may refer a petition for review filed under this Rule to a panel of no fewer than five members of the council, at least two of whom must be district judges.
- (b) **When to File; Form; Where to File.** A petition for review must be filed in the office of the circuit clerk within 42 days after the date of the chief judge's order. The petition for review should be in letter form, addressed to the circuit clerk, and in an envelope marked "Misconduct Petition" or "Disability Petition." The name of the subject judge must not be shown on the envelope. The petition for review should be typewritten or otherwise legible. It should begin with "I hereby petition the judicial council for review of . . ." and state the reasons why the petition should be granted. It must be signed.

D.C. Circuit Rule 18(b) Petition for Review: Form & Where to File

The petition for review must not exceed five pages (single-sided pages). A complainant may request in writing permission from the Chief Judge to submit additional pages if unusual circumstances exist, and the Chief Judge may delegate the consideration of these requests to the Circuit Executive. Only one original petition for review is required for filing.

Petitions for review should be sent to:

Circuit Executive's Office
333 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Petitions for review may not be filed by email or fax.

September 20, 2023

Board on Professional Responsibility
430 E Street NW
Suite 138
Washington, DC 20001

Office of Disciplinary Counsel
District of Columbia Court of Appeals
515 5th Street, NW
Building A, Suite 117, Washington, DC 20001

Re: Professional Ethics Complaint Against Rudolph Contreras, Judge, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia

Enclosed herewith please find my complaint filed on your form. The complete text of G. Details of Complaint is shown below. Proper completion of that form field was prevented by a police powers hack of the form during its preparation at approximately 8:00 AM to 8:45 AM on September 20, 2023.

G. Details of Complaint

Judge Contreras wrongfully, by a legal maneuver which validated an illegal evidentiary hack by police powers defendants, excluded 86% of case evidence to be filed in 23-cv-415, including predicate act evidence in a civil racketeering case under 18 USC section 1962 without first reviewing this evidence, which totaled approximately 10,600 pages. This wrongful act is in his order at 23-mc-014. Judge Contreras then dismissed the underlying case 23-cv-415 sua sponte, appending an unrelated prior memorandum opinion with irrelevant analysis and citations, within two weeks after it was docketed without serious consideration violating DC circuit case law in *Crisafi v Holland* 655 F2d. 1305 (1981) and Supreme Court case law in *Denton v Hernandez* 504 US 25 (1992) and *Nietzke v Williams* 490 U.S. 319. These wrongful decisions were themselves affirmed by the Circuit panel sua sponte, but no complaint as to that matter is being lodged here at this time. The right to file such ethics complaints as to participating Circuit judges is reserved.

Sincerely,



Dennis Sheldon Brewer
1210 City Place
Edgewater, NJ 07020
Phone: 201-887-6541

Enclosure: DC Ethics Complaint Form dated September 20, 2023



OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
THE BOARD ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS

515 Fifth Street, N.W.
Building A, Room 117
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 638-1501 Fax (202) 638-0862
www.dcattorneydiscipline.org

(Please print or type)

Date: September 20, 2023

A. Your Name: (Dr.)

(Mr.)

(Ms.)

(Mrs.)

Dennis Sheldon Brewer

(First)

(Initial)

(Last)

Address: 1210 City Place

(Street)

(Apt. #)

Edgewater NJ 07020

(City)

(State)

(Zip)

Business Phone: _____ Home Phone: _____ Cell Phone: 201-887-6541

Email Address: _____

(NOTE: It is very important that we have your telephone number(s) and that you inform our office if you have a change of address.)

B. Attorney Complained Of:

Name: Rudolph Contreras (District Court Judge, in his official capacity)

(First)

(Initial)

(Last)

Address: 333 Constitution Ave

(Street)

(Apt. #)

Washington DC 20001

(City)

(State)

(Zip)

Telephone No.: 3520202-354- Attorney's Bar No., if known: _____

C. Have you filed a complaint about this matter anywhere else? ☒ Yes ☐ No // If yes, please give details.

No ethics complaint has been filed elsewhere. The underlying matter is the subject of SCOTUS cert petition docketed as 22-7805 appealing Circuit case 23-5052.

D. Do you have a written retainer agreement with the attorney? ☐ Yes ☐ No // If yes, please attach a copy.

Not applicable

E. Where applicable, state the name of the court where the underlying case was filed, and the case name and number.

DC US District Court, Brewer et al v Wray et al, 23-mc-014 and 23-cv-415

F. Do you have other documents that are relevant? ☒ Yes ☐ No // If yes, please give details and provide copies.

See case record on Pacer.gov DC 23-mc-014, 23-cv-415.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR REQUIRED DETAILS & SIGNATURE

G. DETAILS OF COMPLAINT: Judge Contreras wrongfully, by a legal maneuver which validated ar

Original document hacked. Full text of block G is shown in transmittal letter dated September 20, 2023.

The Undersigned hereby certifies to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel
that the statements in the foregoing Complaint are true and correct to
the best of my knowledge.



SIGNATURE

September 20, 2023

Board on Professional Responsibility
430 E Street NW
Suite 138
Washington, DC 20001

Office of Disciplinary Counsel
District of Columbia Court of Appeals
515 5th Street, NW
Building A, Suite 117, Washington, DC 20001

Re: Professional Ethics Complaint Against Rudolph Contreras, Judge, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia

Enclosed herewith please find my complaint filed on your form. The complete text of G. Details of Complaint is shown below. Proper completion of that form field was prevented by a police powers hack of the form during its preparation at approximately 8:00 AM to 8:45 AM on September 20, 2023.

G. Details of Complaint

Judge Contreras wrongfully, by a legal maneuver which validated an illegal evidentiary hack by police powers defendants, excluded 86% of case evidence to be filed in 23-cv-415, including predicate act evidence in a civil racketeering case under 18 USC section 1962 without first reviewing this evidence, which totaled approximately 10,600 pages. This wrongful act is in his order at 23-mc-014. Judge Contreras then dismissed the underlying case 23-cv-415 sua sponte, appending an unrelated prior memorandum opinion with irrelevant analysis and citations, within two weeks after it was docketed without serious consideration violating DC circuit case law in *Crisafi v Holland* 655 F2d. 1305 (1981) and Supreme Court case law in *Denton v Hernandez* 504 US 25 (1992) and *Nietzke v Williams* 490 U.S. 319. These wrongful decisions were themselves affirmed by the Circuit panel sua sponte, but no complaint as to that matter is being lodged here at this time. The right to file such ethics complaints as to participating Circuit judges is reserved.

Sincerely,



Dennis Sheldon Brewer
1210 City Place
Edgewater, NJ 07020
Phone: 201-887-6541

Enclosure: DC Ethics Complaint Form dated September 20, 2023



OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
THE BOARD ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS

515 Fifth Street, N.W.
Building A, Room 117
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 638-1501 Fax (202) 638-0862
www.dcattorneydiscipline.org

(Please print or type)

Date: September 20, 2023

A. Your Name: (Dr.)

(Mr.)

(Ms.)

(Mrs.)

Dennis Sheldon Brewer

(First)

(Initial)

(Last)

Address: 1210 City Place

(Street)

(Apt. #)

Edgewater NJ 07020

(City)

(State)

(Zip)

Business Phone: _____ Home Phone: _____ Cell Phone: 201-887-6541

Email Address: _____

(NOTE: It is very important that we have your telephone number(s) and that you inform our office if you have a change of address.)

B. Attorney Complained Of:

Name: Rudolph Contreras (District Court Judge, in his official capacity)

(First)

(Initial)

(Last)

Address: 333 Constitution Ave

(Street)

(Apt. #)

Washington DC 20001

(City)

(State)

(Zip)

Telephone No.: 3520202-354- Attorney's Bar No., if known: _____

C. Have you filed a complaint about this matter anywhere else? ☒ Yes ☐ No // If yes, please give details.

No ethics complaint has been filed elsewhere. The underlying matter is the subject of SCOTUS cert petition docketed as 22-7805 appealing Circuit case 23-5052.

D. Do you have a written retainer agreement with the attorney? ☐ Yes ☐ No // If yes, please attach a copy.

Not applicable

E. Where applicable, state the name of the court where the underlying case was filed, and the case name and number.

DC US District Court, Brewer et al v Wray et al, 23-mc-014 and 23-cv-415

F. Do you have other documents that are relevant? ☒ Yes ☐ No // If yes, please give details and provide copies.

See case record on Pacer.gov DC 23-mc-014, 23-cv-415.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR REQUIRED DETAILS & SIGNATURE

G. DETAILS OF COMPLAINT: Judge Contreras wrongfully, by a legal maneuver which validated a

Original document hacked. Full text of block G is shown in transmittal letter dated September 20, 2023.

The Undersigned hereby certifies to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel
that the statements in the foregoing Complaint are true and correct to
the best of my knowledge.



SIGNATURE

September 20, 2023

Board on Professional Responsibility
430 E Street NW
Suite 138
Washington, DC 20001

Office of Disciplinary Counsel
District of Columbia Court of Appeals
515 5th Street, NW
Building A, Suite 117, Washington, DC 20001

Re: Professional Ethics Complaint Against Rudolph Contreras, Judge, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia

Enclosed herewith please find my complaint filed on your form. The complete text of G. Details of Complaint is shown below. Proper completion of that form field was prevented by a police powers hack of the form during its preparation at approximately 8:00 AM to 8:45 AM on September 20, 2023.

G. Details of Complaint

Judge Contreras wrongfully, by a legal maneuver which validated an illegal evidentiary hack by police powers defendants, excluded 86% of case evidence to be filed in 23-cv-415, including predicate act evidence in a civil racketeering case under 18 USC section 1962 without first reviewing this evidence, which totaled approximately 10,600 pages. This wrongful act is in his order at 23-mc-014. Judge Contreras then dismissed the underlying case 23-cv-415 sua sponte, appending an unrelated prior memorandum opinion with irrelevant analysis and citations, within two weeks after it was docketed without serious consideration violating DC circuit case law in *Crisafi v Holland* 655 F2d. 1305 (1981) and Supreme Court case law in *Denton v Hernandez* 504 US 25 (1992) and *Nietzke v Williams* 490 U.S. 319. These wrongful decisions were themselves affirmed by the Circuit panel sua sponte, but no complaint as to that matter is being lodged here at this time. The right to file such ethics complaints as to participating Circuit judges is reserved.

Sincerely,



Dennis Sheldon Brewer
1210 City Place
Edgewater, NJ 07020
Phone: 201-887-6541

Enclosure: DC Ethics Complaint Form dated September 20, 2023



OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
THE BOARD ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS

515 Fifth Street, N.W.
Building A, Room 117
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 638-1501 Fax (202) 638-0862
www.dcattorneydiscipline.org

(Please print or type)

Date: September 20, 2023

A. Your Name: (Dr.)

(Mr.)

(Ms.)

(Mrs.)

Dennis Sheldon Brewer

(First)

(Initial)

(Last)

Address: 1210 City Place

(Street)

(Apt. #)

Edgewater NJ 07020

(City)

(State)

(Zip)

Business Phone: _____ Home Phone: _____ Cell Phone: 201-887-6541

Email Address: _____

(NOTE: It is very important that we have your telephone number(s) and that you inform our office if you have a change of address.)

B. Attorney Complained Of:

Name: Rudolph Contreras (District Court Judge, in his official capacity)

(First)

(Initial)

(Last)

Address: 333 Constitution Ave

(Street)

(Apt. #)

Washington DC 20001

(City)

(State)

(Zip)

Telephone No.: 3520202-354- Attorney's Bar No., if known: _____

C. Have you filed a complaint about this matter anywhere else? ☒ Yes ☐ No // If yes, please give details.

No ethics complaint has been filed elsewhere. The underlying matter is the subject of SCOTUS cert petition docketed as 22-7805 appealing Circuit case 23-5052.

D. Do you have a written retainer agreement with the attorney? ☐ Yes ☐ No // If yes, please attach a copy.
Not applicable

E. Where applicable, state the name of the court where the underlying case was filed, and the case name and number.

DC US District Court, Brewer et al v Wray et al, 23-mc-014 and 23-cv-415


F. Do you have other documents that are relevant? ☒ Yes ☐ No // If yes, please give details and provide copies.
See case record on Pacer.gov DC 23-mc-014, 23-cv-415.

SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR REQUIRED DETAILS & SIGNATURE

G. DETAILS OF COMPLAINT: Judge Contreras wrongfully, by a legal maneuver which validated a

Original document hacked. Full text of block G is shown in transmittal letter dated September 20, 2023.

The Undersigned hereby certifies to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel
that the statements in the foregoing Complaint are true and correct to
the best of my knowledge.



SIGNATURE

**BY DEFENDANTS DURING COMPLAINT PREPARATION AND
SUBMISSION TO DC DISTRICT COURT**

A. AFFIDAVITS AND EVIDENCE:

1. CONSTRUCTIVE OBSTRUCTION OF SERVICE OF
PROCESS
2. OBSTRUCTION OF EVIDENCE DURING PRINTING
OF PREDICATE ACTS EXHIBITS REQUIRED UNDER F.
R. CIV. P. RULE 9B

B. SEE ALSO:

3. HACKS MODIFYING LEGAL REFERENCES AT LP
EVIDENTIARY EXHIBITS PAGES 10614, 10620
4. EMAIL FRAUDS BLOCKING ACCESS TO MEDICAL
AND NEUROSCIENCE EXPERTS, PROSPECTIVE LEGAL
COUNSEL AT LP EVIDENTIARY EXHIBITS PAGES 803-
843

Copies to District Court, United States Marshals Service ✓

[Handwritten signature]

ON-GOING OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE
DEFENDANTS DURING COMPLAINT PREPARATION AND
SUBMISSION TO DC DISTRICT COURT

A. AFFIDAVITS AND EVIDENCE:

1. CONSTRUCTIVE OBSTRUCTION OF SERVICE OF PROCESS
2. OBSTRUCTION OF EVIDENCE DURING PRINTING OF PREDICATE ACTS EXHIBITS REQUIRED UNDER F. R. CIV. P. RULE 9B

B. SEE ALSO:

3. HACKS MODIFYING LEGAL REFERENCES AT LP EVIDENTIARY EXHIBITS PAGES 10614, 10620
4. EMAIL FRAUDS BLOCKING ACCESS TO MEDICAL AND NEUROSCIENCE EXPERTS, PROSPECTIVE LEGAL COUNSEL AT LP EVIDENTIARY EXHIBITS PAGES 803-843

Copies to District Court, United States Marshals Service



CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH REDACTION ATTEMPTS

AND RELATED EVIDENCE

SUBMITTED FEBRUARY 14, 2023