

State of Connecticut
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Judiciary Committee
Public Hearing, 8 Feb 2016

**TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO THE RE-NOMINATION
OF JUDGE WILLIAM T. CREMINS OF MIDDLEBURY**

During his recent term as a Judge of the Superior Court, the Hon. William Cremins was also appointed to serve as a judge member of the Judicial Review Council ("JRC"). In that administrative and quasi-judicial capacity, pursuant to C.G.S. § 51-51k, he was one of three judge members and one of twelve members overall to review grievances brought forth against fellow jurists.

This critically important process was established and later reinforced by statute to provide safeguards against judicial abuses, but is not serving the public interest. Instead, the JRC is being used to protect the misconduct and corrupt acts of the relatively small percent of jurists who are tarnishing the reputation and good work being done by Connecticut's Judicial Department.

As a judge member of the JRC from 2008 through 2011, Judge Cremins participated in the consideration and disposition of over 400 judicial complaints. Among those dismissals for alleged lack of probable cause were two of my own complaints, both filed against Judge Howard T. Owens, Jr. for misconduct at the Bridgeport Superior Court.

My complaints, filed 12/07/2010 and 5/03/2011, were clear, well documented, and not a matter of opinion or dissatisfaction, but a matter of fact and law. Judge Owens had repeatedly broken the law and violated his oath as a judicial officer. Rather than acknowledge the record, Judge Cremins participated in a process to cover up the misconduct which represents nothing short of criminal conspiracy.

By way of one very specific example, my first complaint was filed 12/07/2010 and, according to procedure, a copy of same was forwarded to Judge Owens for response. Both the Connecticut General Statutes and Rules of Practice outline with specificity precisely what is required of a jurist when a law suit or complaint is filed against them. Rather than adhere to Rule 2.11 (Code of Judicial Conduct) and Practice Book § 1-22, Judge Owens wholly ignored his sworn obligations regarding consideration of possible

disqualification. In so doing, Judge Owens was then in a position to continue his discriminatory and punitive rulings in subsequent hearings against me as a pro se litigant during the pendency of an appeal which later overturned all of the punitive financial orders set forth in Judge Owens September 2009 dissolution orders.

In hearings on 1/13/2011 and 2/17/2011, transcripts will show that Judge Owens made no reference of any kind, as required by the rules, as to the pending grievances. He continued to violate my due process rights and conspired with opposing counsel to violate the established rules of evidence, and then issued further punitive and retaliatory orders against me. The attorney in question was Stanley M. Goldstein who had been on a court-imposed one-year probation following presentment and would later resign from the bar to avoid ongoing prosecution of four separate grievances as were being pursued by the Office of Chief Disciplinary Council.

For Judge Cremins to give a pass to his fellow jurist, was to allow further judicial misconduct which ultimately impacted two minor children. Judge Cremins took a sworn oath as a jurist, but also as a member of the Judicial Review Council, to uphold the law. Instead, he and other members took the easy path -- knowing that their decision cannot be appealed by the complainant, but can only be challenged by the respondent. This is a further violation of the U.S. Constitution's 14th Amendment provisions which guarantee equal protection to all, but yet Connecticut appears to ignore this protection.

Further continued violations by Judge Cremins as a member of the JRC were the complete failure of the JRC during his tenure to adhere to federal mandates of the ADA Amendments Act of 2008, as well as C.G.S. § 46a-70, et seq., which similarly are in place to protect against discrimination. During Cremins tenure, the JRC failed to meet its affirmative obligations for qualified individuals with disabilities, not offering or making reasonable accommodations available to anyone seeking to participate in the services, programs or activities of the JRC. It is a Title II entity as defined by the ADA.

WHEREFORE, Judge Cremins has knowingly participated in part of an organized criminal enterprise and failed in his obligations as a jurist. He should not continue to serve on the bench of any Connecticut court.

Daniel M. Lynch
P.O. Box 40, Trumbull CT 06611
Phone: (203) 520-2020, Email: dan@danlynch.net