

WELCOME TO THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY LANE, MR. McARDLE III.

September 18, 2026

John A. McArdle, III
Committee Counsel
Committee on Judicial Conduct
P.O. Box 127
Augusta, ME 04332

Re: Docket No. 26-321 — September 15, 2026 dismissal letter

Mr. McArdle:

Your September 15, 2026 letter in Docket No. 26-321 reports the Committee’s dismissal of my complaint concerning Judge John Lucy. I understand that you signed as Committee Counsel and that the dispositions reported are the Committee’s. My criticism concerns that official response—not your private life.

A closure letter is not the end of public accountability. When the concern is the handling of time-sensitive matters affecting children and families, the explanation must confront the concern actually raised. A child’s time is not an administrative rounding error.

The answer must address the question actually raised.

Your letter addresses three matters: whether I showed a basis requiring earlier recusal; whether recusal without explanation violated the Code; and whether there was a basis to reconsider the prior dismissal. It reports dismissal on the first two points and no action on reconsideration. I am not representing that disposition as a finding in my favor.

But my retained June 10, 2026 second amended addendum expressly sought review of “judicial conduct, delay, non-disposition, assignment/routing, docket administration” and record protection. My July 15, 2026 addendum separately stated: “The complaint is not limited to dissatisfaction with a ruling,” and, “Recusal did not answer the status of the work already assigned.” Those passages concern administration before and during reassignment—not merely a demand for a personal explanation of recusal. [1–2]

I do not ask a disqualified judge to keep deciding the merits. I ask how pending work was identified, handled, and transferred, and how the conduct allegations concerning the preceding period were evaluated. Those are different questions.

The September 15 letter does not identify which submissions were considered or expressly explain how those broader concerns were resolved. That omission does not prove that no review occurred. It does mean I cannot determine from the letter whether those issues were reviewed, treated as part of the prior dismissal, excluded, or never associated with this docket. Please answer that distinction.

Please provide the following clarification.

1. Identify the complaint and supplemental submissions considered in Docket No. 26-321, by date and title. Confirm specifically whether the June 10 and July 15 addenda were received and associated with it or another docket. My retained copies and sent emails do not establish your intake history.
2. Explain whether delay, non-disposition, handling of time-sensitive motions, reassignment/status protection, and transcript/audio-record access were evaluated independently of the two recusal questions. For each, identify the disposition and the applicable rule or reasoning, to the extent disclosure is permitted.
3. Identify the earlier disposition referenced in paragraph 3, the materials treated as a request for reconsideration, and the basis for concluding that reconsideration was unwarranted. Rule 1(B)(iv) permits reconsideration on new information when the Committee determines it necessary; it does not promise automatic reopening. Please explain how that provision was applied. [3]
4. Describe, at a nonconfidential level, the categories of records used to resolve the administrative-handling questions. Where an answer or record cannot be disclosed, identify the applicable restriction rather than treating every request for explanation as a request for confidential deliberations.
5. Please preserve the complaint, supplements, intake and association records, records considered, and disposition correspondence under the applicable retention obligations. Acknowledge this reply and advise whether a further explanation will be provided.

The Committee's own published procedures say a complainant may communicate again to seek further explanation or provide additional information. That is what this letter does. It is not a substitute for an appeal, a demand to change a family-court order, or a claim that the dismissal letter proves a crime. [4]

Public office calls for a public-accountability response.

I am preparing a source-linked public comparison of your letter and the scope of my retained submissions. It will distinguish the Committee's stated disposition, my allegations, and facts not established by the available materials. It will not publish my child's private records. A substantive response and supported corrections will be presented alongside the criticism.

No robe, title, professional credential, or committee letterhead substitutes for a reasoned explanation. Legal immunity in a particular proceeding is not a reason to withhold public criticism of official reasoning. I am asking for accountability, not deference.

I just wanted to be a father. The point of this record is not professional comfort. It is whether children and families receive meaningful attention before time changes their lives.

Justice does not belong to a profession. It belongs to the People.
A promise kept is public respect earned back.

Warmest regards,

Justin A. Tahai

Complainant | justintahai@gmail.com

Source notes and enclosures

These references identify the materials relied upon. The retained addenda contain the complainant's allegations and requests, not adjudicated findings. Neither retained copy alone establishes Committee receipt or association with Docket No. 26-321.

[1] Retained June 10, 2026 Second Amended Addendum concerning Mr. John Lucy, p. 1, introductory scope paragraph; requested action at p. 2. Located as an attachment to a sent June 10 email. Committee receipt/association is not independently confirmed.

[2] Retained July 15, 2026 Supplemental Addendum concerning Judge John B. Lucy, Sr., p. 3, sections II.A and II.C; pp. 4–5, requested investigation and disposition. Located as an attachment to a sent July 15 email. Committee receipt/association is not independently confirmed.

[3] Rules of the Committee on Judicial Conduct, Rule 1(B)(iv): <https://www.cjc.maine.gov/rules.html>

[4] Committee Functions and Procedures, "Initial Assessment": https://www.cjc.maine.gov/functions_procedures.html

Enclosed public source materials

A. September 15, 2026 Committee letter, both photographed pages, with the recipient's residential address redacted.

B. Selected verbatim excerpts from the retained June 10 and July 15 addenda, with page and section references.

Public-accountability page

Page address:

<https://www.jtforme.com/committee-on-judicial-conduct-accountability>

This reply was prepared September 18, 2026. Preparation does not establish mailing, delivery, website deployment, or a new Committee response. The page is intended to present the sources, criticism, and any substantive response together.

Public correspondence copy. No residential return address or handwritten signature is published.