

What the retained addenda asked the Committee to review

SOURCE B | SELECTED VERBATIM EXCERPTS

These are text excerpts, not complete copies or facsimiles. Line wrapping is normalized. The quoted words are the complainant's own allegations and requests. Receipt and docket association by the Committee have not been independently confirmed. The full underlying family records are not part of this public exhibit.

June 10, 2026 • Page 1 • Scope paragraph

This addendum is not a request for the Committee to change custody, support, protection-from-abuse, appellate, transcript, or federal rulings. It is a request for review of judicial conduct, delay, non-disposition, assignment/routing, docket administration, public confidence, and the failure to correct or protect the record after known procedural blunders.

Source title: SECOND AMENDED ADDENDUM TO COMPLAINT TO THE MAINE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT. Retained filename:

CJC_SECOND_AMENDED_Addendum_Mr_John_Lucy_No_Hon_Federal_Lanes_2026-06-10.pdf.

July 15, 2026 • Page 3 • Section II.A

“The complaint is not limited to dissatisfaction with a ruling.”

The recent record makes the distinction clearer. I continue to challenge the February 11 order through the appellate process, but the conduct complaint concerns what happened administratively and judicially after the order: whether assigned, time-sensitive motions were meaningfully reviewed; whether the status of those motions was made knowable; whether implementation requests were promptly addressed; whether an alternative appellate record was provided or ruled upon; and whether recusal occurred in a manner that protected rather than further obscured the status of pending child-impact matters.

July 15, 2026 • Page 3 • Section II.C

“Recusal did not answer the status of the work already assigned.”

The Committee should examine not merely whether recusal was permissible, but what happened before and during reassignment. A recusal order does not identify which motions were reviewed, which remained pending, which had been rendered moot by other action, whether an expedited request was presented, whether a successor judge received a clear transfer memorandum or work-queue status, or whether the parties were told what remained to be decided. The present need for a separate line-item status-reconciliation motion is itself evidence that the case-status handoff was not transparent to the litigant whose child-impact requests were pending.

July 15, 2026 • Page 5 • Section IV

The Committee may ultimately determine that some delay was attributable to appellate jurisdiction, eFiling correction, clerk procedure, litigant volume, or legitimate recusal concerns. That possibility is precisely why an investigation should examine the actual routing and work-queue records rather than rely on assumptions from the face of a crowded docket.

Source title: SUPPLEMENTAL ADDENDUM TO JUDICIAL CONDUCT COMPLAINT CONCERNING JUDGE JOHN B. LUCY, SR. The source uses the heading “CONFIDENTIAL JUDICIAL-CONDUCT SUBMISSION.” Only the complainant-authored scope and limiting passages above are reproduced here; private child, medical, and school material is excluded. Retained filename: CJC_Supplemental_Addendum_John_Lucy_20260715.pdf.

Comparison limit

The September 15 response does not identify which dated submissions were considered. These excerpts therefore support a request to reconcile scope and intake. They do not establish that the Committee received these specific versions, ignored them, violated a rule, or committed a crime.