

To: The Court of Judicial Discipline of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania  
Judicial Conduct Board  
601 Commonwealth Ave  
Suite 3500  
PO Box 62525  
Harrisburg, PA 17106-2525

From: Joseph Bradley  
XXX XXXXXXXX XX  
XXXXXXXX, XX XXXXX

RE: The Practice of Sharia Law by Magisterial District Judge Mark Martin.

To The Court of Judicial Discipline, Greetings,

Enclosed with this document, please find a recent email I sent to Magisterial District Judge Mark Martin in which I expressed my views regarding his recent decision to dismiss assault charges against Talaag Elbayomy, a Muslim man who assaulted Ernie Perce, an atheist, who paraded in the street as a zombified Muhammed.

In his pronouncement of his decision to dismiss, it became clear that his decision was based, primarily, on personal bias and had nothing to do with Constitutional law. This was eminently expressed by Judge Martin in one of his invective laced tirades from the bench in which he stated:

*“Having had the benefit of having spent over 2 and a half years in predominantly Muslim countries I think I know a little bit about the faith of Islam. In fact I have a copy of the Koran here and I challenge you sir to show me where it says in the Koran that Mohammad arose and walked among the dead. I think you misinterpreted things. Before you start mocking someone else’s religion you may want to find out a little bit more about it it makes you look like a dufus and Mr. (Defendant) is correct. In many Arabic speaking countries something like this is definitely against the law there. In their society in fact it can be punishable by death and it frequently is in their society.*

*Islam is not just a religion, it’s their culture, their culture. It’s their very essence their very being. They pray five times a day towards Mecca to be a good Muslim, before you die you have to make a pilgrimage to Mecca unless you are otherwise told you can not because you are too ill too elderly, whatever but you must make the attempt. Their greetings wa-laikum as-Salâm (is answered by voice) may god be with you. Whenever, it’s very common when speaking to each other it’s very common for them to say uh this will happen it’s it they are so immersed in it.”*

Unless I’m mistaken, Judge Martin took an oath to uphold the United States Constitution, NOT the Qu’ran. Perhaps, if Judge Martin cannot fulfil his duties in this regard, he should do the noble thing and resign from the bench.

Sincerely,

---

Joseph F. Bradley

Encl.

1 Courthouse Square  
Floor 3R  
Carlisle, PA 17013  
Phone:717.240.6200  
Fax:717.240.6460  
email: courtadmin@ccpa.net

To The Honorable Magisterial District Judge Mark Martin, Greetings,

Recently, as it has been reported, you have dismissed assault charges, filed by prosecutors, against Talaag Elbayomy, a Muslim man, who assaulted Ernie Perce, an atheist, who paraded in the street as a zombified Muhammed. The assault is uncontroverted as the Defendant, Talaag Elbayomy, readily admitted to this assault at trial.

At trial, so it is reported, you dismissed the charges against the defendant because, as you stated and/or inferred, the defendant was justified in his assault on the victim because of the victim's disrespect of Islam's prophet Muhammad.

While it is understandable that the Defendant would be upset at this portrayal, in the United States we have a document entitled the Constitution in which free, even offensive, speech is protected. Nowhere is this concept explicated more thoroughly than in the appellate decision of the case of Snyder v. Phelps. The protection of offensive, even hateful, speech is the single most important foundation of a free society. It is, specifically, offensive and disagreeable speech which the First Amendment protects, as popular speech or silence needs no protection due to it's lack of controversy.

You might think that the government did not impinge on Mr. Perce's First Amendment rights because the purpose of the trial was to adjudicate assault charges against Talaag Elbayomy, however, you would be wrong in this thought. By dismissing the assault case against Talaag Elbayomy, based upon your personal belief that the assault was justifiable because of the offensive nature of the idiom that Mr. Perce utilized, you have given governmental blessings and sanction to private citizens restraining the First Amendment rights of their fellow citizens, through the use of force, with an indemnification similar to Qualified Immunity in which State and Federal officials are held harmless for their acts. In this fashion, depending on the political and/or religious beliefs of the judge, private citizens become surrogates of the government because they have been immunized against the law and any consequences for their actions.

As a judge, you have taken an oath to uphold the Constitution, however, it has become clear that you serve another master.

Joseph F. Bradley

*"I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it"*  
- - - Evelyn Beatrice Hall