

Complainant Information (Optional - but recommended for follow-up): Name: Ronald P. Harper Jr. Address: 23 N. Pitt St., Manheim, PA 17545 Phone: 717-469-5669 Email: tips@RonHarperJr.com Relationship to Matter: Victim's son and power-of-attorney for victim Bertha D. Harper; direct participant in incidents described below.

Judge Information: Name: Judge Dennis E. Reinaker Court: Lancaster County Court of Common Pleas Position: President Judge Address: Lancaster County Courthouse, 50 N. Duke Street, Lancaster, PA 17602

Date of Submission: September 21, 2025

Description of the Alleged Misconduct:

I respectfully submit this Confidential Request for Investigation against Judge Dennis E. Reinaker of the Lancaster County Court of Common Pleas, pursuant to Article V, Section 18(d)(1) of the Pennsylvania Constitution and the Rules of the Judicial Conduct Board. This complaint alleges repeated violations of the Pennsylvania Code of Judicial Conduct (207 Pa. Code Chapter 33), including Rules 1.2 (Promoting Confidence in the Judiciary), 2.2 (Impartiality and Fairness), 2.3 (Bias, Prejudice, and Harassment), and 2.5 (Competence, Diligence, and Cooperation). These violations demonstrate a pattern of arrogant, biased, and unprofessional conduct that undermines public confidence in the judiciary, manifests personal bias against me as a litigant and citizen, and deprives victims of statutorily protected rights. The incidents span 15 years, include prior Board discipline, and involve alleged misconduct outside judicial duties, evidencing a failure to uphold judicial integrity.

I. Jurisdiction and Parties This complaint arises from Judge Reinaker's actions in his official capacity as a judicial officer in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, and his conduct outside that capacity affecting public perception. I, Ronald P. Harper Jr., am the son and registered power-of-attorney for Bertha D. Harper, the 90-year-old direct victim in criminal case Nos. CP-36-CR-0005033-2021 and CP-36-CR-0005034-2021. As such, I have legal standing under the Pennsylvania Crime Victims Act, 18 P.S. §§ 11.101 et seq., particularly Sections 201(4) (defining direct victims) and 231 (granting standing to assert rights). Judge Reinaker's conduct directly implicates his duties under the Code of Judicial Conduct and Article V, § 17(b) of the Pennsylvania Constitution, which prohibits conduct that prejudices the administration of justice.

II. Factual Allegations The following allegations are supported by attached exhibits, public records, and prior Board findings. They establish a pattern of misconduct beginning in 2010 and culminating in 2022, with additional evidence of personal impropriety and refusal to correct errors.

1. 2010 Prison Board Meeting: Arrogant Demand for Title and Unprofessional Conduct

(Violation of Rule 1.2) On or about November 18, 2010, during a public Lancaster County Prison Board meeting—at which Judge Reinaker served in his capacity as a board member, not as a sitting judge—I addressed the board regarding prison-related concerns. Judge Reinaker interrupted me mid-speech, demanding that I address him as "Judge," despite the non-judicial context. This demand was arrogant and unwarranted, as the Pennsylvania Constitution (Article I, § 2) vests all power in the people without hierarchical titles, and no such titles are mandated in non-judicial proceedings.

Following the meeting, Judge Reinaker walked away without further discussion, refusing to engage. I emailed him expressing embarrassment on his behalf and concern over his hubris after five years of friendship (Exhibit A: Email exchange image/PDF). In his response, Judge Reinaker dismissed the need for an apology, claiming he was "acting as a Judge" solely due to his board role—a misappropriation of authority. My follow-up email detailed the emotional toll, including triggered post-traumatic stress and depression, yet he offered no remorse beyond

calling his comment "unprofessional."

This conduct violated Rule 1.2(A), requiring judges to "act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary." By demanding a title in a public, non-judicial forum and responding dismissively to a friend's valid critique, Judge Reinaker created an appearance of impropriety and entitlement, eroding public trust. As noted in the Code's commentary to Rule 1.2, such actions, like alluding to judicial status for deference, undermine the judiciary's integrity.

2. **2019 Traffic Stop: Prior Board Discipline for Similar Arrogance (Pattern Evidence Under Rule 1.2)** As the Board is aware from its prior investigation of Complaint Nos. 2019-359, 2019-382, and 2019-388, Judge Reinaker engaged in conduct during an April 26, 2019, motor vehicle traffic stop that violated Rule 1.2. The Board issued a public Letter of Counsel on December 13, 2019, finding that his actions failed to promote public confidence in the judiciary (Exhibit C: "12-30-2019-Press-Release-PJ-Dennis-E.-Reinaker-Lancaster-County-Public-Letter-of-Counsel.pdf"). This prior discipline mirrors the 2010 arrogance and foreshadows the 2022 bias, demonstrating non-isolated behavior in violation of Rule 1.2's ongoing duty.

3. **2022 Sentencing Hearing: Bias Against Complainant and Denial of Victim Rights (Violations of Rules 2.2, 2.3, and 2.5)** On June 30, 2022, in the above-referenced criminal cases, defendants pleaded guilty to neglect of a care-dependent person (18 Pa.C.S. § 2713) for nearly killing my 90-year-old mother, Bertha D. Harper, who was admitted to the hospital at 77 pounds with a dislocated shoulder, untreated ulcers, and bilateral infections. Judge Reinaker sentenced them to a \$100 fine and two years' probation without input from the victim or family.

Despite Pennsylvania law mandating victim participation—the Crime Victims Act (18 P.S. §§ 11.101 et seq.), Sections 201(6) (dispositional proceedings) and 201(9) (right to submit impact statements before sentencing), and Constitution Article I, § 11 (open courts and remedy without denial)—Judge Reinaker denied entry to the courtroom for: (a) victim Bertha Harper; (b) her daughter-in-law (medical power-of-attorney); (c) her caregiver; and (d) me, her son and legal power-of-attorney (Exhibit D: "Superior Court Mandamus Action filing.pdf," paras. 6-10). Three armed sheriff's deputies then escorted us from the courthouse, announcing, "The hearing you came for is over."

This exclusion was not neutral; it stemmed from 12-year-old bias against me from the 2010 incident, where I publicly challenged his arrogance. Judge Reinaker sentenced without considering victim impact, as required by 18 P.S. § 11.201(10), violating Rule 2.2(A) ("perform the duties of judicial office impartially and diligently") and Rule 2.5(A) (ensure "competence, diligence, and cooperation" in proceedings). It also manifested "bias or prejudice" under Rule 2.3(B), as the denial targeted me personally, prejudicing the administration of justice per Pa. Const. Art. V, § 17(b). My subsequent Mandamus petition to the Superior Court sought remand for re-sentencing with family input, underscoring the deprivation (Exhibit D, paras. 21-23). Attempts to resolve via chambers and the DA's office failed.

4. **Failure to Rectify the 2022 Sentencing Wrong: Persistent Arrogance (Violation of Rule 2.5)** Following the June 30, 2022, sentencing, Judge Reinaker had at least two opportunities to correct the wrongful exclusion of the victim and her family but declined to do so. Immediately after leaving the courthouse, I contacted his office and spoke with his secretary, who later called back to unjustly blame me for the situation. Subsequently, the Mandamus Action was served on him, providing a formal opportunity to order re-sentencing with victim and family participation. This would have required Judge Reinaker to acknowledge his error and allow my mother and her support network to be present, yet he refused. This persistent refusal reflects an entrenched

attitude of arrogance, consistent with the 2019 traffic stop discipline as a tempered manifestation of his habitual hubris, violating Rule 2.5(A) by failing to perform judicial duties with the requisite diligence and cooperation.

5. **Alleged Adulterous Affair with WGAL Reporter Kim Lemon: Misuse of Office and Media Manipulation (Violation of Rule 1.2)** Around the time of the 2019 traffic stop investigation, Judge Reinaker is alleged to have engaged in an adulterous affair with Kim Lemon, a well-known married WGAL reporter. This relationship purportedly included using her handicapped husband's parking placard to park at a train station for a weekend trip to New York, suggesting misuse of privileges tied to his judicial status. Additionally, Judge Reinaker granted an exclusive interview to WGAL, where Ms. Lemon's station aired a favorable "puff piece" (Exhibit B: WGAL article at <https://www.wgal.com/article/wgal-exclusive-lancaster-county-judge-who-confronted-officer-during-traffic-stop-gives-only-tv-interview/28075217>), ostensibly to mitigate public backlash from the Board's discipline.

This conduct violated Rule 1.2(A), which mandates actions promoting public confidence in judicial integrity. Using media influence to soften disciplinary consequences, potentially through a personal relationship, creates an appearance of impropriety and undermines the judiciary's impartiality, as noted in Rule 1.2's commentary. The alleged misuse of a handicapped placard further suggests unethical exploitation of his position.

III. Charges and Legal Basis Judge Reinaker's conduct constitutes judicial misconduct under Pa. Const. Art. V, § 18(d)(1) and violates:

- **Rule 1.2(A):** Repeated failures to promote public confidence, including arrogant title demands (2010), the 2019 traffic stop (as previously disciplined by the Board), biased exclusions (2022), and media manipulation via an alleged affair.
- **Rule 2.2(A) and 2.5(A):** Impartial and diligent performance denied by excluding victims without legal basis and refusing to rectify the error.
- **Rule 2.3(B):** Manifest bias against complainant, influencing a dispositional proceeding.

These acts prejudice justice, warranting discipline up to censure, suspension, or removal (Pa. Const. Art. V, § 18(d)(1)). The pattern, post-2019 discipline, shows non-remediation.

IV. Request for Relief I request a full investigation, including review of attached exhibits and any available evidence of the alleged affair and parking placard misuse. If probable cause is found, file formal charges in the Court of Judicial Discipline. This will restore public confidence and protect victims' rights.

Attachments:

- Exhibit A: 2010 Email Exchange Image/PDF
- Exhibit B: WGAL Interview Article (printed)
- Exhibit C: 2019 Press Release and Letter of Counsel PDF
- Exhibit D: 2022 Mandamus Action Filing Image/PDF
- Exhibit E: Police Criminal Complaint PDF

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. I understand false complaints may result in criminal charges.

Signature: _____ Date: September 21, 2025 Ronald P. Harper Jr.