Read Message			
Previous Next M	love To Select One 🗘		
OK REPLY REPLY ALL FORWARD			
DELETE REPORT SPAM	EXPORT PRINT		
From: Skaggs, Adam <skaggsa@exchange.law.nyu.edu></skaggsa@exchange.law.nyu.edu>	[ add to contacts ]		
To: elena@judgewatch.org	[ add to contacts ]		
Cc: Da Silva, Maria <dasilva@exchange.law.nyu.edu></dasilva@exchange.law.nyu.edu>			
Date: Monday, August 16, 2010 12:09 pm Subject: RE: Advancing the Brennan Center's Recusal Reform Recommendations in NYS			
Attachments: D Text version of this message. (4KB)			
Elena —			
Many thanks for contacting us, and for sharing the information on the opportunity for the participate as an amicus in the NY proceedings.	Brennan Center to		
We have reviewed the materials and shared them with our colleagues. Unfortunately, at Brennan Center will not be able to participate in the case. This decision in no way reflects merits of the case — on which we express no opinion — but is the unfortunate result of live resources and numerous competing demands.	s our views on the		
Many thanks again. We wish you the best with this litigation, and with your other, import	tant, pursuits.		
Best regards,			
Adam			
J. Adam Skaggs			
Counsel, Democracy Program			
Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law			
161 Avenue of the Americas, 12th Floor			
New York, New York 10013			
646.292.8331 (phone)   212-463-7308 (fax)			
adam.skaggs@nyu.edu   www.brennancenter.org			
From: elena@judgewatch.org [mailto:elena@judgewatch.org] Sent: Tuesday, August 10, 2010 2:54 PM To: adam.skaggs@nyu.edu Cc: maria.dasilva@nyu.edu Subject: Advancing the Brennan Center's Recusal Reform Recommendations in NYS			
Thank you and Maria, again, for meeting with me on July 27th and discussing CJA's advancing the Brennan Center's recusal reform recommendations in New York: (1) of			

based scholarship, particularly of cases involving motions to disqualify judges for ACTUAL, rather than apparent, bias; (2) establishing a recusal advisory committee -- the Brennan Center's only recommendation that can be citizen-activated: "Outside observers need not sit idly by as judges consider the [other 9] reforms"; (3) engaging in amicus curiae advocacy

As indicated by the voice messages I left for you, Adam, yesterday and earlier today, the opportunity for the Brennan Center's amicus voice has now arisen -- one embracing scholarship and the functions of a recusal advisory committee: The Appellate Term denied, without reasons, the legally-sufficient April 25, 2010 motion for its disqualification that I left with you (embodying also my legally-sufficient January 2, 2010 disqualification motion, which I also left with you). Attached is a copy of its July 8, 2010 decision/order -- which I only learned of a couple of hours after our meeting. Also attached: my draft notice of motion to the Appellate Division and moving affidavit, incorporating the Brennan Center's recusal reform recommendations (see paras 32-35).

I would appreciate your review, <u>as soon as possible</u>. For starters, is there an appeal of right from the Appellate Term's denial, without reasons, of a motion to disqualify its justices -- or is the Appellate Division's review only by leave? Have any laws "limited or conditioned" Article 6, Sec. 4K of the NYS Constitution?

Please circulate this query and my draft motion among Brennan scholars, lawyers, law students, and other researchers so that this and the other legal and constitutional issues can be more fully developed. I am completely open to suggestions for improving my draft motion.

By the way, the underlying record, both in White Plains City Court and at the Appellate Term (&, of course, the appellate briefs), is accessible from CJA's website, www.judgewatch.org [see: sidepanel: Judicial Selection-NYS, with a hyperlink for White Plains City Court. Also, via the top panel "Latest New", likewise with a hyperlink.]

I will call you on Friday, if I don't hear from you sooner.

Thanks, again.

Elena

OK	REPLY REPLY ALL	FORWARD	
J			Previous
DELETE	REPORT SPAM		

Next