

Monday, August 14, 1995

LETTERS

*To the Editor***Comm'n Abandons
Investigative Mandate**

Your front-page article, "Funding Cut Seen Curbing Disciplining of Judges," (*NYLJ*, Aug. 1) quotes the chairman of the New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct as saying that budget cuts are compromising the commission's ability to carry out "its constitutional mandate." That mandate, delineated in Article 2-A of the Judiciary Law, is to "investigate" each complaint against judges and judicial candidates, the only exception being where the commission "determines that the complaint on its face lacks merit" (§44.1).

Yet, long ago, in the very period when your article shows the commission had more than ample resources — and indeed, was, thereafter, requesting less funding — the commission jettisoned such investigative mandate by promulgating a rule (22 NYCRR §7000.3) converting its mandatory duty to an optional one so that, unbounded by any standard and without investigation, it could arbitrarily dismiss judicial misconduct complaints. The unconstitutional result of such rule which, as written, cannot be reconciled with the statute, is that, by the commission's own statistics, it dismisses, without investigation, over 100 complaints a month.

For years, the commission has been accused of going after small town justices to the virtual exclusion of those sitting on this state's higher courts. Yet, until now, the confidentiality of the commission's procedures has prevented researchers and the media from glimpsing the kind of facially-meritorious complaints the commission dismisses and the protectionism it practices when the complained-of judge is powerful and politically-con-

nected. However, the Center for Judicial Accountability Inc., a not-for-profit, non-partisan citizens' organization, has been developing an archive of duplicate copies of such complaints. Earlier this year, we undertook a constitutional challenge to the commission's self-promulgated rule, as written and applied. Our Article 78 petition annexed copies of eight facially-meritorious complaints against high-ranking judges filed with the commission since 1989, all summarily dismissed by the commission, with no finding that the complaints were facially without merit.

In "round one" of the litigation, Manhattan Supreme Court Justice Herman Cahn dismissed the Article 78 proceeding in a decision reported on the second-front-page of the July 31 *Law Journal* and reprinted in full. By his decision, Justice Cahn, ignoring the fact that the commission was in default, held the commission's self-promulgated rule constitutional. He did this by ignoring the commission's own explicit definition of the term "investigation" and by advancing an argument never put forward by the commission. As to the unconstitutionality of the rule, as applied, demonstrated by the commission's summary dismissals of the eight facially-meritorious complaints, Justice Cahn held, without any law to support such ruling and by misrepresenting the factual record before him, that "the issue is not before the court."

The public and legal community are encouraged to access the papers in the Article 78 proceeding from the New York County Clerk's office (*Sassower v. Commission*, #95-109141) — including the many motions by citizen intervenors. What those papers unmistakably show is that the commission protects judges from the consequences of their judicial misconduct — and, in turn, is protected by them.

Elena Ruth Sassower
White Plains, N.Y.

Ex "D"
to CJA's
4/18/96
HR