

July 7, 1986

Gerald Stern, Esq.  
Commission on Judicial Conduct  
801 Second Avenue,  
New York, New York, 10017

Re: Presiding Justice FRANCIS T. MURPHY  
Chief Admin. Judge JOSEPH W. BELLACOSA  
Admin. Judge XAVIER C. RICCOBONO

Dear Mr. Stern,

1. There is one aspect of the judicial-official corruption involving PUCCINI CLOTHES, LTD. ["Puccini"], which I believe particularly egregious, which I will briefly summarize:

2a. Senior Attorney, DAVIS S. COOK, Esq., was and is essentially a one-man unit in the Attorney General's Office, at 2 World Trade Center, New York City, charged with vouchsafing the interests of involuntarily dissolved corporations, including Puccini.

b. The law places upon the Attorney General various discretionary and mandatory powers and obligations (e.g. Business Corporation Law §1214, §1216).

c. Almost invariably, non-indemnifiable losses and expenditures, can only occur through the actions of the judiciary and/or their appointees!

3a. When, in January 1984, I had the "hard evidence" of the larceny of Puccini's trust assets; was not permitted to intervene, on my own behalf, or on behalf of my client, HYMAN RAFFE; and had incriminating evidence of improper judicial involvement; I communicated with the Attorney General.

b. It was Mr. Cook who responded, and since his legal obligations and my own were completely parallel, there was over the months that followed, a complete exchange of information, a great deal of which I considered confidential.

c. Significantly, my right, if not my obligation, to communicate with the Attorney General's Office, had constitutional protection (Amend. I, U.S. Constitution; Article 1, §9, N.Y.S. Constitution; California Motor v. Trucking Unlimited, 404 U.S. 508, 513).

4a. It takes a vivid and base imagination to conceive that when the above were charged, or made actual defendants or respondents, that of all of the attorneys available, even if the group of available attorneys were limited to the Attorney General's Office, that it would be Mr. Cook who would be selected, commandeered, and/or dragooned to represent the above and the judicial thrall.

b. Obviously, Mr. Cook carried with him, on such judicial representation of the above, all the confidential information that I, and perhaps other, imparted to him on behalf of Puccini.

c. It was not only a switch of representation by Mr. Cook to his new clients, but a simultaneous representation by Mr. Cook, wherein he betrayed Puccini, the helpless judicial eunuch, in favor of the above!

5. A few examples of the severe and dramatic prejudice caused by such simultaneous representation are herein set forth:

a. The law imposes, as a mandatory "duty", upon the Attorney General, to make application for an accounting and distribution after eighteen (18) months have elapsed (Business Corporation Law §1216[a]). But as the attorney for Administrative Judge XAVIER C. RICCOBONO, Mr. Cook does not make such application, and indeed opposes same when such application is made as an absolute right by the undersigned!

Consequently, it is now more than seventy-three (73) months since Puccini was involuntarily dissolved, and still no accounting, although the larceny of Puccini's judicial trust assets is documented and undisputed!

b. The law seems clear that there is no judicial immunity for, inter alia, non-discretionary actions (Tango v. Tulevich, 61 N.Y.2d 34, 40-41, 471 N.Y.S.2d 73, 76-77). When I, on behalf of Puccini, commenced an action against Mr. Justice DAVID B. SAXE for his blatantly violation of the mandatory, non-discretionary, provisions of 22 NYCRR §660.24[f], it was Mr. Cook who was selected to represent Mr. Justice DAVID B. SAXE in this suit brought for the benefit of Puccini.

Mr. Cook, was selected by the above to represent Mr. Justice Saxe, while simultaneously representing Puccini on behalf of the Attorney General!

Mr. Justice Saxe was the original, and most suspect jurist, when the undersigned first communicated with the Attorney General's Office in January 1983, and it was about Mr. Justice Saxe that the undersigned made his most formidable, and confidential, presentation to Mr. Cook.

The undersigned was not therefore surprised, when thereafter, he was convicted, sentenced, and incarcerated by Mr. Justice Saxe, without a trial, the mandatory constitutional prohibitions to the contrary notwithstanding!

c. In every action or proceeding wherein the above are defendants or respondents, for their alleged non-immune conduct, contrary to Puccini's interests, they are represented by Mr. Cook, except where Mr. Cook is also a defendant or respondent.

When Mr. Cook is a defendant or respondent, the attorney of record is Assistant Attorney General Jeffrey I. Slonim, Esq., but Mr. Cook is always present at judicial appearances openly giving Mr. Slonim instructions on behalf of the above!

6. While there are other acts of misconduct which I believe within your bailiwick, they are not mentioned herein, since I do not desire to dilute this particular aspect, which I believe reaches "rock bottom" on everyone's ethical scale!

7a. The above have been given every opportunity to "clean their own house", but instead, the situation simply deteriorates further!

b. Thus, for example, on Martin Luther's Birthday, in November 1984, in a Brief to the Appellate Division, I repeated the words of Oliver Cromwell to the Long Parliament, which I now herein again reiterate, as appropriate:

"You have sat too long here for any good you have been doing. Depart, I say, and let us have done with you. In the name of God, go!"

8a. There is nothing contained herein which is not already within the public domain, in the form of filed judicial papers, and therefore I deal with this matter only in a quasi-confidential manner.

b. You may have, upon mere request, any further information or documents that you may believe necessary, except for sources of confidential information or information wherein the confidential source can be determined.

9. Since the above have made every attempt to impair my First Amendment right to "petition government to redress my grievances", in their control of "access to the courts", I am, and intend to, resort to the other cognitive rights contained in such amendment, by employing, inter alia, the media as my forum for redress!

Respectfully,

GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq.  
51 Davis Avenue,  
White Plains, N.Y. 10605  
(914) 949-2169

GS/bh

- cc: Presiding Justice Francis T. Murphy
- Chief Administrative Judge Joseph W. Bellacosa
- Administrative Judge Xavier C. Riccobono
- Justice Presiding Theodore R. Kupferman
- Attorney General Robert Abrams
- Senior Attorney, David S. Cook, Esq.
- Hon. Milton Mollen



STATE OF NEW YORK  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

AGENCY BUILDING 1

11TH FLOOR

THE NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER EMPIRE STATE PLAZA

ALBANY, NEW YORK 12223

(518) 474-5617

MEMBERS

- MRS. GENE ROBB, CHAIRWOMAN
- JOHN J. BOWER
- DAVID BROMBERG
- HON. CARMEN BEAUCHAMP CIPARICK
- E. GARRETT CLEARY
- DOLORES DELBELLO
- VICTOR A. KOVNER
- HON. WILLIAM J. OSTROWSKI
- HON. ISAAC RUBIN
- HON. FELICE K. SHEA
- JOHN J. SHEEHY
- CLERK
- ALBERT B. LAWRENCE

- GERALD STERN  
ADMINISTRATOR
- ROBERT H. TEMBECKJIAN  
DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR
- STEPHEN F. DOWNS  
CHIEF ATTORNEY

September 18, 1986

CONFIDENTIAL

George Sassower, Esq.  
51 Davis Avenue  
White Plains, New York 10605

Dear Mr. Sassower:

The State Commission on Judicial Conduct has reviewed your letter of complaint dated July 7, 1986. The Commission has asked me to advise you that it has dismissed the complaint.

Very truly yours,

*Albert B. Lawrence*  
 Albert B. Lawrence  
 Clerk of the Commission

ABL:slc

**GEORGE SASSOWER**

ATTORNEY AT LAW  
16 LAKE STREET  
WHITE PLAINS, N. Y. 10603

914-949-2169

September 30, 1988

Commission on Judicial Conduct  
801 Second Avenue  
New York New York 10017

Re: Judge David B. Saxe  
Referee Donald Diamond  
Administrator Xavier C. Riccobono

Gentlemen;

The above awarded fees, or approved disbursements, for Feltman, Karesh & Major, Esqs.; Feltman, Karesh, Major & Farbman, Esqs.; and Rashba & Pokart, from the judicial trust assets of Puccini Clothes, Ltd. of more than one million dollars (\$1,000,00), and as the records of the Office of Court Administration reveals (see annexed letter), they did not comply with Judiciary Law §35-a or 22 NYCRR Part 26.

Referee Donald Diamond does nothing in the Puccini matter without the express or implied approval of Administrator Xavier C. Riccobono.

Although I have a judgment against Puccini, and other substantial monetary interests in same, Judge Saxe prohibited me from participating in the fee awards that he made, and I am not permitted to enter or participate in the proceedings before Referee Donald Diamond.

If Chief Administrator Albert M. Rosenblatt takes no strong affirmative action to compel compliance with the law by the above in this respect, then this complaint should also include His Honor.

Respectfully,

GEORGE SASSOWER

cc: Judge David B. Saxe  
Referee Donald Diamond  
Administrator Xavier C. Riccobono  
Chief Administrator Albert M. Rosenblatt

EX 'E-29"

**GEORGE SASSOWER**

ATTORNEY AT LAW  
16 LAKE STREET  
WHITE PLAINS, N. Y. 10603

914-949-2169

October 10, 1988

Commission on Judicial Conduct  
801 Second Avenue  
New York New York 10017

Re: Judge DAVID B. SAXE

Gentlemen;

1a. There is pending before your body my complaint against the above jurist, dated September 30, 1988, for his failure to comply with the mandatory reporting requirements contained in Judiciary Law §35-a or 22 NYCRR Part 26.

b. When such report is filed, I am absolutely certain that you will find that very substantial fees was awarded by Judge David B. Saxe to Feltman, Karesh, & Major, Esqs. from the judicial trust assets of Puccini Clothes, Ltd., although that law firm did nothing -- absolutely nothing -- intended to benefit the helpless judicial trust or which, in fact, inured to its benefit.

c. Even if the Feltman firm performed substantial services and/or expended monies on behalf of Puccini, 22 NYCRR §660.24[f] unconditionally precluded, in no uncertain terms, any award to the Feltman firm, since they were not appointed to render services by any judge, in accordance with the extant mandatory judicial rules effective during that period of time.

d. Although my client, Hyman Raffe, and I had vested interests in Puccini, which could not be "impaired" by Judge Saxe or any other state official (U.S. Constitution, Article 1, §10[1]), we were not permitted to participate in Saxe's "give-away" festivities.

e. Feltman, Karesh, & Major, Esqs., openly boast that they, with Kreindler & Relkin, P.C. and Citibank, N.A., control the judiciary, and clearly Judge David B. Saxe, is one of their cadre of corrupt judges.

2. Robert Abrams, Esq., the Attorney General of the State of New York, by Senior Attorney David S. Cook, Esq., the statutory fiduciary, had actual knowledge of such unlawful diversion of judicial trust assets, had the power, and indeed the obligation, to intervene (Bus. Corp. Law §1214[a]), but failed to do so, which made the situation even more suspect.

Ex 'E-26"

42  
Oct. 10, 1988

3a. Thereafter, on behalf of Puccini, the judicial trust, I sued Judge Saxe for such diversion of judicial trust assets, and reprehensibly it was Senior Attorney David S. Cook, Esq., who was dragooned to legally represent Judge Saxe, against Puccini, while Cook was simultaneously serving as Puccini's statutory fiduciary.

b. Such action is still pending, and accepting Cook's conflicting representation, is still another basis for my complaint against the above jurist before your commission.

4a. Thereafter, while the above action was still pending, I moved to declare unconstitutional CPLR §5222[b], insofar as it permitted the restraint of "twice" the amount of a judgment, and multiple restraints and other similar in terrorem conduct actionable.

b. Such motion was dragooned by the above, and the Feltman firm, from the calendar of Hon. ALLEN MURRAY MYERS, without my knowledge or consent, to Mr. Justice Saxe, although they both knew that he had a Judiciary Law §14 disqualification, which is still another basis for my complaint herein.

5. Mr. Justice Saxe, then revealed his total disregard for the law, even when of basic constitutional magnitude, by convicting me of non-summary criminal contempt, for bringing on the above motion, and sentencing me to be fined and incarcerated, all without benefit of a trial (Bloom v. Illinois, 391 U.S. 194).

6. Adding to the insult, Judge Saxe publicly directed that such trialess conviction be reported to the Appellate Division for discipline, in manifest violation of Judiciary Law §90[10].

7. Unquestionably, by virtue of the many decisions by your Commission on the subject matters herein, Judge Saxe, is totally unfit to hold judicial office, and he should be ousted, after affording him a hearing -- a hearing this tyrant unconstitutionally denied me.

Most Respectfully,

GEORGE SASSOWER

cc: Judge David B. Saxe





STATE OF NEW YORK  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

AGENCY BUILDING I

11TH FLOOR

THE NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER EMPIRE STATE PLAZA

ALBANY, NEW YORK 12223

(518) 474-5617

MEMBERS

- MRS. GENE ROBB, CHAIRWOMAN
- HON. MYRIAM J. ALTMAN
- HENRY T. BERGER
- JOHN J. BOWER
- HON. CARMEN BEAUCHAMP CIPARICK
- E. GARRETT CLEARY
- DOLORES DELBELLO
- VICTOR A. KOVNER
- HON. WILLIAM J. OSTROWSKI
- HON. ISAAC RUBIN
- JOHN J. SHEEHY
- CLERK
- ALBERT B. LAWRENCE

- GERALD STERN  
ADMINISTRATOR
- ROBERT H. TEMBECKJIAN  
DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR
- STEPHEN F. DOWNS  
CHIEF ATTORNEY

November 18, 1988

CONFIDENTIAL

Mr. George Sassower  
16 Lake Street  
White Plains, New York 10603

Dear Mr. Sassower:

The State Commission on Judicial Conduct has reviewed your letters of complaint dated September 30 and October 2 and 10, 1988. The Commission has asked me to advise you that it has dismissed the complaint.

Judge Rubin did not participate in the consideration of your complaint.

Very truly yours,

Albert B. Lawrence  
Clerk of the Commission

ABL:slc

**GEORGE SASSOWER**

16 LAKE STREET

WHITE PLAINS, N. Y. 10603

914-949-2169

February 10, 1989

Commission on Judicial Conduct  
801 Second Avenue  
New York, New York 100017

Re: Presiding Justice Francis T. Murphy  
Administrator Xavier C. Riccobono

Gentlemen:

Please consider the contents of my letter to Chairman Sol Wachtler, dated February 7, 1989, requesting that His Honor demand and receive the resignations of the above, as a complaint to your agency.

Please acknowledge receipt of the within on a copy of this letter, returning same in the self-addressed stamped envelope.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE SASSOWER

Ex 'E-39"

**GEORGE SASSOWER**

16 LAKE STREET  
WHITE PLAINS, N. Y. 10603

914-949-2169

February 7, 1989

Chairman Sol Wachtler  
Chairman of the Administrative Board,  
Unified Court System  
Court of Appeals Hall  
20 Eagle Street,  
Albany, New York 12207

Dear Mr. Chairman:

1a. Your Honor sought and received the appointment of Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals, which position carried with it the concomitant responsibilities as Chairman of the Administrative Board of the Unified Court System, pursuant to Article 6, §28 of the Constitution of the State of New York.

b. The situation that I summarily describe herein compels that you, Mr. Chairman, demand and receive the immediate resignation of Presiding Justice FRANCIS T. MURPHY and Administrative Judge XAVIER C. RICCOBONO, or else seriously consider Your Honor's own resignation.

2a. Mr. Chairman, in a nutshell, Presiding Justice FRANCIS T. MURPHY and Administrative Judge XAVIER C. RICCOBONO employ their position and influence with the Department Disciplinary Committee, and other governmental agencies, to advance criminal racketeering enterprises.

b. The co-conspirators of Presiding Justice FRANCIS T. MURPHY and Administrative Judge have stolen, raped, ravished, and unlawfully dissipated all of the judicial trust assets of PUCCINI CLOTHES, LTD. ["Puccini"] -- "the judicial fortune cookie" -- leaving nothing for its legitimate creditors and stockholders -- not one cent!

c. Having stolen and unlawfully ravished all of Puccini's trust assets for their own personal benefit, the "Murphy-Riccobono entourage" have extorted and are extorting further funds from HYMAN RAFFE ["Raffe"], one of Puccini's stockholders.

d. In Raffe's words "they are bleeding me to death"!

Chairman Sol Wachtler

February 7, 1989

3a. The facts recently made the subject of media attention is but a small aspect of much broader unethical, unconstitutional, and criminal scenarios involving the Presiding Justice of the First Judicial Department and Administrative Judge of the Supreme Court of New York County.

b. It is not simply a situation of interference by the Presiding Justice with the disciplinary process on behalf of those who have the "inside track", but a wholesale grant of disciplinary immunity to those engaged with the Presiding Justice, as co-conspirators, in criminal racketeering adventures.

c. When necessary, as will be demonstrated, the disciplinary process is employed to punish or threaten to punish the victims, in an attempt to compel them to succumb and remain silent about judicial misconduct.

4a. These serious charges require, even when summarily set forth, some specificity, which I do here include.

b. If further specificity is required, a simple request is all that is necessary.

c. Since copies of this letter is being extensively distributed, including to the lay, certain legal principles and material are included in this brief presentation.

5a. Mr. Chairman, essential to the criminal scenarios herein described, is the absolute and unbridled control by Presiding Justice FRANCIS T. MURPHY over the Department Disciplinary Committee, as well as other agencies of government, judicial and otherwise.

b. Since the present public controversy revolves around the Department Disciplinary Committee, its Chief Counsel, and his assistant, I emphasize that particular aspect.

6a. Faced with front page media disclosures of judicial nepotism (N.Y. Times, 7/26/77), Presiding Justice Murphy announced that remedial action would be taken.

Chairman Sol Wachtler

February 7, 1989

b. This resulted in his enactment, for the First Department, of 22 NYCRR §660.24, which provided:

"On and after the effective date of this section [Sept. 19, 1977] no order or judgment providing for the appointment of a referee, receiver, person designated to accept service ... or person designated to perform services for a receiver such as but not limited to an agent, accountant, attorney, auctioneer, and appraiser ('appointee'), shall be entered, unless and until the following has been completed: ... (f) Any appointment made without following the procedures provided in this section, shall be null and of no effect and no person so appointed shall be entitled to recover any compensation for the services rendered or claimed to have been rendered."

c. The aforementioned mandatory rule was superimposed on Judiciary Law §35a, enacted in 1967, which required the jurists involved to file public available reports on all fees awarded.

d. Additionally, in all American jurisdictions, where a receiver is judicially appointed, there must be a publicly filed accounting for his stewardship.

e. In New York, such accounting must be filed "at least once a year" (22 NYCRR §202.52[e]).

f. The Attorney General of the State of New York has been designated by the legislature as the statutory fiduciary for all involuntarily dissolved corporations, and he has been given extensive discretionary powers (e.g. Bus. Corp. Law §1214[a]), and some mandatory duties (e.g. Bus. Corp. Law §1216[a]), in order to vouchsafe such assets.

g. Included in the mandatory obligations, permitting no discretion whatsoever, is the Attorney General's "duty" to make application to settle such filed accounting and distribute the assets, if not voluntarily performed by the court-appointed receiver within eighteen (18) months (Bus. Corp. Law §1216[a]).

48  
February 7, 1989

h. However, in the jurisdictional bailiwick of Presiding Justice FRANCIS T. MURPHY there is a manifestly unlawful, unethical, and corrupt understanding between the Presiding Justice and ROBERT ABRAMS, the Attorney General, wherein Robert Abrams will betray his fiduciary obligations, even those duties which are mandatory in nature.

i. Unquestionably, whether the obligations of the fiduciary are mandatory or discretionary, all fiduciaries, including Robert Abrams, owe their trusts "undivided loyalty".

j. Presiding Justice Francis T. Murphy has corrupted Robert Abrams to actively betray all his statutory trusts arising out of involuntary dissolutions.

k. The scenario with respect to Puccini is but one example of an unlawful, indeed criminal, policy understanding between ROBERT ABRAMS, the constable, and FRANCIS T. MURPHY, a member of the suspect group.

7a. Puccini -- "the judicial fortune cookie" -- was involuntarily dissolved on June 4, 1980, its assets and affairs becoming custodia legis.

b. Although dissolved and helpless, Puccini nevertheless remains a "person" within the meaning of the XIV Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, enjoying certain basic constitutional and legal rights, not essentially dissimilar to those held by viable corporations.

c. The stockholders and creditors of Puccini, and other involuntarily dissolved corporations, also have constitutional and legal rights in its assets and affairs.

d. However, as against the judiciary and its appointees, the rights of stockholders and creditors generally have little effective significance.

e. It is only the Attorney General who has any "clout" to protect these judicial trust assets from the sometimes insatiable monetary appetites of corrupt members of the judiciary and their appointees.

f. Thus the corruption of Robert Abrams, the constable, augurs serious and significant ethical, legal, and constitutional problems.

Chairman Sol Wachtler

February 7, 1989

8. The bottom lines as a result of being involuntarily dissolved in the bailiwick of Presiding Justice FRANCIS T. MURPHY and Administrative Judge XAVIER C. RICCOBONO, with emphasis on the disciplinary procedures controlled by Presiding Justice FRANCIS T. MURPHY, are as follows:

a. Puccini's judicial trust assets were made the subject of massive larceny engineered by the law firm of KREINDLER & RELKIN, P.C. ["K&R"], with the cooperation of the law firm of NACHAMIE, KIRSCHNER, LEVINE & SPIZZ, P.C. ["NKLS"].

b. LEE FELTMAN, Esq. ["Feltman"], the court-appointed receiver, agreed that he would not disclose such massive larceny of judicial trust assets or make any attempt at recovery thereof, in exchange for which all the remaining tangible trust assets would be transferred to him.

c. Since Feltman's maximum fee is determined by statute (Bus. Corp. Law §1217), the transfer of such remaining tangible assets was to be made to his law firm, FELTMAN, KARESH, MAJOR & FARBMAN, Esqs. ["FKM&F"], although they would do nothing to advance the interests of the helpless judicial trust.

d. Indeed, FKM&F, who with K&R, openly boast that they "control" the judiciary, was never appointed by any judge or judicial officer, under 22 NYCRR §660.24 or otherwise.

e. Consequently, although the law requires that an accounting must be filed "at least once a year" (22 NYCRR §202.52[e]), in the more than eight (8) years, eight (8) months since Puccini was involuntarily dissolved, not a single accounting has been filed -- not one!

f. Although Bus. Corp. Law §1216[a] mandates that the Attorney General make application in the event settlement and distribution does not take place within eighteen (18) months, not a single application has been made by the corrupted ROBERT ABRAMS in the more than one hundred four (104) months that have elapsed since Puccini was involuntarily dissolved -- not one!

g. Although the court-appointed receiver must file with the County Clerk and Attorney General, by each and every February 1, a verified statement "showing assets received" (Bus. Corp. Law §1207(C)[3]), the few times such verified statement has been filed, such item has been left incomplete and/or perjuroniously set forth.

Chairman Sol Wachtler

February 7, 1989

h. Although 22 NYCRR §660.24[f] mandates that neither FKM&F nor RASHBA & POKART ["R&P"] receive anything, there was transferred to them approximately one million dollars (\$1,000,000), or the balance of Puccini's tangible assets, for their purported services on Puccini's behalf, when in fact they only betrayed this judicial trust.

i. Although Judiciary Law §35a provides that all fees awarded be publicly filed by the jurists involved, not a single report has been filed -- not one!

j. For a course of conduct which included massive larceny of judicial trust assets, perjury, betrayal of clients and trusts, criminal extortion, corruption of members of the judiciary and officials, and other similar conduct, did the Department Disciplinary Committees, controlled by Presiding Justice FRANCIS T. MURPHY, punish K&R, Feltman, FKM&F, and/or NKLS -- "the criminals with law degrees"?

k. No, instead the victims were punished!

l. The victims are punished by disciplinary proceedings and otherwise for nothing more than exposing the conduct of "the criminals with law degrees", their cadre of corrupt judges, including Presiding Justice FRANCIS T. MURPHY and Administrator XAVIER C. RICCOBONO, and compelled to pay "extortion".

9a. Obviously, in view of the aforementioned massive larceny and plundering of judicial trust assets, no accounting can ever be filed, nor any verified §1207 statement ever be filed, the mandates of the law notwithstanding.

b. Consequently, a "reign of judicial terror" had to be imposed upon those who exposed this criminal racketeering practice and compel them to submit to a "code of silence".

c. Such "reign of judicial terror", included disciplinary proceedings punishing the attorneys involved in such exposure of judicial misconduct, or threatening to impose such disciplinary punishment, in the event they refused to betray the legitimate interests of their clients in Puccini, and be silent about the matter.



February 7, 1989

10. The general scenarios were as follows:

a. In every American jurisdiction, state and federal, one cannot be convicted of a crime without a trial or opportunity for same, including for the crime of non-summary criminal contempt (Nye v. U.S., 313 U.S. 33; Bloom v. Illinois, 391 U.S. 194), nor can anyone be placed in criminal jeopardy more than once.

b. Three (3) weeks after Mr. Justice MARTIN EVANS exonerated Raffe, who had the largest financial interest in Puccini, and myself, of non-summary criminal contempt, the proceedings were reinstated, but this time Administrator XAVIER C. RICCOBONO had same dragooned to Referee DONALD DIAMOND, his ex parte appointee.

c. At the time such proceedings were ex parte dragooned to Referee Diamond, both Administrator and Referee Diamond were active party defendants and respondents in several lawsuits instituted by Raffe and myself for their involvement in non-immune corrupt activities.

d. Without a trial or opportunity for same, and ignoring the verdict of Mr. Justice MARTIN EVANS with its decisive "double jeopardy" implications, Referee Diamond found us both to be guilty of non-summary criminal contempt, and in addition to heavy fines, Raffe was threatened with incarceration for five (5) years and eleven (11) months, if he did not succumb.

e. For myself, I chose to be incarcerated, irrespective to the term imposed, under such trialess procedures.

f. Contemporaneously, also without a trial or opportunity for same, in one document, Mr. Justice ALVIN F. KLEIN, convicted (1) Raffe, (2) myself, and (3) SAM POLUR, Esq. ["Polur"] of non-summary criminal contempt, and sentenced each of us to be incarcerated for thirty (30) days.

The "crimes" were for allegedly commencing a lawsuit against Administrator Riccobono, Referee Diamond, K&R, and FKM&F, for "judicial fixing" and similar activities.

(1) Raffe paid millions of dollars in cash, and gave other considerations to "criminals with law degrees", and was never incarcerated under the Referee Diamond or Justice Klein trialess convictions.

Chairman Sol Wachtler

February 7, 1989

Some of the other considerations he was compelled to give in order not to be incarcerated under such trialess convictions, were general releases to "the criminals with law degrees", Referee Diamond, and the Justices of the Supreme Court.

Thus, Justice Klein and Referee Diamond convicted Raffe, at the instance of "the criminals with law degrees", but for the payment of millions of dollars and general releases to them, Raffe did not spend a minute of the six (6) years in jail.

Raffe, is still paying monies under the aforementioned extorted agreements, and in his words "they are bleeding me to death", but as long as he keeps paying he will not be incarcerated.

(2) Polur refused to submit, served his imposed time of incarceration under the trialess Justice Klein conviction.

Thereafter, upon the institution of disciplinary proceedings against him by Murphy's Departmental Disciplinary Committee, based upon such trialess, manifestly unconstitutional conviction, Polur left the Puccini scene, and such proceedings were placed in abeyance to insure his non-return to the Puccini scene.

Instructively, Polur was convicted and incarcerated, without a trial, under an uncorroborated perjurious affidavit of FKM&F, for purportedly serving a summons, which even they do not deny was a false assertion.

(3) I refused to submit, refuse to remain silent, refuse to pay extortion in any form, and without being permitted to controvert the legal or factual validity of these trialess convictions was disbarred, after almost forty (40) years of the continuous practice of the law.

I consider myself singularly "honored" by each and every one of my trialess conviction, and "honored" by being disbarred, rather than betray the legitimate interests of my client, or have any part of such criminal racketeering adventures.

My bank deposited assets have been seized under "phantom" judgments, my personal cases stayed, and repeated orders have been issued by Referee Diamond to the Sheriff of Westchester County, directing him to "break into my home", "seize all word processing equipment and software", and "inventory" my possession.

Chairman Sol Wachtler

February 7, 1989

Mr. Chairman, as you see, I will not be silenced, no matter what the personal consequences may be!

11a. Mr. Chairman, recently, on October 26, 1988, Referee Donald Diamond "approved" a "final accounting" for Puccini by Feltman.

b. There is no accounting, final or otherwise, it is "phantom", as a United States Judge, a federal official, and a member of the media can verify.

c. Annexed hereto are written demands that have been made to Feltman, R&P, Referee Diamond, and Robert Abrams, that they produce for to Your Honor for Your Honor's personal examination such accounting -- and I assure you that it cannot be produced by anyone of them or anyone else.

d. I have also annexed other demands that agencies of government, including the Office of Court Administration, produce other documents to support my assertions herein.

e. These documents, when produced, will reveal to you, the media, and the public that for judicial trusts and estates the forums controlled by Presiding Justice FRANCIS T. MURPHY are "judicial infernos", where they must abandoned all hope.

f. For those, like myself, who insist that legitimate interests of clients be protected with "zeal", the courts are simply "Unfit for Human Litigation".

12. One further point so that the unwary, like myself, are not trapped by obedience to the Code of Professional Responsibility.

a. Under pains of disciplinary punishment, the attorney is compelled to "whistle blow" (DR 1-103), which is otherwise a constitutional right (Article 1, §8, §9 of the N.Y.S. Constitution, and a societal obligation.

b. However when such confidential information about the larceny and plundering of trust assets is given to ROBERT ABRAMS, the statutory fiduciary, he and his office employ such confidential information when he defends the "Murphy racketeering entourage".

Chairman Sol Wachtler

February 7, 1989

c. Thus, for example, when I, on Puccini's behalf, sued Mr. Justice DAVID B. SAXE for disobeying a non-discretionary mandate, by giving substantial fees to FKM&F and R&P (which Judge Saxe also failed to report), it was defended by Senior Attorney DAVID B. COOK, Puccini's assigned statutory watchdog, while he was simultaneously designated by ROBERT ABRAMS to vouchsafe Puccini's trust assets.

d. Indeed, all litigation on behalf of Puccini, including that against Presiding Justice FRANCIS T. MURPHY, Administrator XAVIER C. RICCOBONO, Referee DONALD DIAMOND, and the Office of Court Administration, is defended by Cook, while simultaneously he purports to be Puccini's statutory guardian.

e. Obviously, Cook brings to such litigation all the confidential material I gave him personally, on behalf of the Attorney General, to defeat the interests of his statutory ward.

13. In short, Presiding Justice FRANCIS T. MURPHY must go, and the rule of law vindicated, and I so demand, Mr. Chairman.

Most Respectfully,

GEORGE SASSOWER

55



STATE OF NEW YORK  
COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

801 SECOND AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NY 10017  
(212) 949-8860

GERALD STERN  
ADMINISTRATOR  
ROBERT H. TEMBECKJIAN  
DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR

MEMBERS

- MRS. GENE ROBB, CHAIRWOMAN
- HON. MYRIAM J. ALTMAN
- HENRY T. BERGER
- JOHN J. BOWER
- HON. CARMEN BEAUCHAMP CIPARICK
- E. GARRETT CLEARY
- DOLORES DELBELLO
- VICTOR A. KOVNER
- HON. WILLIAM J. OSTROWSKI
- HON. ISAAC RUBIN
- JOHN J. SHEEHY
- CLERK
- ALBERT B. LAWRENCE

February 22, 1989

Mr. George Sassower  
16 Lake Street  
White Plains, New York 10603

Dear Mr. Sassower:

This will acknowledge receipt by the State Commission on Judicial Conduct of your letter dated February 10, 1989.

Very truly yours,

Lee Kiklier  
Administrative Assistant

LK:fb

EX "E-36"

**GEORGE SASSOWER**

16 LAKE STREET  
WHITE PLAINS, N. Y. 10603

914-949-2169

February 27, 1989

Commission on Judicial Conduct  
801 Second Avenue  
17th Floor  
New York, New York 10017

Certified Mail  
P 866 238 859

Re: Presiding Justice Francis T. Murphy

Dear Sir:

Since I probably have given your agency more complaints, with "hard evidence", than anyone else about the misconduct of the above, I was surprised to read in New York Newsday of Friday, February 24, 1989, that you have begun your investigation, but that you have not communicated with me.

Are you planning another whitewash?

Within the next few days, I will summarize my assertions of misconduct against the above, but in the meantime, I assert.

1. During the tenure of Michael A. Gentile, Esq., at the direction of Presiding Justice Francis T. Murphy, complaint letters against his cronies were physically destroyed or secreted.

2. As my complaint letter concerning William F. Jackson, Esq., a copy of which is here enclosed, reveals, that practice has continued since Mr. Gentile left his position.

3. The enemies of Presiding Justice Francis T. Murphy were prosecuted, even when the prosecution had no merit.

4. At the Departmental Disciplinary Committee level, where everyone involved were appointed or approved by the Presiding Justice, matters concerning the cronies of Presiding Justice Murphy could be "fixed".

Ex "E-4"

Commission on Judicial Conduct

February 27, 1989

5. Presiding Justice Francis T. Murphy was engaged in criminal racketeering adventures involving the larceny and plundering of judicial trust assets and other criminal activities.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE SASSOWER

cc: Chief Judge Sol Wachtler  
New York Newsday  
Att: Mr. Leonard Levitt  
Mr. Anthony M. DeStefano

Gerald Stern, Esq.  
State Commission on Judicial Conduct  
801 Second Avenue  
New York, NY 10017

March 22, 1994

Re: Presiding Justice Francis T. Murphy

Dear Mr. Stern,

I would appreciate it if you could advise me whether any part of the 1989 hearings and report concerning Presiding Justice Francis T. Murphy are available for public inspection in view of the fact that the Commission made public disclosure of some aspects of same.

My own view was and is that since I, personally, had relevant evidence on the subject that I should have been called upon to present such evidence and/or that you should, at least, have informed the Commission members of that fact.

Significantly, my present complaint against Mr. Justice Theodore R. Kupferman revolves around the perjurious affidavit of Donald F. Schneider which caused the suspension of Sam Polur, Esq. (DDC v. Polur, 173 A.D.2d 82, 579 N.Y.S.2d 3 [1st Dept.-1992]), and which states that formal disciplinary proceedings were commenced on or about April 25, 1979.

Those concocted charges by DDC against Mr. Polur, insofar as Puccini Clothes was concerned, I can show, were instigated by or on behalf of Presiding Justice Murphy, and under the circumstances I question whether you will make a fair presentation of my present complaint to the Commission.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE SASSOWER



April 13, 1994

Gerald Stern, Esq.  
Commission on Judicial Conduct  
801 Second Avenue,  
New York, New York, 10017

Re: Associate Justice JOSEPH P. SULLIVAN  
Appellate Division: First Department

Dear Mr. Stern,

1a. This complaint against Mr. Justice JOSEPH P. SULLIVAN ["Sullivan"] is bottomed on His Honor's failure to: (a) exercise his mandatory administrative and citizen's obligation to remedy "extortion" payments made and being made by HYMAN RAFFE ["Raffe"], which now "exceeds \$2,000,000"; and (b) the failure to file disciplinary charges against, inter alia, DONALD F. SCHNEIDER, Esq. ["Schneider"].

b. Although I have no direct evidence that Mr. Justice Sullivan, on or about July 2, 1985, had specific knowledge that there was an intent to "extort" substantial monies from Raffe to avoid incarceration under a conviction for non-summary criminal contempt, His Honor knew that there was an intention to "extort".

2. Although I limit this complaint against Mr. Justice Sullivan on the aforementioned issues, your Commission obviously is at liberty to find other acts of misconduct as a legitimate basis for sanctions and/or make its own reference to the DEPARTMENTAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE ["DDC"].

3a. There was presented to Mr. Justice Sullivan a stay application, dated July 2, 1985, on behalf of (a) myself, (b) SAM POLUR, Esq. ["Polur"] and (c) Raffe, against Mr. Justice ALVIN F. KLEIN ["Klein"] and Mr. Justice DAVID B. SAXE ["Saxe"].

b. Mr. Justice Saxe had convicted me of non-summary criminal contempt, imposed a fine and sentenced me to be incarcerated for 10 days.

c. Mr. Justice Klein, in one document, had convicted all three, fined each of us, and sentenced each of us to be incarcerated for 30 days.

d. Each of the aforementioned convictions for non-summary criminal contempt were rendered without a trial, without the opportunity for a trial, without any confrontation rights, in absentia, without due process, without the right of allocution, without any live testimony in support thereof, and without any constitutional or legal waiver of the aforementioned rights.

Ex "E-69"

4. However, the basis of the application before Mr. Justice Sullivan, was for a Writ of Prohibition etc., requesting a hearing on the issue of equal protection of the laws, staying incarceration pending same, and a stay of incarceration because of the "double jeopardy" prohibition.

5a. In a complaint dated May 15, 1985, Mr. Justice Sullivan was a named party defendant (Puccini Clothes, Ltd. v. Francis T. Murphy et al., SDNY-85Civ.3712 [WCC]).

b. In another complaint dated May 22, 1985, Mr. Justice Sullivan was also a named party defendant (Hyman Raffe, George Sassower, Sam Polur, et al., v. Xavier C. Riccobono, et al., SDNY 85Civ3927 [WCC]).

c. Thus, Mr. Justice Sullivan, on July 2, 1985, actually knew of the larceny of the judicial trust assets of PUCCINI CLOTHES, LTD. ["Puccini"], and the criminal activity of, *inter alia*, KREINDLER & RELKIN, P.C. ["K&R"] and FELTMAN, KARESH & MAJOR, Esqs. ["FK&M"], thereafter FELTMAN, KARESH & MAJOR & FARBMAN, Esqs. ["FKM&F"], including the corruption of jurists and officials.

d. In my view, Mr. Justice Sullivan was, at that time, bound to act, which included reporting the K&R-FK&M activities to the DDC.

5a. During the stay application proceedings, and to induce Mr. Justice Sullivan to deny same, particularly as to Polur, Schneider advised His Honor, that he had been informed by HOWARD M. BERGSON, Esq. ["Bergson"], that while Raffe was willing to finance the Puccini litigation, that he would succumb if faced with a term of incarceration.

b. Schneider made it clear to Mr. Justice Sullivan that the only way they could compel Raffe, a man then over 70, to succumb was to have his attorneys of record, to wit., myself and Polur simultaneously incarcerated, while they negotiated with Raffe.

6a. Mr. Justice MARTIN EVANS ["Evans"], after a massive, two year long, submission had by Order entered January 4, 1985, failed to find either Raffe or myself guilty of non-summary criminal contempt, triggering "double jeopardy" prohibitions, as Mr. Justice Sullivan was aware from the stay application.

b. Polur, who had served a summons on Schneider on April 1, 1985, which was admitted, was not adjudicated guilty by Mr. Justice Saxe, triggering a "double jeopardy" prohibition in his favor for similar conduct, as Mr. Justice Sullivan was also aware.

c. However, for a similar summons, which Polur did not serve on April 10, 1985, or any other time, on Schneider, Mr. Justice Klein found Polur guilty of non-summary criminal contempt.

7a. The Murphy-Riccobono scheme, as expressed in the Order of Mr. Justice Klein was obvious. Incarcerate both Polur and myself, and compel Raffe to succumb in the absence of his incarcerated attorneys.

61  
April 13, 1994

b. Any doubt on the subject was placed at rest, as I articulated this depraved and demented scheme before Mr. Justice Sullivan.

c(1) Mr. Justice Sullivan was also aware, for I articulated same, that Polur never served the summons on April 10, 1985 on Schneider, nor was there any reason for my request that he do so.

(2) On April 1, 1985, Polur served the summons in the FK&M offices, because I had to remain in the vehicle being driven.

(3) On April 10, 1985, which was served in a courtroom I, not being a party to the action, was legally able to serve the summons on Schneider without any assistance from Polur, who was not even in the immediate scene at the time.

8. Mr. Justice Sullivan, in his own way, made it eminently clear that Presiding Justice Murphy desired that we both be incarcerated, and consequently His Honor denied the stay.

9a. Now, nine years after Polur was incarcerated by reason of a perjurious affidavit by Schneider, and based upon such trialess incarceration, he has been suspended (Departmental Disciplinary Committee v. Polur, 173 A.D.2d 82, 579 N.Y.S.2d 3 [1st Dept.-1992]), for an act never committed by him.

b. Now, nine years later, "more than \$2,000,000" has been "extorted" from Raffe in favor of FK&M and K&R to avoid incarceration under a criminal conviction.

10a. I submit, at a minimum, Mr. Justice Sullivan is obligated to file a complaint against Schneider with the DDC and take some action to divest K&R-FK&M of their booty, including the monies "extorted" from Raffe.

b. I entertain little doubt that if Mr. Justice Sullivan's actions were committed by a town or village jurist, he would be removed from office by your Commission, with dispatch.

Most Respectfully,  
GEORGE SASSOWER

cc: Mr. Justice Joseph P. Sullivan

100-12-15-62

May 23, 1994

Gerald Stern, Esq.  
Commission on Judicial Conduct  
801 Second Avenue,  
New York, New York, 10017

Re: Associate Justice JOSEPH P. SULLIVAN  
Appellate Division: First Department

Dear Mr. Stern,

This communication is with respect to my April 13, 1994 complaint against Mr. Justice JOSEPH P. SULLIVAN.

On March 22, 1994, I filed a complaint with the Department Disciplinary Committee against Donald F. Schneider, Esq. (Docket No. 94.1019), a copy of which is enclosed.

In Mr. Schneider's response, he does not deny any of the allegations set forth in my complaint, including: (i) that his sworn affidavit that Sam Polur, Esq., served him on April 10, 1985 with a summons was perjurious; and (ii) during the incarceration of Mr. Polur and myself, they threatened our client, Hyman Raffe, with incarceration unless he succumbed, which he did, and agreed, inter alia, to pay "extortion" monies, which Mr. Raffe, in an unsolicited affidavit, swore "exceeded \$2,000,000."

These check "extortion" payments, as well as the written agreement under which they were made, are available.

Most Respectfully,

GEORGE SASSOWER

cc: Mr. Justice Joseph P. Sullivan

EX 'E-66"