

From: Nora Renzulli
To: Sherrill Spatz
Date: 6/26/2006 10:37 AM
Subject: Status

Dear Ms. Spatz:

On June 5, 2006, Richmond County Acting Supreme Court Judge Barbara Panepinto reserved decision on my motion for immediate transfer to a court outside of the Staten Island/Brooklyn Judicial District.

Judge Panepinto was the product of the personal selection of Judge Jeffrey Sunshine outside of the neutral assignment system. Judge Sunshine did his best to infect Judge Panepinto with his bias against a whistleblower.

Somehow evading the random assignment process was considered ok in spite of my objections to the Office of Court Administration. Under the circumstances, now that there may in fact be movement of my case to another judge, let's follow the principle of avoiding the neutral assignment system again. Can't those of us who care about a fair and impartial decision finally in my case rely on the old adage that what is good for the goose is good for the gander.

The defrauding Judge Sunshine who tried to bury me for exposing the fraud on the court handpicked the defrauding and compliant Judge Panepinto who has avoided dealing with the issues, dragged it out, farmed out half the case, prevented a one family one judge decision, and "lost" the court papers on the fraud argument. She is complicit in the fraud on the court. She should not be allowed to pick her successor the way Judge Sunshine picked her.

Is there a fearless, fair and impartial judge who clearly understands that he or she will be backed up and protected by the conscience of the court system from any reprisals by the judges and lawyers finally held accountable? Please don't send the case to someone who will assume it is going to be appealed anyway so why take any firm stand. Please reread the March 22, 2005 Report of Dr. Robert Goldstein who said the destructive rounds of appeals are very detrimental to the children. There is no reason why there cannot be an effective fraud fighting precedent issued by a trial court on my case as long as the next judge is picked for his or her courage and wisdom.

My case can go anywhere in the State. There is no need for further appearance by the parties. Everything going back on both the matrimonial in Supreme and the Article 78 in Supreme against Judge McElrath are judicially noticed. But I shouldn't have to wait another half lifetime for a decision.

The system has to fix what it broke even if it means developing a whole new mindset about what courts can and should do to remedy the psychological effects of extrinsic fraud of the magnitude which occurred in my case. The system has to own up to what it has done to me, to my family, and to my reputation, and create a remedy in a therapeutic jurisprudential decision that has a fighting chance of mitigating the damage and detoxifying my children.

The long leash being given to Judge Panepinto to sit on her decision does not bode well. My kids and I deserve better. We have been through enough.

Respectfully submitted,

Nora Renzulli