CENTER for JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY, INC.

P.O. Box 69, Gedney Station White Plains, New York 10605-0069

Tel. (914) 421-1200 Fax (914) 428-4994

E-Mail: judgewatch@aol.com Web site: www.judgewatch.org

Elena Ruth Sassower, Coordinator

<u>BY HAND</u>

February 16, 2001

Steven M. Zeidman, Executive Director The Fund for Modern Courts 351 West 54th Street New York, New York 10019

RE:

Amicus and other assistance in the appeal of the public interest Article 78 proceeding, Elena Ruth Sassower, Coordinator of the Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc., acting pro bono publico, against Commission on Judicial Conduct of the State of New York (NY Co. #108551/99; Appellate Division, First Dept. Cal #2000-5434)

Dear Mr. Zeidman:

As previously discussed, including following your testimony at the December 7th hearing of the Commission on Fiduciary Appointments, this is to request *amicus* and other assistance of the Fund for Modern Courts in the above-entitled public interest appeal against the New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct, sued for corruption.

As you will see from the enclosed Appellant's Brief and Appendix, this appeal not only underscores the *sine qua non* of judicial independence: a fair and impartial tribunal, free of such external considerations as a complete lack of judicial tenure¹, but does so in the context of a case whose object is to vindicate the public's right to an effective state judicial disciplinary mechanism.

Examination of the Brief will convince you that the Commission has NO legitimate defense to this appeal – and that the *only* way it can survive the evidence of its corruption, established by the record of the Article 78 proceeding, is if the Appellate Division, First Department replicates the lower court's subversion of judicial independence by fashioning a factually fabricated, legally insupportable decision.

1

The Fund's involvement will ensure that this appeal is decided as it should be: on the facts and the *law*. This is what judicial independence is all about. The Fund's assistance in building a coalition of organizational support and in garnering media coverage for the important issues of governmental integrity the appeal presents will make it more difficult for the Appellate Division to "throw" the appeal by a fraudulent judicial decision – as it did last November in deciding another appeal involving the Commission, *Michael Mantell v. New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct* (NY Co. #108655/99, Appellate Division, First Dept. Cal. #2000-3833)².

A copy of the Appellate Division's decision in *Mantell v. Commission*, as reported by the November 20, 2000 <u>New York Law Journal</u>, is enclosed, annexed to CJA's December 1, 2000 memorandum to the Commission and its attorney, the State Attorney General, calling upon them to move to vacate that decision for fraud.

The status of the instant appeal is that the Attorney General requested additional time to respond to my Appellant's Brief. The January 11th stipulation I signed, giving the Attorney General until March 23rd and myself until April 27th, puts the appeal over to the June term. A copy of the stipulation is enclosed. Also enclosed is my January 10th letter to Attorney General Spitzer, calling upon him to disavow his representation of the Commission and to join in support of the appeal and in a motion to ensure that it is heard by a fair and impartial tribunal. Additionally, enclosed is my January 11th letter transmitting my faxed signature on the stipulation.

Should you wish to see the lower court record in the appeal -- encompassing the lower court record in *Mantell v. Commission* - or the appellate papers in *Mantell v. Commission*, including my dispositive motion to intervene therein -- I would be pleased to transmit them forthwith.

I look forward to meeting with you to discuss the ways in which the Fund can advance both judicial independence and accountability by this historic public interest case.

Yours for a quality judiciary,

Etena R.G. Doosol

ELENA RUTH SASSOWER, Coordinator Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)

Enclosures

² The lower court decision in *Mantell v. Commission* appears at 299-307 of the Appendix, with CJA's analysis thereof appearing at 321-334.