

COMPLAINT FORM

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF THE SECOND CIRCUIT

COMPLAINT AGAINST JUDICIAL OFFICER UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 372 (C)

INSTRUCTIONS:

- (a) All questions on this form must be answered.
- (b) A separate complaint form must be filled out for each judicial officer complained against.
- (c) Submit the correct number of copies of this form and the statement of facts, limited to 5 pages (5 sides). For a complaint against:
- a court of appeals judge --- 3 copies
a district court judge or magistrate --- 4 copies
a bankruptcy judge --- 5 copies
- (For further information see Rule 2(e)).
- (d) Service on the judicial officer will be made by the Clerk's office. (For further information See Rule 3(a)(1)).
- (e) Mail this form, the statement of facts and the appropriate number of copies to the Clerk, United States Court of Appeals, United States Courthouse, Foley Square, New York, New York 10007.

1. Complainant's name: George SASSOWER
Address: 16 Lake Street
White Plains, N.Y. 10603
Daytime telephone (with area code): (914) 949-2169
2. Judge or magistrate complained about:
Name: Chief Judge Charles L. Bryant
Court: Southern Dist. of New York

3. Does this complaint concern the behavior of the judge or magistrate in a particular lawsuit or lawsuits?

[] Yes [] No

If "yes," give the following information about each lawsuit (use the reverse side if there is more than one):

Court: _____

Docket number: _____

Docket numbers of any appeals to the Second Circuit: _____

Did a lawyer represent you?

[] Yes [] No

If "yes" give the name, address, and telephone number of your lawyer:

4. Have you previously filed any complaints of judicial misconduct or disability against any judge or magistrate?

[] Yes [] No

If "Yes," give the docket number of each complaint.

87-8503

5. You should attach a statement of facts on which your complaint is based, see rule 2(b), and

EITHER

(1) check the box and sign the form. You do not need a notary public if you check this box.

[] I declare under penalty of perjury that:

(1) I have read rules 1 and 2 of the Rules of the Judicial Council of the Second Circuit Governing Complaints of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, and

(2) The statements made in this complaint and attached statement of facts are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

(signature)

Executed on _____
(date)

George Sastrowel
Oct. 10, 1990

OR

(2) check the box below and sign this form in the presence of a notary public;

[] I swear (affirm) that--

(1) I have read rules 1 and 2 of the Rules of the Judicial Council of the Second Circuit Governing Complaints of Judicial Misconduct or Disability, and

(2) The statements made in this complaint and attached statement of facts are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

(signature)

Executed on _____

(date)

Sworn and subscribed to
before me _____

(Notary Public)

My commission expires:

Chief Judge CHARLES L. BRIEANT
28 U.S.C. §372[c]

Chief Judge CHARLES L. BRIEANT constitutes a clear and present danger to the administration of justice and his conduct will certainly bring this circuit in disrepute unless decisive remedial action is taken.

1. As an example of the "fixing" practices of Chief Judge Brieant, were the events of November and December of 1987, whose effects are still operational:

In or about November of 1987, complainant "caught", once again, U.S. District Judge WILLIAM C. CONNER ["Conner"] of "fixing" a judicial proceeding.

This time the judicial proceeding was pending before U.S. District Judge CHARLES S. HAIGHT, JR. ["Haight"].

Indeed copies of such Conner "fixing" memorandum to Judge Haight, "Bill to Terry", were circulated to others as well, including Judge Brieant, Judge GERARD L. GOETTEL ["Goettel"], and Bankruptcy Judge HOWARD SCHWARTZBERG ["Schwartzberg"].

Such Conner "fixing memorandum" was distributed on behalf of FELTMAN, KARESH, MAJOR & FARBMAN, Esqs. ["FKM&F"] and KREINDLER & RELKIN, P.C. ["K&R"] -- "the criminals with law degrees" -- after an ex parte meeting with FKM&F, on behalf of themselves and their co-conspirators, with respect to the matter pending before Judge Haight.

As a consequence thereof, as a matter of course, complainant amended his complaint to add Judge Conner, "The Fixor", as a Dennis v. Sparks (449 U.S. 24 [1980]) defendant.

Since complainant was very familiar with the Dennis v. Sparks (supra) holding, he did not include Judge Haight, "The Fixee", as a party defendant.

By an ex parte procedure, in which complainant was not involved nor given notice, Judge Brieant apparently was requested to reassign such matter from Judge Haight to another jurist, and for no other purpose.

This should have been performed ministerially by the "wheel" selection method, but instead, without notice, without opportunity to controvert, without any "due process", before or after, without anything, Judge Brieant seized upon the occasion to dismiss, without prejudice, the Judge Haight case, which at all times, both before and after, was before Judge Haight and no one else.

The Brieant published "diatribe", in justification thereof, was based upon the false and contrived premise that:

"Judge Haight himself has been added to the case as a defendant [by plaintiff] ..".

Thus, based upon such false and contrived premise, by a "no due process" ukase, which Judge Brieant himself knew was false and lawless, Judge Brieant could further state that the:

"inclusion of the assigned judge [Judge Haight] as an additional defendant had the effect, and probably the purpose of disrupting the orderly judicial decisional process of the district court."

Still without any due process procedures, Judge Brieant stated:

"The Clerk of this Court is hereby ORDERED not to accept for filing any paper or proceeding or motion or new case of any kind presented by Mr. George Sassower, or naming him as a party plaintiff or petitioner, without the leave in writing first obtained from a judge or magistrate of this Court who shall have examined such paper to assure that it is not in violation of the 1985 ["Conner"] injunction."

The day after the Brieant ukase, again without any pretense of due process or authority, Judge Brieant invaded the jurisdictional bailiwick of Bankruptcy Judge Schwartzberg, an Article I jurist, and directed that in the proceeding before Judge Schwartzberg that:

"No further papers are to be filed under this docket number by Mr. Sassower ... without leave in writing first obtained from a Judge or Magistrate."

This Judge Brieant direction, and other "fixing" operations by Judge Brieant, Judge Conner and others, was clearly intended as "marching orders" to Judge Schwartzberg, JEFFREY L. SAPIR, Esq. ["Sapir"], and U.S. Trustee HAROLD JONES ["Jones"], that they should execute false federal documents and papers, which they did, asserting, inter alia, that complainant's estate contained "no assets", and terminate complainant's case in bankruptcy.

This Judge Brieant direction, and other "fixing" operations by Judge Brieant, Judge Conner, and their co-conspirators, was also intended, and perceived by Judge Schwartzberg, as a direction not to entertain those motions which complainant might make as a matter of right under, inter alia, Rule 59 and 60 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and/or as mirrored in the Bankruptcy Rules.

2. Thereafter, in or about August of 1989, without even a pretense of due process or lawful authority, by oral edict, not made in complainant's presence or knowing, Judge Briant physically excluded complainant, as he thereafter learned, from the entire Federal Building in White Plains, and each and every part thereof, "unless and until his [complainant's] physical presence is actually required", as Judge Briant, six (6) months later, wrote.

3. The clear and present danger is that each and every judge, as far as is known to complainant, considers the Judge Briant actions to be unlawful, but nevertheless they follow such directions.

The above misconduct has and will bring this circuit in disrepute unless decisive action is taken herein.

Dated: October 10, 1990

GEORGE SASSOWER