

GEORGE SASSOWER

16 LAKE STREET
WHITE PLAINS, N. Y. 10603

914-949-2169

January 8, 1990

Elaine B. Goldsmith, Esq.
Clerk, Court of Appeals: Second Circuit
Foley Square
New York, N.Y. 10007

Re: Charge of Judicial Misconduct
Chief District Judge Charles L. Brieant
Docket # 90-8557

Dear Ms. Goldsmith,

1a. I hereby petition the judicial council for review of the Order of Acting Chief Judge THOMAS J. MESKILL dated December 10, 1990 in the above matter.

b. Although the disposition of December 10, 1990, was consolidated with Docket #90-8562, the covering letter from your office states that separate protests must be filed.

2a. The charges against Chief District Court Judge Charles L. Brieant are the employment of non-existing, non-judicial power, to intrude upon the judicial authority and responsibilities of Article I and Article III jurists.

b. There is no charge against Judge Brieant related to the merits of any judicial case or controversy presented to the Chief Judge for disposition.

c. In short, the merits of a judicial controversy, where Judge Brieant was the jurist, was not in issue in my complaint.

3. The logic, vel non, of Judge Meskill determination is patently infirm.

a(1) The existence of a judicial remedy does not, ex proprio vigore, preclude a finding of ethical misconduct by the Judicial Council.

(2) Thus, for example, if Chief Judge Brieant had converted the monies in the clerk's office for his own personal use, rather than barred me from the federal building in White Plains, the fact that the government could sue the Chief Judge to recover such monies would not preclude a finding of misconduct by the Judicial Council.

January 8, 1991

b(1) Judicial review for Judge Briant's misconduct, judicial or otherwise, does not exist when, as Judge Meskill noted, I have been (p. 1-2):

"enjoined from filing further lawsuits without leave of court in the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and two districts in this Circuit."

(2) Thus to nullify the physical exclusion edict of Chief Judge Briant from the Federal Building through the judicial process, resulted in the denial of my application, which was affirmed by the Circuit Court.


c. Where I have been barred from access to the courts for relief, as stated by Judge Meskill, the normal adjudication process obviously does not exist. Consequently, In re Charge of Judicial Misconduct (685 F.2d 1226 19th Cir.-1982) is clearly inapplicable at bar.

4a. The totality of events, in my filed complaints and otherwise, reveals Chief Judge Briant is an active and essential participant in this criminal racketeering adventure, and his activities are directed toward that end.

b. I may be enjoined from access to some courts, but I am not enjoined from access to the media, good government and public interest organizations, and the public.

c. Until an "accounting" for Puccini is filed, monies payable "to the federal court" recovered, the "millions" paid by Hyman Raffe returned or paid over to the "sovereigns", and Dennis F. Vilella released from incarceration for crimes that never occurred, the Second Circuit remains a "Ship of Judicial Fools".

Most Respectfully,



GEORGE SASSOWER