GEORGE SASSOWER
ATTORNEY AT LAW
~~2125 MILL AVENUE~~ 51 Davis Avenue,
~~BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11234~~ White Plains, N.Y. 10605
~~212-444-3400~~
914-949-2169

November 29, 1985

Lee Cross, Esq., Chairwomen
Sheridan Albert, Esq.
Joseph A. Baum, Esq.
Ms. Frances Berkwitz
Hon. William H. Booth
Paul F. Callahan, Esq.
Ms. Ollie D. Dent
Joseph H. Gellman, Esq.
Frederic R. Grae, Esq.
Richard B. Irwin, Esq.
Ralph H. Kress, Esq.
Allen Lashley, Esq.
Evelyn R. Lawrence, Esq.
Constance M. Mandina, Esq.
Peter J. Napolitano, Esq.
Edward S. Reich, Esq.
Thomas O. Rice, Esq.
Perry Sklarin, Esq.
Rabbi Sidney Solomon
Spencer Steele, Esq.

Dear Grievance Committee Members,

1. Today, Thanksgiving Day, I am, among other things, sincerely grateful that your committee voted to commence disciplinary proceedings against me.

2. On December 14, 1984, almost one year ago, responding to the complaint against me, I wrote to your counsel, Robert H. Straus, Esq., for reasons stated therein, "I must insist on an expeditious hearing", and therein demanded such public hearings!

3. By periodic letter communication, I intend to advise you of the transpiring events so that I am assured of prosecutorial fairness by Mr. Straus (Disciplinary Rule 7-103), and that he, Mr. Straus, and you, perform your professional and committee obligations (Disciplinary Rule 1-103), for I enter this struggle the accuser, not the accused.

4. In my affidavit to the Appellate Division of November 18, 1985, I stated:

> "The general thrust of the Committee's complaint is that [respondent] engaged in vexatious and frivolous judicial proceedings, and indeed knowingly violated judicial orders in so doing.
>
> The general response of [respondent] is that he was engaged in the professional obligatory search for truth and justice on behalf of his client, the task was performed with great integrity, and that the orders claimed to have been violated are null, void, and/or of no effect (United States v. Throckmorton, 98 U.S. 61).
>
> Indeed, the pervasive fraud, perjury, and corruption involved in the underlying litigation, warrants the affirmative action by the committee for the purpose of having same declared a nullity (Hazal-Atlas v. Hartford-Empire, 322 U.S. 238; Universal v. Root, 328 U.S. 575).
>
> The petition of the Committee, presumably prepared by its Counsel, and signed by its Chairperson [Lee Cross, Esq.] reveals that they are sufficiently familiar with this matter so that they can confirm that some of the more egregious disclosures which have been surfaced as a result of [respondent's] efforts are:
>
> a. Kreindler & Relkin, P.C. ['K&R'] and their clients 'engineered' the larceny of the court entrusted assets of Puccini Clothes, Ltd. ['Puccini'], and no punitive action has been taken against it.
>
> b. The clients of K&R, Citibank, N.A. ['Citibank'] and Jerome H. Barr, Esq. ['Barr'], were the recipients of some of such larcenous dissipated judicially entrusted assets, and no punitive action has been taken against them.

c. The firm of Arutt, Nachamie, Benjamin, Lipkin & Kirschner, P.C. ['ANBL&K'] was the recipient of some of such larcenous assets, and no punitive action has been taken against it.

d. K&R, prepared, and their clients executed, perjurious affidavits, vehemently denying such larceny, and no punitive action has been taken against it.

e. Acting contrary to the legitimate interests of its clients, ANBL&K had actual knowledge of such perjurious submission by K&R, but acting in unlawful concert with K&R, did not disclose same to the Court, knowing that such non-disclosure would result in a judgment against its clients of more than $350,000, and no punitive action has been taken against it.

f. Acting contrary to the legitimate interests of his judicial trust, Lee Feltman, Esq. ['LF'], had actual knowledge of such perjurious submission by K&R, but acting in unlawful concert with K&R and ANBL&K, did not did not disclose same to the Court, knowing that it would result in a judgment against the judicial trust, Puccini, of almost $500,000, and no punitive action has been taken against him.

g. Acting contrary to the legitimate interests of their judicial trust, Feltman, Karesh, & Major, Esqs. ['FK&M'], had actual knowledge of such perjurious submission by K&R, but acting in unlawful concert with K&R and ANBL&K, did not did not disclose same to the Court, knowing that it would result in a judgment against the judicial trust, Puccini, of almost $500,000, and no punitive action has been taken against them.

h. Without openly disclosing to the Court that Rashba & Pokart ['R&P'] were and/or are the accountants for K&R and/or its clients, LF petitioned Hon. Martin H. Rettinger for their judicial appointment, as investigatory accountants for Puccini, when K&R was being accused of 'engineering' the larceny of Puccini's assets, and no punitive action has been taken against them.

i. Without openly disclosing to the Court that Rashba & Pokart ['R&P'] had received 'laundered' monies from ANBL&K, taken from Puccini, in payment of an invoice to K&R and/or its clients, LF petitioned Hon. Martin H. Rettinger for its judicial appointment, as investigatory accountants for Puccini, when ANBL&K was being charged as being a participant in this corrupt conspiracy, and no punitive action has been taken against him.

j. Indeed, in every action, proceeding, and/or motion, ANBL&K has acted contrary to the legitimate interests of its clients, and in consort with adverse interests, having been unlawfully paid-off from Puccini's judicially entrusted assets, and no punitive action has been taken against it.

k. In every action, proceeding, and/or motion, LF has acted contrary to the legitimate interests of his judicial trust, and in consort with adverse interests, his firm having been unlawfully paid-off from Puccini's judicially entrusted assets, and no punitive action has been taken against him.

l. In every action, proceeding, and/or motion, FK&M has acted contrary to the legitimate interests of their judicial trust, and in consort with adverse interests, they having been unlawfully paid-off from Puccini's judicially entrusted assets, and no punitive action has been taken against them.

m. ANBL&K, aided and abetted by K&R, 'substituted', 'switched', and 'changed', the court judicial papers submitted to the Court from those served on [respondent] resulting in his void disqualification orders ... (United States v. Throckmorton, supra), and no punitive action has been taken against them.

n. On many occasions, including in the instance where the aforementioned disqualification orders were submitted to the Court, K&R, FK&M, and ANBL&K submitted and caused to be signed deceitful orders, and no punitive action has been taken against them.

o. Senior Attorney General David S. Cook, Esq. ['Cook'], the essentially one-man unit in the Attorney General's Office, assigned by statute to safeguard the interests of Puccini, from 1980 to January 1983, has shown a remarkable dereliction of statutory duty and obligation, and no punitive action has been taken against him.

p. Cook, since January 1983 to date, still the essentially one-man unit in the Attorney General's Office, assigned by statute to safeguard the interests of Puccini, having actual notice of the larceny of Puccini's judicially entrusted assets, continues to exhibit a remarkable dereliction of statutory duty and obligation, and no punitive action has been taken against him.

q. Cook, despite the aforementioned statutory obligation to Puccini, has undertaken to defend those who are charged with actively aiding and abetting the 'rape of Puccini', including Referee Donald Diamond, Hon. Xavier C. Riccobono, and Hon. Ira Gammerman, and no punitive action has been taken against him.

r. Indeed, Cook, despite the the mandatory statutory mandatory obligation, has refused to join in any demand for an accounting of Puccini, final or intermediate, since June 4, 1980, when Puccini was involuntarily dissolved, and no punitive action has been taken against him.

s. Indeed also, Cook, taking advantage of the confidential, and constitutionally protected information given him by [respondent] and others, only by virtue of his office, has used such information to the disadvantage of Puccini, and no punitive action has been taken against him.

t. Robert H. Straus, Esq. ['Straus'], Chief Counsel for the Committee, by reason of his position, is extraordinarily familiar with the duties and obligations of attorneys under 'Code of Professional Responsibility', and in particular with Disciplinary Rules 1-102 and 1-103; familiar with the aforementioned vast amount of unrefuted evidence in support of [respondent's] claims against K&R, Citibank, Barr, ANBL&K, LF, FK&M, Cook, and others; has, nevertheless, on information and belief, failed and refused to take any action under the aforementioned disciplinary rules, and no punitive action has been taken, nor will be taken, against him.

u. Straus, with the ethical and professional obligations akin to a public prosecuting attorney, on information and belief, knowing that he does not have a single reputable judge or lawyer in the United States willing to testify under oath that he believes that the Orders under which he bottoms Charges One, Two, and Three against [respondent], are constitutionally valid, nevertheless, lodged charges against [respondent] based upon such Orders, and no punitive action has been taken, nor will be taken, against him.

v. Straus, on information and belief, with actual knowledge, that the Orders on which he bases Charges One, Two, and Three, patently transgresses the power and authority of every american and state judge and court, nevertheless, has brought meritless charges against the [respondent], and no punitive action has been taken, nor will be taken, against him.

w. Straus, on information and belief, with knowledge, actual or constructive, that the actions, proceedings, and motions on which he basis Charge Four were reasonably necessary to protect [respondent] client's, as well as his own, rights, and/or to expose the corruption herein, has nevertheless brought a knowingly meritless charge against [respondent], and no punitive action has been taken, nor will be taken, against him.

x. Straus, on information and belief, with knowledge, actual or constructive, that most of the Orders mentioned in Charge Five of the petition, in [my invidious discrimination proceeding], are the product of fraud and corruption, has nevertheless brought a knowingly meritless charge against [respondent], and no punitive action has been taken, nor will be taken, against him.

y. Straus, on information and belief, with knowledge, actual and/or constructive, that the basis of Charge Six was and is the product of improper, unethical, illegal, unlawful, and coerced communications between [respondent's] client and adversary counsel has, nevertheless seized upon such invalid, corrupt, and void communication in order to bring an otherwise meritless charge against [respondent], and no punitive action has been taken, nor will be taken, against him.

z. Straus, on information and belief, with knowledge, actual and/or constructive, that Charge Seven is false, contrived, as a matter of law and fact, has nevertheless brought a charge against [respondent], when instead, he should have taken affirmative action to nullify an 'out-of-orbit' (unconstitutional and invalid) corruptly secured judicial decree, which inter alia, jeopardizes the very existence of disciplinary bodies of this state in its most quintessential respect, and no punitive action has been taken, nor will be taken, against him.

In short -- the Grievance Committee of the Second and Eleventh Judicial Districts, acting through Robert H. Straus, Esq., have become part and parcel of a joint attempt to deprive [respondent] of his constitutional right of equal protection, applicable to all branches of government (Shelley v. Kraemer, 334 U.S. 1); made [respondent] the subject of invidious and selective prosecution (Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356), and is attempting to deprive [respondent] of his First Amendment, and other, fundamental rights."

5a. I am pleased that Mr. Straus, in his opposing affirmation dated November 26, 1985, has assured me that I "will be afforded a full due process hearing before a Special Referee".

b. While I hope the aforementioned is true, due process requires that Mr. Straus perform his prosecutorial function properly and ethically, and not concern himself now on how, the still to be appointed Special Referee, performs.

c. I submit that Mr. Straus owes to your committee, at least, specific answers to my aforementioned charges, as a result of his, not someone else's, examination of the documentation and evidence, so that you can determine whether he is acting properly on your behalf.

6. Nothing stated by me is intended to preclude or avoid the forthcoming hearings, so that I may have the opportunity to resoundingly substantiate my contentions.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE SASSOWER

GS/h

cc: Robert H. Straus, Esq.
Grievance Committee, Ninth Judicial District
Att: Gary L. Casella, Esq.