

**GEORGE SASSOWER**

*Attorney-at-Law*  
10 Stewart Place  
White Plains, NY 10603-3856  
(914) 681-7196

Robert P. Guido, Esq.  
Special Counsel for Grievance Matters  
30 East Hoffman Avenue  
Lindenhurst, New York, 11757-5001

April 2, 2012

Re: Gary L. Cassela, Esq.

Dear Mr. Guido,

1A. In making this presentation, I am unaware what relevant documents & information you have in your possession, and assert that I am entitled to such information so that I may also address that material.

B. On March 15, 2012, I requested the Appellate Division, Second Department for copies of certain non-confidential documents, relevant to this matter, but have not, as yet, received any response.

2. My prime complaint against Chief Counsel *Gary L. Cassela* and those on whose behalf he was acting, is that they have used their offices to harass & prosecute my former wife, *Doris L. Sassower, Esq.*, in order to control and/or influence my, *not* her, activities.

For example: On July 8, 1991, by a Show Cause application, I moved the U.S. Third Circuit Court of Appeals, in *Geo. Sassower v. Abrams/Feltman* (CCA3 #90-5147) [emphasis in the original]:

“let the GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT and/or its attorneys show cause before this Court, held at the Courthouse ... why a Temporary Restraining Order and/or a Preliminary Injunction should not be issued restraining it from prosecuting and otherwise harassing DORIS L. SASSOWER, Esq. by reason of appellant's [my] legal activities in, and exposures made to, this Court, with draconian sanctions ...”.

Nothing in the eleven (11) page moving affirmation was denied or controverted by Chief Counsel *Gary L. Cassela* or anyone else.

The opening paragraphs of the *undenied & uncontroverted* moving affirmation were [emphasis in the original]

“ 1a. This affirmation will prove beyond a peradventure of doubt that DORIS L. SASSOWER, Esq. [“DLS-The Hostage”] is, once again, being made the object of unconstitutional invidious selectivity by THE GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE FOR THE NINTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT [“GC”].

b. With subpoena power, affirmant can demonstrate that such unconstitutional action is being taken against “DLS-The Hostage” in retaliation for affirmant's legal activities in, and exposures made to, this Court. Consequently, in the event this aspect is denied by or on behalf of GC, a hearing is respectfully requested.

2. This motion is made for the retaliatory actions by GC against “DLS-The Hostage”, affirmant's former wife, in vindication of: ...”

I am reasonably confident that you, Mr. Guido, after affording Mr. Cassela with the opportunity to respond, that you will conclude that the disciplinary charges made against her, were absurd, and had an ulterior motivation (see, Chapters III, *infra*).

Even if any of these charges against *Doris L. Sassower, Esq.* had merit, and they did not, and even if she had some control over my activities, and she does not, it was and is reprehensible, legally & otherwise, for *Gary L. Cassela* & others to use her for leverage purposes!