UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CHAMBERS OF
JUDGE CHARLES S. HAIGHT, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
141 CHURCH STREET
NEW HAVEN, CT 06510

RECEIVED

SEP 05 2012

LORETTA A. PRESKA
CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE
S.D.N.Y.

Sept. 4 2012

Loretta —

As per my e-mail to you of today.

Renewed apologies —

— Terry

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA for the benefit of GEORGE SASSOWER, and GEORGE SASSOWER,
Plaintiffs,

- against -

JEFFREY L. SAPIR; HAROLD JONES; HOWARD SCHWARTZBERG; IRA POSTEL KREINDLER & RELKIN, P.C.; JEROME H. BARR; CITIBANK, N.A.; LEE FELTMAN; FELTMAN, KARESH, MAJOR & FARBMAN; "Z SURETY COMPANY" and "Y SURETY COMPANY", names fictitious but intended to be those who have executed bonds to insure the faithful performances of JEFFREY L. SAPIR and HAROLD JONES; and Hon. EDWIN MEESE, III, as Attorney General of the United States, and Hon. WILLIAM C. CONNER,
Defendants

Docket No.
87 Civ. 7135 [CSH]

Notice of Motion

S I R S:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that upon the annexed affirmation of GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq., dated August 28, 2012, and all pleadings and proceedings had heretofore herein, the undersigned will move this Court on the 13th day of September, 2012, at 9:30 in the forenoon of that day or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard before U.S. District Court Judge *Charles S. Haight,* or to a re-assigned jurist, randomly selected, at the United States Court House, 141 Church Street, New Haven, Connecticut 06510, for a FRCivP 60(b)[4][6] Order vacating the *ex parte* request of U.S. District Court Judge *Charles S. Haight* to Chief U.S. District Court Judge *Charles L. Brieant* "for reassignment", and subsequent proceedings, without prejudice to U.S. District Court Judge *Charles S. Haight* requesting the Clerk of the Court for such relief, together with any further different relief as this Court may seem just and proper in the premises.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE, that opposing papers, if any are to be served and filed in accordance with the Rule 3 of the Rules of this Court and Rule 6 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Dated: White Plains, New York
August 28, 2012

Yours, etc.

GEORGE SASSOWER [GS-0512]
Plaintiff, pro se
10 Stewart Place,
White Plains, N.Y. 10603
(914) 949-2169

Certificate of Service

George Sassower, Esq., affirms that on August 28, 2012, he caused to be mailed in properly addressed stamped envelopes the foregoing Notice of Motion & Affirmation to: U.S. Attorney *Preet Bharara*, U.S. Attorney's Office, 1 Saint Andrews Plaza, New York, NY 10007-1701; NY State Attorney General *Eric T. Schneiderman*, 120 Broadway, New York, NY 10271-0332; *Kreindler & Relkin, P.C.*, c/o Phillips, Nizer, Esqs., 666 5th Avenue, 10103; *Feltman, Karesh, Major & Farbman*, Esqs., c/o Martin S. Major, Esqs., 211 East 28th St. 10016 and *D'Amato & Lynch*, Esqs., 70 Pine Street, New York, New York 10270

Dated: White Plains, NY
: August 28, 2012

GEORGE SASSOWER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

---x

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA for the benefit of GEORGE SASSOWER, and GEORGE SASSOWER, Plaintiffs, - against - JEFFREY L. SAPIR; HAROLD JONES; HOWARD SCHWARTZBERG; IRA POSTEL KREINDLER & RELKIN, P.C.; JEROME H. BARR; CITIBANK, N.A.; LEE FELTMAN; FELTMAN, KARESH, MAJOR & FARBMAN; "Z SURETY COMPANY" and "Y SURETY COMPANY" names fictitious but intended to be those who have executed bonds to insure the faithful performances of JEFFREY L. SAPIR and HAROLD JONES; and Hon. EDWIN MEESE, III, as Attorney General of the United States, and Hon. WILLIAM C. CONNER, Defendants	Docket No. 87 Civ. 7135 [CSH] Moving Affirmation.

---x

Geo. Sassower, Esq., an attorney, affirms under the penalties of perjury, in support of the relief of the requested in the annexed Notice of Motion.

Part "A":

At no time or place has anyone asserted or contended that the December 10, 1987 "publication" of Chief U.S. District Court Judge *Charles L. Brieant* for the Southern District of New York, in the within action, was valid!

Part "B":

1. In March of 1984, an agreement was consummated on behalf of *Citibank N.A.* with NY Supreme Court Administrator *Xavier C. Riccobono* of New York County, that provided that for a "*bribe*" payment of $5,000,000, *Citibank N.A.* and its entourage would receive total civil, criminal & disciplinary immunity (***"The Citibank Bribes for Total Immunity Agreement"*** [***"The Agreement"***]).

The "*bribe*" payment of $4,200,000 from the private assets of *Citibank, N.A.* was expressly conditioned on the transmission of the remaining cash assets in *Puccini Clothes, Ltd.*, an involuntarily dissolved corporation, in the amount of $800,000, to judges.

Since *Hyman Raffe* and his attorney, *Geo. Sassower*, Esq., had contractually based, constitutionally protected, liquid assets in *Puccini Clothes, Ltd.* in excess of $800,000, no "*bribe*" payments were due or payable unless and until *Raffe-Sassower* could be compelled to surrender these assets.

2. To consummate such $5,000,000 "*bribe*" transaction, Administrator *Xavier C. Riccobono* designated Referee *Donald Diamond,* at will-employee, who imposed a "*Reign of Judicial Terror*", in order to compel a *Raffe-Sassower* "submission", which included the denial to them of "access to the New York courts" for any and all relief!

3. Consequently, in August of 1984 affirmant, on behalf of his client, *Hyman Raffe*, filed a Complaint, which was assigned to U.S. District Court Judge *William C. Conner* (*Raffe v. Doe*, 84 Civ 6272 [SDNY-WCC]).

Raffe v. Doe (*supra*) was filed seven (7) months *after* the Supreme Court of the United States rendered *Pennhurst v. Halderman* (465 U.S. 89 [1984]) wherein the Court "*directed*" (at p. 121) [emphasis supplied]:

> "[a] federal court <u>*must*</u> examine <u>*each*</u> claim in a case to see if the court's jurisdiction over that claim is barred by the Eleventh Amendment (*Hans v. Louisiana,* 134 U.S. 1 [1890])."

In *Pennhurst v. Halderman* (*supra*) the Court merely restated what courts have uniformly stated, *ad nauseam*, before and after *Pennhurst v. Halderman* (*supra*) that where "*subject matter jurisdiction*" is involved, the matter cannot be ignored or waived, but it must be addressed and adjudicated by the Court!

4. In *Raffe v. Doe* (supra) a money damage tort action the title page reads:

> "Robert Abrams, Atty. Gen. of N.Y., New York City, for defendants Donald Diamond, Xavier C. Riccobono, Michael J. Dontzin, Thomas V. Sinclair, Jr., Robert Abrams, and David S. Cook; Jeffrey I. Slonim, Howard L. Zwickel, Asst. Attys. Gen., of counsel."

Obviously, the appearance of *Abrams-Slonim* meant that: (1) Judge *William C. Conner* had been "*fixed*"; (2) he would not address the Amendment *XI/Hans* "subject matter jurisdictional" and other lethal infirmities, although mandatory, and (3) the merit disposition made were "*null & void*"!

<u>Part "C":</u>

1. In Order to preserve the remaining assets of *Puccini Clothes, Ltd.*, until it could be transmitted as "*bribes*" to judges and provide *Citibank, N.A.* and its entourage with immunity, NY Supreme Court Justice *Ira Gammerman* of New York County and U.S. District Court Judge *William C. Conner* issued

"transparent invalid" injunctions (*Geo. Sassower v. Sheriff of Westchester County*, 651 F. Supp. 128 [SDNY-1986]; *Raffe v. Doe, supra*).

2. On the eve of the elevation of U.S. District Court *Charles L. Brieant* to be Chief Judge, he and NY State Appellate Division Presiding Justice *Francis T. Murphy* of the First Judicial Department concocted a base criminal scheme to transmit the remaining judicial trust assets of *Puccini Clothes, Ltd.* as "*bribes*" for judges.

3. To abort such transmission, scheduled to take place on October 30, 1986, although petitioner's assets were greatly in excess of his liabilities, on October 28, 1986. he filed a Chapter 7 Petition in Bankruptcy.

4. Having aborted a $5,000,000 "*bribe*" *Brieant-Murphy* & other jurists went into an uncontrollable rage and retaliation was immediate, swift & draconian.

5. The legal obligation and self-interests of *Jeffrey L. Sapir*, the trustee in bankruptcy, was: (1) to liquidate petitioner's substantial assets, including those in *Puccini Clothes, Ltd.*; (2) satisfy petitioner's minimal liabilities; (3) deduct his substantial fees, and (4) turn over the remaining monies to petitioner.

Thus, there was to be no $5,000,000 "*bribe*"!

6. Consequently, Chief Judge *Charles L. Brieant* threatened *Jeffrey L. Sapir*, "*fixed*" U.S. Bankruptcy Judge *Howard Schwartzberg* and others in order to salvage ***"The Citibank Bribes for Total Immunity Enterprise"*** [***"The Enterprise"***]).

7. On October 5, 1987, as a consequence, *United States of America for the benefit of Geo. Sassower v. Sapir* (87Civ7135 [SDNY-CSH]), was filed, which was assigned to U.S. District Court Judge *Charles S. Haight*.

Part "D":

1. On November 18, 1985, or six (6) weeks after the complaint had been filed, U.S. District Court Judge *Charles S. Haight, sua sponte*, issued an Order to Show Cause, which was obviously the product of a "*fix*" since it provided:

> "I currently have before me in this action four motions made by plaintiff George Sassower: (1) to compel Bankruptcy Judge Howard Schwartzberg and Jeffrey L. Sapir, Esq. `to give obedience to 18 U.S.C. §3057[a],-' dated October 8, 1987; ... (3) to compel defendant Sapir "to liquidate the judgment . . . in favor of plaintiff against Puccini Clothes, Ltd.,' etc., dated November 4, 1987; and (4) for a writ of mandamus, etc., dated November 15, 1987. ..."

2A. To compel the issuance of an 18 *U.S.C.* §3057[a] Order, which was and could not be opposed, would have resulted in an <u>*immediate*</u> grand jury indictment of Chief Judge *Charles L. Brieant* for, *inter alia*, "bankruptcy fraud", which was one of the reasons that Chief Judge *Charles L. Brieant* requested U.S. District Court Judge *Charles S. Haight* to issue the Order to Show Cause of November 18!

B. To "compel defendant *Jeffrey L. Sapir*. Esq. to liquidate the judgment in favor of plaintiff against Puccini Clothes, Ltd.", would abort a $5,000,000 "*bribe*" in which Chief Judge *Charles L. Brieant* had a financial interest!

The relief, in full, in this aspect of this motion, read as follows:

> "compelling *Jeffrey L. Sapir*, Esq. [the trustee in bankruptcy]; (1) to liquidate the money judgment, and other money claims, in favor of affirmant against *Puccini Clothes, Ltd.* by moving to intervene in the *Puccini* bankruptcy proceedings; (2) asserting affirmant's statutory lien [*Judiciary Law* §475] on the stock of *Hyman Raffe* in *Puccini*; (3) recovering from *Lee Feltman*, Esq. and/or *Feltman, Karesh, Major & Farbman*, Esqs. all monies received pursuant to a purported judgment and/or order from Referee *Donald Diamond*; (4) together with such other, further, and different relief ...."

3. The evidence, even before the surfacing of the "*ex parte fixing memorandum*", of the involvement of Chief U.S. District Court Judge *Charles L. Brieant* and U.S. District Court Judge *William C. Conner* in "*bribery*" and similar criminal activities, was documented and conclusive!

4. Consequently, upon the surfacing of the "*fixing memorandum*" and some of the surrounding circumstances, as a matter of right, on December 2, 1987, the plaintiff amended his complaint and added *William C. Conner* as a *Dennis v. Sparks* (449 U.S. 24 [1980]) money damage "*fixing*" co-defendant.

5. Thereupon, on December 10, 1987, Chief U.S. District Court Judge *Charles L. Brieant*, *sua sponte*, without *any* notice or due process, issued a Decision and Order which *falsely* stated that the petitioner, for sinister purposes, had added "*Charles S. Haight*" as a co-defendant, when the author added *William C. Conner*, as he and <u>*everyone*</u> else <u>*knew*</u>.

The title page of the Amended Complaint _and_ the *sua sponte* Order of December 10, 1987 by Chief U.S. District Court Judge *Charles L. Brieant both* reveal that the petitioner added, "*The Fixor*", "*William C. Conner*", _not_ "*The Fixee*", "*Charles S. Haight*"!

Chief U.S. District Court Judge *Charles L. Brieant*, openly flaunted the fact that he intentionally and deliberately contrived and concocted the false statement in order to justify his statement of December 10, 1987!

6. The "*without notice or due process*" Order of December 10, 1987 without more, and there was much more, was "*null &void*", not entitled to any respect in any court or tribunal (*Windsor v. McVeigh*, 93 U.S. 474, 277 1876])!

7. A re-assignment was to be by the mandatory "random judicial selection" process, not dragooned by Chief U.S. District Court Judge *Charles L. Brieant*, a financially interested and disqualified jurist, to himself.

8. Based on openly flaunted, *concocted, contrived* and *fabricated* assertions, Chief U.S. District Court Judge *Charles L. Brieant* "*dismissed*" the action which still had still had the identifying symbols "CSH", _and_ barred the petitioner from filing _any_ paper in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, without judicial permission, which every jurist meant the permission of Chief U.S. District Court Judge *Charles L. Brieant* _only_.

Thus, whenever the petitioner requested the permission to file a motion, Chief U.S. District Court Judge *Charles L. Brieant*, without inquiring as to the nature of the motion, would deny permission!

9. The *sua sponte* "diatribe" of Chief Judge *Charles L. Brieant* concluded, as follows:

> "... this action [still bearing the initials of `CSH'] is hereby _dismissed_ without prejudice and without costs.
>
> Te Clerk of this Court is hereby ORDERED not to accept any paper or proceeding or motion or new case of any kind presented by Mr. George Sassower, or naming him as a party plaintiff, without leave in writing first obtained from aa judge or magistrate of this Court who shall have examined such paper to assure that it is not violative of the 1985 injunction heretofore referred to ..... .
>
> The clerk shall issue a final judgment."

WHEREFORE, affirmant prays that this motion be granted.

Dated: White Plains, N.Y.
August 28, 2012

GEORGE SASSOWER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

---x

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA for the benefit of GEORGE SASSOWER, and GEORGE SASSOWER,
Plaintiffs,

- against -

JEFFREY L. SAPIR; HAROLD JONES; HOWARD SCHWARTZBERG; IRA POSTEL KREINDLER & RELKIN, P.C.; JEROME H. BARR; CITIBANK, N.A.; LEE FELTMAN; FELTMAN, KARESH, MAJOR & FARBMAN; "Z SURETY COMPANY", and "Y SURETY COMPANY" names fictitious but intended to be those who have executed bonds to insure the faithful performances of JEFFREY L. SAPIR and HAROLD JONES; and Hon EDWIN MEESE, III, as Attorney General of the United States and Hon. WILLIAM C. CONNER,
Defendants

---x

Docket No.
87 Civ. 7135 [CSH]

S I R S:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE, that the within Order will be presented for settlement by U.S. District Court Judge *Charles S. Haight*, at the United States Court House, 141 Church Street, New Haven, Connecticut 06510, or to a re-assigned jurist, randomly selected, on the 7th day September, 2012 at 10:00 o'clock in the forenoon of that day.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that responding papers or counter-orders, if any, are to be served & filed at least two (2) days beforehand, with such additional time if such service is by mail.

Dated: White Plains, New York
August 28, 2012

Yours, etc.

GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq.,
Attorney for petitioner-plaintiff, *pro se*
10 Stewart Place,
White Plains, New York, 10603
914-681-7196

Certificate of Service

George Sassower, Esq., affirms that on August 28, 2012, he caused to be mailed in properly addressed stamped envelopes the foregoing Notice of Settlement & Proposed Order to: U.S. Attorney *Preet Bharara*, 1 Saint Andrews Plaza, New York, NY 10007-1701; NY State Attorney General *Eric T. Schneiderman*, 120 Broadway, New York, NY 10271-0332 and U.S. District Court Judge *Kenneth M. Karas*, 300 Quarropas Street, White Plains, New York 10601.

Dated: White Plains, NY
August 28, 2012

GEORGE SASSOWER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA for the benefit of GEORGE SASSOWER, and GEORGE SASSOWER, Plaintiffs, - against - JEFFREY L. SAPIR; HAROLD JONES; HOWARD SCHWARTZBERG; IRA POSTEL KREINDLER & RELKIN, P.C.; JEROME H. BARR; CITIBANK, N.A.; LEE FELTMAN; FELTMAN, KARESH, MAJOR & FARBMAN; "Z SURETY COMPANY" and "Y SURETY COMPANY", names fictitious but intended to be those who have executed bonds to insure the faithful performances of JEFFREY L. SAPIR and HAROLD JONES; and Hon. EDWIN MEESE, III, as Attorney General of the United States, and Hon. WILLIAM C. CONNER, Defendants	Docket No. 87 Civ. 7135 [CSH] Temporary Restraining Order & Preliminary Injunction.

Part "A":

1. Assistant New York State Attorney General *Charles F. Sanders* has, by letter dated August 13, 2012, thrust upon U.S. District Court Judge *Kenneth M. Karas,* three (3) decisions, as purportedly valid, but which were & are "null & void", and if relied upon by Judge *Kenneth M. Karas* or any other jurist, would be felonies committed by them (18 *U.S.C.* §1001).

2. 18 *U.S.C.* §1001, in relevant part, provides:

> "(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of ... judicial branch of the Government of the United States, knowingly and willfully– ...
> (3) makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry; shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 5 years ...
> (b) Subsection (a) does not apply to a party to a judicial proceeding, or that party's counsel, for statements, representations, writings or documents submitted by such party or counsel to a judge or magistrate in that proceeding."

Thus, while the statute exempts a party and/or his/her attorney, it does not exempt the jurist!

3. All three (3) decisions thrust upon U.S. District Court Judge *Kenneth M. Karas*, are part of the "***The Citibank Bribes for Total Immunity Enterprise***" ["***The Enterprise***"]).

A. The first, *Geo. Sassower v. Abrams* (833 F. Supp. 253 [SDNY-1993]) was addressed in plaintiff's motion of August 16, 2012.

B. The second, *Geo. Sassower v. Sapir* (87 Civ. 7135 [SDNY-CSH]), is here addressed.

4. There was never any question that the "publication" of December 10, 1987 by Chief Judge *Charles L. Brieant* for the Southern District of New York, now deceased, in *Geo. Sassower v. Sapir* (*supra*) was, is and will always be "*null & void*"!

5. An essential aspect to "*The Enterprise*" is the "denial" of "access to the courts" to those who oppose this criminally corrupt racketeering operation by *Citibank, N.A.*

As expressed in the *unopposed* Proposed Injunctive Order of July 9, 2012, whose allegations were *undenied & uncontroverted*:

> "the *modus operandi* of *The Enterprise* also includes that jurist, trial & appellate, will concoct, contrive & fabricate the action or appeal as `*frivolous*' and will condition `access to the court' upon `permission', which is invariably `denied'."

<u>Part "B"</u>:

1. Whatever else it might be, the "publication" of December 10, 1987 by Chief U.S. District Court Judge *Charles L. Brieant* in *Geo. Sassower v. Sapir* (*supra*), was <u>*not*</u> a "decision", "opinion" or "order" in the "legal" sense of those terms!

A. In *Geo. Sassower v. Sapir* (*supra*), Chief U.S. District Court Judge *Charles L. Brieant* was <u>*never*</u> the jurist assigned to determine *anything* on December 10, 1987, or at any other time!

As the title of the Amended Complaint reveals, which was the title employed by Chief Judge *Charles L. Brieant* on December 10, 1987, the initials were "CSH" (*Charles S. Haight*), not "CLB" (*Charles L. Brieant*)!

At all times, the initials on each & every document was "CSH", *never* "CLB" or any other jurist!

B. There was no "case", "controversy" or "legal issue" to be determined by Chief Judge *Charles L. Brieant* or *any* other jurist on December 10, 1987!

2. Although, "on its face" the *sua sponte* "*diatribe*" of December 10, 1987 in *Geo. Sassower v. Sapir* (*supra*) was & is patently "void", because of continuing prejudice to plaintiff, a temporary restraining order & preliminary injunction is requested, pending a merit decision on the matter.

Part "C":

1. With incredible stupidity, the *fraud* perpetrated by Chief U.S. District Court Judge *Charles L. Brieant* conclusively appears "on the face" of his December 10, 1987 "*diatribe*"!

2. On October 5, 1987, the complaint in *United States of America for the benefit of Geo. Sassower v. Sapir* (*supra*) was filed, which action was assigned to U.S. District Court Judge *Charles S. Haight*.

3. At *all* times, even when the December 10, 1987 "diatribe" was made by Chief Judge *Charles L. Brieant*, the title page in *Geo. Sassower v. Sapir* (*supra*) contained the initials "CSH" *not* "CLB!

4. On November 18, 1985, or six (6) weeks after the complaint had been filed, U.S. District Court Judge *Charles S. Haight, sua sponte*, issued an Order to Show Cause, which was obviously the product of a "*fix*".

5. Investigation revealed that this suspect Order to Show Cause was preceded by an *ex parte* "*fixing memorandum*" from *"Bill"* [U.S. District Court Judge *William C. Conner*] to "*Sandy*" [U.S. District Court Judge *Charles S. Haight*], which "*fixing memorandum*", "on its face" revealed that copies were sent to several others, including to Chief U.S. District Court Judge *Charles L. Brieant*.

6. U.S. District Court Judge *William C. Conner*, was the author of the patently invalid *Raffe v. Doe* (619 F. Supp. 891 [SDNY 1985]), and was also a money damage tort defendant sued & defended by a federal attorney at *unauthorized* federal cost & expense in his "*personal capacity*" in *Vilella v. Santagata* (87 Civ 1450 [SDNY-GLG]).

U.S. District Court Judge *William C. Conner* and Chief Judge *Charles L. Brieant* were active participants in *The Enterprise*.

7. Consequently, upon the surfacing of this "Bill to Sandy" "*fixing memorandum*", as a matter of course, plaintiff amended his complaint and added *William C. Conner* as a *Dennis v. Sparks* (449 U.S. 24 [1980]) money damage "*fixing*" co-defendant, as confirmed by the title of the December 10, 1987 "diatribe".

In *Dennis v. Sparks* (*supra*) the Court held that the "*fixor*", such as U.S. District Court Judge *William C. Conner*, is liable in money damages, but not the "*fixee*", such as U.S. District Court Judge *Charles S. Haight*.

8. While plaintiff amended the complaint to add *William C. Conner*, as a money damage co-defendant, he also, by motion, dated December 1, 1987, requested the "recusal" of U.S. District Court Judge *Charles S. Haight*, as his motion concluded as follows:

> "WHEREFORE, it is respectfully asserted that Hon. CHARLES S. HAIGHT, JR., by reason of this `Conner-fix' is disqualified to sit as a judicial official in this and related matters."

<u>Part "D"</u>:

1. Under the caption of the Amended Complaint, which reveals *William C. Conner* as a co-defendant <u>*not*</u> *Charles S. Haight*, the December 10, 1987 "*diatribe*" of Chief U.S. District Court Judge *Charles L. Brieant, falsely & deceptively*, opens as follows [with emphasis added]:

> "The Honorable Charles S. Haight, Jr., a Judge of this Court, *has applied to me* in my capacity as Chief Judge and Chairman of the Assignment Committee of the Court, charged with the administration of the Rules of the Court for the Division of Business, *for reassignment of the above entitled action* on the ground of his judicial disqualification. Such disqualification is based on the fact that by an amended complaint docketed in the action on December 2, 1987, *Judge Haight himself has been added to the case as a defendant*, along with Judge Conner of this Court. The amended complaint seeks to recover money damages from all the defendants."

The mere fact, as asserted by Chief Judge *Charles L. Brieant*, that U.S. District Court Judge *Charles S. Haight* made this application, without notice or due process to plaintiff, made the *merit* disposition made by Chief Judge *Charles L. Brieant* to be "*null & void*" (*Windsor v. McVeigh*, 93 U.S. 274 [1876]).

2. Assuming, *arguendo*, U.S. District Court Judge *Charles S. Haight* requested that Chief Judge *Charles L. Brieant*, as he asserted, "*for reassignment*", and further assuming, *arguendo*, that request was appropriate, and it was not, the authority of the Chief Judge was to make a "*reassignment*", *not* to make a merit determination.

3. Based on the patently false statement that plaintiff had added *Charles S. Haight*, as a party defendant, when he did not and legally could not (*Dennis v. Sparks, supra*), the "*Brieant diatribe*" stated [with emphasis supplied]:

> "It is quite clear to me that the amended complaint, *which added Judge Haight* as a party defendant, was served after Judge Haight had, by a memorandum and order dated November 19, 1987, filed herein, determined that all motions of plaintiff in this action should be held in abeyance, and no more should be filed, until Judge Haight decided a motion by defendants to dismiss the action *as violative of an injunction issued* in this Court against the plaintiff Mr. Sassower, sub nom *Raffe v. Doe*, 691 F. Supp 898 (S.D.N.Y. 1985), and it is also clear that *inclusion of the assigned judge* as an *additional defendant* had the effect, and probably the purpose of disrupting the orderly judicial decisional process of this district court insofar as concerns the motion to dismiss. Plaintiff ..... must be deemed to recognize that the Amended Complaint *violates the 1985 injunction*, and also that Judge Haight, and for that matter Judge Conner also, *are immune from this sort of litigation*."

A. To repeat, once again, plaintiff did not and legally could not, add *Charles S. Haight*, as a money damage defendant! Plaintiff moved to disqualify U.S. District Court Judge *Charles S. Haight* as having been "*fixed*" by Judge *William C. Conner* which was appropriate relief.

B. There was no valid injunction which prohibited plaintiff's action against *any* defendant!

C. "On its face", *Raffe v. Doe* (*supra*) suffers from a "*subject matter jurisdictional*" lethal infirmary (*Pennhurst v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 121 [1984]) rendering the merit dispositions to be "*null & void*"!

D. U.S. District Court Judge *William C. Conner* also did not have "*personal jurisdiction*" over plaintiff in *Raffe v. Doe* (*supra*).

E. *Raffe v. Doe* (*supra*) was, "on its face" "*transparently invalid*" and its injunction could be ignored with impunity (*United States v. United Mine Workers* (330 U.S. 258; 309-310 [1947]).

F. *William C. Conner* has been sued many times in tort for money damages & it was *never* held that he had judicial immunity, albeit a federal judge!

Part "E":

1. The *sua sponte* "diatribe" of Chief Judge *Charles L. Brieant* concluded, as follows:

> "... this action [still bearing the initials of `CSH'] is hereby dismissed without prejudice and without costs.
>
> Te Clerk of this Court is hereby ORDERED not to accept any paper or proceeding or motion or new case of any kind presented by Mr. George Sassower, or naming him as a party plaintiff, without leave in writing first obtained from aa judge or magistrate of this Court who shall have examined such paper to assure that it is not violative of the 1985 injunction heretofore referred to .... .
>
> The clerk shall issue a final judgment."

Now, on motion of *George Sassower*, Esq., it is

ORDERED pending a merit determination as to the legal validity of the December 10, 1987 "diatribe" in *Geo. Sassower v. Sapir* (87 Civ 7135 [SDNY-1987]), be and the same is hereby "stayed".

Dated: New Haven, Connecticut
September 7, 2012

U.S.D.J.

Mr. George Sassower
10 Stewart Pl
White Plains, NY 10603

UNITED STATES
POSTAL SERVICE

1000

06510

U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
WHITE PLAINS, NY
10601
AUG 29, '12
AMOUNT
$0.85
00036631-03

U.S. District Court.
141 Church Street
New Haven, Conn. 06510