Doris L. Sassower

283 Soundview Avenue White Plains, New York 10606-3821

Elena Ruth Sassower, Paralegal Assistant

Tel: (914) 997-1677 Fax: (914) 684-6554

BY EXPRESS MAIL EM025604722US

September 2, 1998

Francis Lorson, Chief Deputy Clerk U.S. Supreme Court 1 First Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20543

RE:

Sassower v. Mangano, et al.,

Supreme Court Docket #98-106

Dear Mr. Lorson:

As discussed, enclosed are 40 copies of petitioner's Supplemental Brief; with a certificate of service. Also enclosed are the documents to be lodged in the Clerk's office -- copies of which were sent in July to respondents' counsel, the co-respondent New York State Attorney General. These documents, indicated by footnote 2 of the Supplemental Brief (at p. 9), are:

- (1) CJA's evidentiary compendium supporting its written statement to the House Judiciary Committee for inclusion in the record of the Committee's June 11, 1998 "oversight hearing of the administration and operation of the federal judiciary" [SA-17]; and
- (2) the exhibits to petitioner's July 27, 1998 letter to the Chief of the Public Integrity Section of the U.S. Justice Department's Criminal Division [SA-47].

As also discussed — and as reflected by the cert petition (at p. 24) — petitioner remains a member in good standing of the Supreme Court bar. Although suspended by the Appellate Division, Second Department, by order dated June 14, 1991 [A-96-97], and by the Southern District of New York, by order dated February 27, 1992 [A-134], she was not suspended by the Supreme Court nor served with a Rule to Show Cause, pursuant to its Rule 8. I was told that this was because the state court, which has the responsibility of furnishing the Court with notification, had never done so.

However, the Clerk of the Appellate Division, Second Department who handles disciplinary matters, Robert Rosenthal, informed me -- after checking petitioner's disciplinary file -- that the Appellate Division, Second Department had notified the Supreme Court of the June 14, 1991 order. Indeed,

Mr. Rosenthal sent me the notification list, circling the Supreme Court. A copy is enclosed. Should you wish to speak with Mr. Rosenthal directly, his number is 718-875-1300.

I have been unable to ascertain whether the Southern District of New York notified the Supreme Court of its February 27, 1992 order. The Southern District's Local Civil Rule 1.5(g) explicitly states that its Clerk forwards such disciplinary orders to courts in which the affected attorney is known to be admitted to practice. I have been told that this was the procedure, as well, under the Southern District's predecessor Rule 4, in effect when petitioner was suspended. In petitioner's case, her admission to the U.S. Supreme Court bar was reflected at the outset of her Martindale-Hubbell Law Listing [A-137], which was included in her response to the Southern District's order to show cause.

So that the Supreme Court's records will accurately reflect petitioner's legal status, I have requested Mr. Rosenthal to send to your attention a certified copy of the Appellate Division, Second Department's June 14, 1991 order. I have also requested that Ruth McClean of the Clerk's office in the Southern District (212-805-0652) send you a certified copy of that court's February 27, 1992 order.

Inasmuch as the Southern District of New York deemed the Appellate Division, Second Department's June 14, 1991 order sufficient to issue an order to show cause for petitioner's suspension from the Southern District, and, thereafter, to suspend her based thereon, petitioner expects — and desires — that the Supreme Court will promptly issue a Rule 8 show cause order. This will permit the Justices to address petitioner's Supreme Court bar status simultaneous with their consideration of the cert petition, involving those two unconstitutional and retaliatory federal and state suspensions. Such would serve both the interests of justice and judicial economy.

Your kind assistance is greatly appreciated.

Yours for a quality judiciary,

ELENA RUTH SASSOWER

Paralegal Assistant

Letter read and approved by:

DORIS L. SASSOWER

Petitioner Pro Se, Sasower v. Mangano, et al.

Enclosures

cc: New York State Attorney General, counsel for respondents

POST OFFICE TO ADDRESSEE





EM025604722US

| 110 50 | Cuts 9 2 98 No 9 2 98 | Ventury South S S South S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S | n Racupt Postage & Fees | SERVICE G ON THE IN | ERSE SIDE FOR UARANTEE AND ISURANCE COVE | ERAGE |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| METHOD OF PAYMENT: Express Mail Corporate Acct. No. or Postal Service Acct. No. FRC Microscopics | X106589 | | agent (if in the subgreet of that the shorment was delivered at that the shorment was delivered at the that the shorment was delivered at the that the shortest of the | FOINT) Prott. 21 | Customer Sprakura | distinct, and other to the state of the stat |
| CENTER A JUDICIAL PU BOX O WHITE | ACCOUNTABIL AINS | ITY INC IY 10505-006 | 4 455 | is corso chief beau strene strene shington | CANO CANE | 0543 |
| | FOR | PICKUP OR TRAC | i | -800:222:18iii | 1000 | |

September 3rd