

SUPERVISORY OVERSIGHT REQUESTS

Presidy
Dear Justice Sullivan —

11/19/01

I have been informed by Cmt Curt
Carter Holmes that following your
review of my letter of today's date,
you referred my ^{UNOPPOSED} Interim Relief
Application to Justice Abdell.

As Justice Abdell has, without
reasons, denied ALL the relief
sought, including permission for a
record to be made of oral argument
of the appeal "either by a court
stenographer, and/or audio or video
recording" I hereby reiterate the
need for your supervisory oversight,
as set forth in my letter of today's
date (at p. 2)

Pursuant to Part 29 of the Rules of
the Chief Judge, this Cmt is ^{audio-visual}
authorized to approve recording
of proceedings. As you are this Cmt's
Presidy Justice, I request your
permission pursuant thereto — or at
least permission for a court stenographer
to take down a written record,
consistent with this being a court of
record" under Article VI, Sec 15 of the NYS
Constitution — Judiciary Law Sec. 2.

Let there be no doubt in the matter —
& as set forth in my Interim Relief
Application (at para. 27) — & particularized

by paragraphs 75-87 of my August 17th motion, the oral argument will be first evidentiary proof of this CWT's disqualifying self interest + actual + apparent bias + I am entitled to a record of what transpires to support my appeal to the CWT of Appeals based thereon. By denying me such record the CWT deliberately prejudices my rights like wise the public - 600 of Rose members have signed petitions to the CWT, reflecting their interest in this ^{important} public interest proceeding in which their rights are at ~~st~~ stake - no less than my own - are entitled to a record of the oral argument.

Finally, as set forth on pages 4-5 of my letter of today's date to you - "I request that you at least ensure that the members of the appellate panel have individually examined the August 17th motion + familiarized themselves with its content. Plainly, each member must search his own conscience + make his own decision regarding the particulars of his own disqualification. Certainly, it is each individual member who knows the facts that should be his duty to disclose pursuant to Sec. 100.37 of the Chief Administrator's Rules Governing Judicial Conduct...

Needless to say, in the event oral argument proceeds on November 21st I will expect that the panel members would →

make the disclosure requested by my motion. As I have only 15 minutes for my oral argument, it would be highly prejudicial if I had to spend precious time detailing for panel members unfamiliar with the motion the various grounds of disqualification, it sets forth from which their disclosure obligations arise.

As I understand from Ms Holmes that the court has a scheduled conference today, I respectfully submit that the conference would afford an excellent opportunity to verify if — & to what extent — the appellate panel members have reviewed my August 17th motion, including my October 15th reply affidavit, as well as my Nov 13th letter preceding this Interim Relief Application. "

(pp. 4-5 of 11/19/01 letter)

Thank you.

Elena R. R. Sessner
Petitioner - Appellant Pro Se

SUMMARY STATEMENT ON APPLICATION FOR EXPEDITED SERVICE AND/OR INTERIM RELIEF

(SUBMITTED BY MOVING PARTY)

Date 11/19/01

Title of Matter Elena RWR Saadov v. NYS Crim. & Judicial Conduct Index/Indict # 108551/99

Appeal by petition from decree order judgment of Supreme Surrogate's Family County NY Court entered on Feb 18, 2000

Name of Judge Acty Supreme Crim Justice Wetzel Notice of Appeal filed on March 23, 2000

If from administrative determination, state agency

Nature of action or proceeding Article 78 proceeds

Provisions of order judgment appealed from decree each & every part thereof

This application by appellant respondent is for Supervision Oversight by

Presiding Justice Joseph Sullivan with reasons for denial of Petition - Appellant's right to public to a record of oral

If applying for a stay, state reason why requested secondly, ensuring that appellate panel is familiar with Petitioner Appellant's situation

Has any undertaking been posted If "yes", state amount and type

Has application been made to court below for this relief no If yes, state Disposition

Has there been any prior application herein in this court yes and nature 11/19/01 denial with reasons by Justice Udelli - to whom interim Petition Application was referred by Presiding Justice Sullivan following his review of Petitioner Appellant's

Has adversary been advised of this application Does he/she consent 11/19/01 letter to him

Name Elena RGR Sassover
Petitioner - Appellant
 Address Post
Box 69, Geddes Station
White Plains, NY 10605-0069
 Tel. No. 914-421-1200

NYS Attorney General
Eliot Spitzer
120 Broadway
NY NY 10271

Appearing by Elena RGR
Sassover

CASE NO 03
11/16/01 Interim
Relief Application

DISPOSITION

(Do not write below this line)

To the extent petition for relief seeks audio-visual recording of November 21, 2000 proceedings or alternatively, a stenographic transcript thereof, application denied.

JRS/JS
 Justice

Nov. 20, 2001
 Date

Motion Date _____ Opposition _____ Reply _____

EXPEDITE _____ PHONE ATTORNEYS _____ DECISION BY _____

ALL PAPERS TO BE SERVED PERSONALLY.

 Law Assistant