SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF NEW YORK: PART 8

ELENA RUTH SASSOWER, Coordinator of the Center For Judicial Accountability, Inc., Acting Pro Bono Publico,

Petitioner,

- against -

: Index No. 108551/99

Commission on Judicial Conduct of The State Of New York,

Respondent.

60 Centre Street New York, New York 10007

May 17, 1999

B E F O R E:

HONORABLE DIANE A. LEBEDEFF, JSC

APPEARANCES:

ELENA RUTH SASSOWER, Pro Se

ELIOT SPITZER, ESQ.
Attorney General
120 Broadway
New York, New York 10271
BY: CAROLYN CAIRNS OLSON, ESQ.

Colloquy

THE COURT: There are several issues that were raised with me before going on the record. The first is that the respondent counsel maintains that this matter is, in a sense, a motion to reargue an opinion of Justice Cahn.

Now, is that opinion in the papers?

MS. CAIRNS OLSON: Yes, your Honor, we attached it as Exhibit 1 to our application in support of the motion or application for adjournment under 3012.

THE COURT: Now, it appears then with this additional background which makes it somewhat easier, perhaps movant can explain this to me, notice of right to seek intervention and I don't quite understand that because I'm not sure who is seeking to intervene.

MS. SASSOWER: Excuse me, your Honor, may I be heard?

THE COURT: Elena Ruth Sassower is seeking to intervene in the Doris Sassower case.

1	Colloquy
2	MS. SASSOWER: No.
3	MS. CAIRNS OLSON: No.
4	MS. SASSOWER: Absolutely not.
5	THE COURT: Now, you are whom,
6	please?
7	MS. SASSOWER: I am Elena Ruth
8	Sassower. I am the petitioner pro se
9	acting pro bono publico in this public
10	interest Article 78 proceeding against
11	the New York State Commission on
12	Judicial Conduct. I have asked that
13	these proceedings be on the record
14	because of the
15	THE COURT: I put you on the
16	record.
17	MS. SASSOWER: the importance of
18	the case.
19	THE COURT: Please explain to me
20	then, first, what are you seeking to
21	intervene?
22	MS. SASSOWER: I am not seeking to
23	intervene. I am seeking to have the
24	attorney general and other public
2 5	offices and agencies intervene in this
- 11	

Colloquy

2.5

public interest litigation where the constitutionality of the statutes are at issue and rules are at issue as well as the demonstration in the papers of the corruption of this essential agency in covering up judicial misconduct complaints that are legitimately filed with --

THE COURT: Ma'am, we can start
the basics then. Could you tell me
what's the procedural import of this
piece of paper which you directed to
the New York State Attorney General,
the District Attorney of New York
County, the New York State Ethics
Commission, the United States Attorney,
labeled notice of right to seek
intervention?

Usually when someone speaks of intervention they wish to intervene in some other proceeding.

MS. SASSOWER: Under the statute we are required to give notice to the attorney general when an agency such as

Colloquy

the Commission on Judicial Conduct is sued. We not only gave notice to them, but we have sought actively that they should, the attorney general should, intervene on behalf of this public interest.

However, before getting to these important issues I respectfully request your Honor to put on the record the threshold issue of conflict of interest and potential disqualification that you probably identified off the record when we first approached the bench.

THE COURT: Certainly. I advised you that I had been counsel to Daniel Joy from about maybe 1976 to 1980, and I was extremely fond of him and you are suing him as a member of that commission.

MS. SASSOWER: The commission on judicial conduct is being sued. He is its now highest ranking judicial member. The question that you posed was whether or not you should

Colloquy

disqualify yourself.

THE COURT: That's because I hadn't particularly focused-- as I told you, this particular file was brought up to me on Friday and I saw his name in the papers, I flipped through it, I didn't focus on what the nature of the proceedings was. If you are trying to do something on a claim against him then I would recuse myself. If you are just naming him because he's a member of the commission and you are just suing the commission, that's a different matter, it's not personal.

MS. SASSOWER: The particular facts that give rise to this Article 78 petition are the commission's dismissal without investigation and without any determination of facial merit of a judicial misconduct complaint dated October 6, 1998, in violation of Judiciary Law 44.1 which mandates that the commission shall investigate a complaint except if it determines that

Colloquy

a complaint is facially lacking in merit. Absent such determination its duty under law is to investigate. It did not investigate. It dismissed without investigation and without any findings or reasons.

Additionally, you will notice that among the relief sought is to compel the commission to receive a judicial misconduct complaint dated February 3, 1999, directing against Justice Joy. The commission has failed to acknowledge such complaint and failed to determine it as it is required to do under law, including the New York Constitution Article 22.

Now, I don't want to pass over this threshold issue of whether or not it is appropriate for your Honor to sit on this case. You quite properly made the disclosure that you are required to make under the law and ethical rules. I thank you and commend you. Perhaps, the -- are you asking--

1 Colloquy 2 THE COURT: I'm just looking for 3 the part--4 MS. SASSOWER: Relief. 5 THE COURT: -- of the petition--6 MS. SASSOWER: Relating to Justice 7 Joy. 8 THE COURT: That relates to 9 Justice Joy. 10 MS. SASSOWER: If I may direct you 11 to the notice of petition. 12 THE COURT: Certainly. 13 MS. SASSOWER: Number 6 on page 2 14 of the notice of petition. "Commanding 15 respondent to formally "receive" and 16 "determine" petitioner's February 3, 17 1999, judicial misconduct complaint 18 against Appellate Division, Second 19 Department, Justice Daniel W. Joy." 20 MS. CAIRNS OLSON: Your Honor, the 21 written complaint against Judge Joy 22 dated February 3, is attached to the 23 petitioner's Exhibit F-6. The 24 commissioner reply to that letter is 25 from Mr. Stern, attached is Exhibit

1 Colloquy 2 F-7. 3 MS. SASSOWER: Yes. My response to 4 Mr. Stern's letter is Exhibit G dated 5 March 11, 1999, which as detailed in 6 the petition I received no response 7 from Mr. Stern whatsoever and, indeed, 8 the last factual allegation of the 9 petition on page -- bottom of page 15 " Neith 10 going to 16-- paragraph 46, Respondent 105 Administrator 11 nor administrative have responded to 12 petitioner's March 11, 1999, letter 13 including acknowledging petitioner's 14 prior February 3, 1999, letter as a 15 judicial misconduct complaint against 16 Justice Joy." 17 THE COURT: Now, could I ask you 18 what is your relationship to Doris L. 19 Sassower? 20 MS. SASSOWER: I am her obvious 21 adult daughter. 22 THE COURT: And have you filed a 23 complaint with the commission?

24

25

Michele Mallette, RPR Official Court Reporter

MS. SASSOWER: Yes, the complaints,

the two complaints here at issue in

Colloquy

2 3

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this litigation, the October 6, 1998, judicial misconduct complaint is signed It appears at C-1. by me. It is so reflected in the factual allegations that this was my complaint as likewise was my complaint against Justice Joy.

THE COURT: Then I believe the best course would be for me to recuse myself. I will return this case for reassignment. I will advise motion support that it should be reviewed, including appropriate contact with administrative Judge Crane, for possible reassignment to Justice Cahn or to be put on the wheel. That will be a determination made by somebody else.

MS. CAIRNS OLSON: We have a pending application for extension of time to respond to the petition That was the application we made before the referee on Friday. We are asking for an extension of time.

We had agreed that we would have

May I be

Ιt

Colloguy 2 papers served in opposition on Friday 3 of this week and that we had hoped to 4 have it returnable on the 28th of May, 5 but if it is going to be reassigned 6 then it should be returnable before the 7 new justice assigned, whatever date he 8 or she has motions. 9 MS. SASSOWER: Excuse me. 10 heard, your Honor? 11 THE COURT: Yes. 12 MS. SASSOWER: Not only have you 13 rightfully recognized that you have 14 personal and professional relationships 15 that input, impact upon your 16 impartiality, but it is respectfully monoasc 17 submitted that there are enumerable 18 justices in this court who are likewise 19 disqualified for both apparent and 20 actual bias --21 THE COURT: I really don't know of 22 anybody who has been counsel to one of 23 the respondents. 24 MS. SASSOWER: Justice Crane--25 THE COURT: Excuse me, ma'am.

1

Colloquy

is something which is unusual and it is an unusual relationship and rather than getting into it now I think that recusal is appropriate. But, I'm not saying that I would have necessarily been biased. It's just in the interest of appearance of justice that I do that and no other judge would appreciate getting a case after it had been on my calendar for awhile so I think taking everything into accountability --

MS. SASSOWER: I recognize your disqualification from this case which you have voluntarily held--

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. SASSOWER:-- is simply to insure the appearance of impartiality that must be attached to those proceedings. However, every justice in this state is under the jurisdiction, disciplinary jurisdiction on the commission on judicial conduct and as such there are legitimate reasonable questions as to their ability to be

Colloquy

fair and impartial and particularly in a case of this magnitude where what --

THE COURT: Ma'am, let me refer you to the late Justice Leff. There are many people who are not admires of that particular system. However, I don't think there's anything further I can do on this point.

You had asked for an extension to answer for what date?

MS. CAIRNS OLSON: This Friday, your Honor. We'll mail them opposing papers on Friday.

MS. SASSOWER: They have to have standing.

Excuse me, your Honor. I have asked Miss Olsen by what authority, by what legal authority is she here representing the Commission on Judicial Conduct.

Now, I understand that it is accepted almost as a matter of course that the attorney general pops up whenever a public officer or agency is

You have

I do have

1 Colloquy 2 However, there is law that sued. 3 requires that the attorney general 4 appear only in litigation on which the 5 state is interested to advance the 6 state interest and that requires that a 7 determination be made as to where that 8 interest is. I have asked--9 THE COURT: Ma'am, let me tell you 10 it's very common for the attorney 11 general to represent people and 12 agencies even though they have their 13 own counsel and maybe they are still 14 sorting that out. 15 MS. SASSOWER: There is--16 THE COURT: May 24th is the date 17 that you wanted? 18 MS. CAIRNS OLSON: Fine. 19 MS. SASSOWER: Excuse me. 20 no jurisdiction to grant any 21 extension. 22 Let me show-- in addition--23 THE COURT: Ma'am, you can take 24 that up with the next judge. 25 a full courtroom.

Colloquy

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22

23

24

25

MS. SASSOWER: In addition to disqualification the procedure is laid out in Article, in the CPLR, Section 7804. Interestingly, their application was not made pursuant to 7804. This is an Article 78 proceeding. 7804 specifically says, subparagraph E, "Should the body or officer fail either to file and serve an answer or to move to dismiss, the court may either issue a judgment in favor of the petitioner or order that an answer be submitted."

They have -- there is no jurisdiction.

MS. CAIRNS OLSON: It is our intent to make application under 7804 after dismissing the petition.

MS. SASSOWER: You already disqualified yourself. Having disqualified--

THE COURT: I have said I am remanding the case for assignment. The time to answer is extended to May 24.

1	Colloquy
2	MS. CAIRNS OLSON: It was our
3	opposition of 7804 after.
4	THE COURT: Thank you. You have
. 5	to follow reassignment through the Law
6	Journal.
7	MS. SASSOWER: You are saying that
. 8	having disqualified yourself you could
9	extend their time
10	THE COURT: Yes, it's not going to
11	be before another judge
12	MS. SASSOWER: and relieve them
13	of default?
14	THE COURT: Ma'am, I made my
15	ruling. It's on the record. You are
16	free to order the transcript.
17	MS. SASSOWER: They are in default.
18	THE COURT: Thank you very much
19	000
20	Certified to be a true and correct transcript of the foregoing proceedings
21	- Hulli filitti
22	
23	
24	
25	