Circuit Court Judge ROBERT E. COWAN
28 U.S.C. §372(c) Complaint
"The Mother of All Judicial Frauds"

I do not here complain of the disposition in C.A. 89-5810, in which Circuit Court Judge ROBERT E. COWAN ["Cowan"] was a panel member, although I find such disposition indefensible for numerous legal reasons.

However, one such reason, is ironically relevant in this §372(c) complaint.

1a. I was convicted for giving obedience to the mandate contained in Disciplinary Rule 1-103 and the obligation of citizenship, by exposing the criminal activity in the Third Circuit (cf. Holt v. Virginia, 381 U.S. 131 [1965]).

b. Judge Cowan, however, has done nothing to prevent the continued payment of extortion monies from HYMAN RAFFE ["Raffe"] to CLAPP & EISENBERG, P.C. ["C&E"], for efforts contrary to Raffe's legitimate interests (cf. Wood v Georgia, 450 U.S. 261, 265 n. 5 [1981]) and other unethical and criminal activities, although Judge Cowan was and is under a similar mandate (Canon 3B3).

c. Raffe has been compelled to make these payments for the C&E efforts in order to avoid incarceration under the trialess conviction of Mr. Justice ALVIN F. KLEIN ["Klein"] and the trialess Report of Referee DONALD DIAMOND ["Diamond"].

d. Furthermore, the efforts of C&E, were not for legitimate legal efforts, but to corrupt judges and officials.

e. If I am guilty for performing my duty, certainly Judge Cowan should be punished for his failure to perform his.

2a. In an attempt to reverse this sham conviction at the threshold, I moved this Court, by motion dated October 23, 1989, which was specifically mentioned in my Brief.

b. Four (4) months later, with no decision forthcoming, I was compelled to prepare and submit my Brief, which did not pretend to repeat the material set forth such October 23 motion.

c. For example, in my Brief, I stated (p. 23, 35):

> "Strine's testimony ... appears ... affirmation of October 23, 1989, as part of appellant's motion of that date, under this Docket Number.
>
> Appellant's motion of that date remains sub judice, although 'expeditious treatment' was specifically requested and no opposition was ever interposed."
>
> "Also unopposed, including appellant's motion of October 23, 1989 in this matter, pending sub judice, has been appellant's motion based upon 'double jeopardy' and 'invidious selectivity'.
>
> There have been more than forty (40) proceedings, each one of which them triggering 'double jeopardy' and 'invidious selectivity'."

d. However, unknown to me was the fact that my October 23, 1989 motion was not docketed by SALLY MVROS, Esq. ["Mvros"], Clerk of this Court, was being concealed by PAUL DOUGLAS SISK, Esq. ["Sisk"], Staff Attorney of this Court, and was never transmitted to this Court's panel.

e. The point is that Judge Cowan, must have known from, inter alia, my Brief, that my October 23, 1989 motion had not been transmitted to the Court's panel -- which motion, to this date, has not been determined.

f. Furthermore, being stonewalled by Mr. Sisk, are my post-decision motions, including the motion to have this Court determined my October 23, 1989 motion.

g. It is also clear that the office of the U.S. Attorney SAMUEL A. ALITO, JR. ["Alito"] was aware of this extrinsic fraud in this Court.

3a. Without more, Judge Cowan must have known that pages of A1-A53 of the Alito Appendix, which were the C&E papers, could not have possibly been admitted at the trial of my criminal contempt proceeding.

b. Also, Judge Cowan must have known that the Alito's Brief proliferated with improper statements, taken from the C&E papers which were not part of the record, although improperly included in his Appendix.

c. Obviously, in including such improper, C&E material in his Appendix and Brief, the Alito Office was aware that this Court was corrupt, which Judge Cowan confirmed.

4a. Furthermore, no judge, with even a scintilla of integrity, would have entertained a criminal proceeding by any U.S. Attorney, at federal expense, to insure the flow of extortion monies to C&E.

b. A further object of affirmant's pre-trial incarceration by this sham contempt proceeding was to have Referee Diamond "approve" a non-existent "final accounting" by a court-appointed receiver, a C&E client, and thereby perpetrate a fraud upon every legitimate creditor in the United States.

5a. This depraved criminal racketeering adventure, which includes the diversion of monies payable "to the federal court" to the C&E clients, cannot possibly succeed, particularly after it is made the subject of public disclosure.

b. Any inaction by Judge Cowan, who is being sent a copy of this complaint, simply adds another level of misconduct.

Dated: March 20, 1991

Respectfully,

GEORGE SASSOWER