GEORGE SASSOWER

Attorney-at-Law 10 Stewart Place White Plains, NY 10603-3856 (914) 681-7196

Public Integrity Section U.S. Department of Justice 10th & Constitution Ave. Washington, D.C. 20530 April 30, 2012

Re: Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe

Gentlemen:

1. Investigation reveals that the recently received "Order" issued by the Chief Clerk of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, *Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe*, dated August 24, 2010 (Exhibit "A"), with its "constitutionally & legally impossible" disposition, was <u>not</u> supported by any contemporaneous document by a panel of Circuit Court judges who authorized such Order.

The panel judges who authorized the issuance of the Order of August 24, 2010, were and are "phantom" "fictitious" & "non-existent"!

Even if this panel of judges existed, and it did not, the disposition made was "constitutionally & legally impossible"!

It is because the disposition made was & is "constitutionally & legally impossible", that there are no identifiable panel of judges who authorized the disposition made by Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe!

- 2. A small portion of the *undenied & uncontroverted* portion of ten (10) page "Leave to Appeal" affirmation of July 23, 2010, reads as follows:
 - " 2. The *only* 'bribes' by and/or behalf of *Citibank*, *N.A.* that are here targeted, although *only* a fraction of its total *bribes*, are the more than \$3,500,000 from 'sources' where: (1) 'public accountings' are *mandatory*, and (2) affirmant has 'standing' to 'sue & recover'.

Thus, for example, <u>all</u> monies payable `to the [federal] court', which included affirmant's monies, pursuant to the Order by U.S. District Court Judge <u>Eugene</u> H. Nickerson (Raffe v. Citibank, 84Civ0305 [EDNY-EHN]) were `diverted' to the coffers of Citibank, N.A. and its `estate chasing' attorneys, <u>Kreindler & Relkin, P.C.</u> [`K&R'], and `the federal court' and/or the `United States', received <u>none</u> of these federal monies. Thus, to have these "diverted" federal monies recaptured from Citibank-K&R in favor of the United petitioner needs permission!

- 3. The *only* 'expenditures' that are here targeted are those where: (1) where 'public accountings' are mandatory; (2) result in 'subject matter jurisdictional' infirmities and (3) where affirmant has 'standing' to cause '*reimbursement*' to be made.

 Obviously, here also, to prevent 'reimbursement' to the United States and State of New York, affirmant must be denied 'access' to the courts for these Federal & NY State judges to continue their financial frauds upon United States and State of New York."
- 3. Under Docket No 10-2371, *Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe* is requested to forward to you Document #2 (dated June 25, 2010) and Document #4 (dated June 27, 2010), and you will immediately obtain a view of the *modus operandi* of this criminal racketeering operation.

4. As Document #4 reveals, besides the United States & State of New York, the *Estate of Eugene Paul Kelly* and *Puccini Clothes, Ltd.* are among the other victims of this racketeering "*Enterprise*". As Exhibit "B" confirms there are none of the mandatory *NY Judiciary Law* §35-a Statements for these two (2) judicial trusts, since they would show "*bribe*" payments to judges!

Please advise me when you receive Document #2 and #4 and I will give you additional information about this operation, which includes copies of cancelled checks for some of the "*bribe*" payments made.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE SASSOWER

cc: Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe

United States Court of Appeals

SECOND CIRCUIT

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse, 500 Pearl Street, in the City of New York, on the 24th day of August, two thousand ten,

George Sassower,

Petitioner,

V.

10-2371-mv

Franklin A. Mahoney, Honorable, as Presiding Justice of the Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department, Wilfred Feinberg, Eugene H. Nickerson, Milton Mollen, Xavier C. Riccobono, Alvin F. Klein, Ira Gammerman, Allan L. Winick, Denis Dillon, Robert Abrams, Anthony Mastroianni, The District Court of Nassau County, David S. Saxe,

Respondents.

Appellant, pro se, moves for leave to file an appeal from a district court order denying his motion for, inter alia, relief pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(4). Upon due consideration of the appellant's history of vexatious litigation, as demonstrated by his repeated filing of the same allegations against the respondents, it is ORDERED that the motion for leave to file is DENIED. See In re Martin-Trigona, 737 F.2d 1254, 1261-62 (2d Cir. 1984). It is further ORDERED that Appellant's motion for summary reversal is DENIED as moot.

FOR THE COURT: Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk

Cothering Second Particolfe

SAO-EJC

Ex h.b. 14"



A. GAIL PRUDENTI Chief Administrative Judge STATE OF NEW YORK
UNIFIED COURT SYSTEM
25 BEAVER STREET
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10004
TEL: (212) 428-2160
FAX: (212) 428-2155

JOHN W. MCCONNELL

January 30, 2012

Mr. George Sassower 10 Stewart Place White Plains. New York 10603-3856

Dear Mr. Sassower:

In response to your recent letter, please be advised that a search of our relevant files revealed no Judiciary § Law 35(a) filings responsive to your inquiry about:

For Puccini Clothes, Ltd.: Lee Feltman Karesh, Major & Farbman Rashba & Pokart

For the Estate of Eugene Paul Kelly: Vincent Berger Irwin Klein Richard C. Cahn Ernest Ruck John Marshal, Jr.

Very truly yours,

Shawn Kerby

Assistant Deputy Counsel

ExhibN 11B1