

GEORGE SASSOWER  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
2125 MILL AVENUE  
BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11234

212-444-3400

December 14, 1984

Robert H. Straus, Esq.  
Grievance Committee for the Second  
and Eleventh Judicial Districts  
Municipal Building,  
Brooklyn, New York, 11201

Re: Complaint of Donald F. Schneider, Esq.  
Docket No. K-671-1984

Dear Mr. Straus,

1. I truly welcomed the receipt of a copy of the complaint of Donald F. Schneider, Esq., of Feltman, Karesh & Major, Esqs.

2a. I have not read it, do not intend to read it, plead "not guilty", and request, indeed solicit and demand, a public hearing.

b. Mr. Schneider, assuming the role of an apostle for your committee, has openly advised members of the judiciary that someone in your organization has "instructed" him to advise its various members to have a court stenographer present, as proof of my presence and/or participation.

Mr. Schneider does not merely request the presence of a court stenographer, which is his entitlement, but publicly announces that "the Grievance Committee has requested that he make the request" on its behalf!

c. Since the privilege of statutory confidentiality is mine alone, I have sued Schneider and the Feltman firm for such breach.

When Mr. Schneider refused to divulge the identity of the person in your committee who purportedly gave him such "instructions", I moved the Court for such relief, which is presently, sub judice.

d. Your communication, thereafter received, would ordinarily moot the judicial relief requested, except I know it is the policy of your committee to keep such information undisclosed. The only way I know whereby I can secure said information, or a denial that such "instructions" were given, is from Mr. Schneider and/or by Order of the Appellate Division.

3a. In my view, your committee has not found a method to counteract this "Schneider type" of invidious defamation, wherein the mere public proclamation of its filing does the damage!

b. This type of complainant, disregards the secrecy mandate of Judiciary Law §90[10], with impunity, causes its damage, and then, years later, the vindiction becomes confidential!

c. The upside-down world of Alice in Wonderland might be "funny" to her, falling down a rabbit hole (Chap. 1), but this inverted logic, where the complaint is public and the vindication is secret is ludicrous!

d. Thus, I must insist on an expeditious hearing, and respectfully request that it be held at a high floor, so that the Feltman entourage break more than a couple of legs jumping out of the window during cross-examination!

4a. Notwithstanding the above, your committee wants an answer from me, simply because your rules so provide.

My answer is as simple as a-b-c!

b. Mr. Schneider's complaint probably recites my peccadillos (I have a few); probably says I do not slavishly obey rules, as he perceives them to be (neither did Christ); and sometimes, I am unreasonable (true)!

5a. Barr v. Raffe (97 A.D.2d 696, 468 N.Y.S.2d 332 [1st Dept.]), says, what was never denied! -- What is good for Raffe, is good for Puccini!

The more Raffe pays Barr, the more Puccini pays Raffe! The less that Raffe pays Barr, the less Puccini pays Raffe!

Therefore, if I am accused of helping Raffe, my alleged crime is helping Puccini, the court's trust, of which Feltman is the agent!

Then the question is why is Feltman and his firm complaining for indirectly helping Puccini?

Is that not as simple as a-b-c!

b. Mr. Schneider probably accuses me of making 100 motions. Assuming, arguendo, that is true, since mathematicians, which I once was, generally do not know how to add!

c. At the public hearing that I demand, the Feltman firm will be asked why on all the 100 motions took a position contrary to Raffe?

At the public hearing that I demand, the Feltman firm will be asked why on all of the 100 motions, the Feltman firm took a position contrary to the legitimate interests of their trust, the judicial trust, their client?

At the public hearing that I demand, the Feltman firm will be asked why they concealed the larceny of judicially entrusted funds by the Kreindler entourage, so their trust, Puccini, was caused to have a judgment against it for \$500,000?

At the public hearing that I demand, the Feltman firm will be asked why they oppose the vacating of a judgment against Puccini for approximately \$500,000?

At the public hearing that I demand, the Feltman firm will be asked why, when it petitioned for investigatory accountants to verify the accusation against Kreindler & Relkin, P.C. and Arutt, Nachamie, Benjamin, Lipkin & Kirschner, P.C., they evaded the mandatory provisions of 22 NYCRR §660.24 in order to request the appointment of Rashba & Pokart, who they did not know before?

Of all the accountants in New York City, why did the Feltman firm desire Rashba & Pokart, the accountants for Kreindler & Relkin, P.C. and/or its clients, and the firm to whom the Arutt firm "laundered" \$6,200 of unlawfully taken cash from Puccini in order to pay a Kreindler bill?

Think of it! In order to conduct an investigation, the Feltman firm has the court appoint the accountants for the accused.

Think of it! In order to conduct an investigation of the accused, the Feltman firm requests the appointment of accountants who had "laundered" monies to such accountants from unlawfully taken cash trust assets of Puccini.

Why did not the Feltman firm disclose the disqualifying relationship to the Court when it requested the appointment?

How many times did the Feltman firm, by affidavit, advise federal and state courts and the undersigned that they had "all" the financial books and records of Puccini, now more than one-half are missing?

Let Mr. Schneider explain to Hon. Ethel B. Danzig why the receiver and his firm has not interposed a first party defense to his third party answer in view of the massive unlawful dissipation of judicially entrusted assets!

Mr. Schneider will go flying out the window before I will allow him to defile the courtroom of Hon. Ethel B. Danzig! He can confine his corrupt practices to the courtroom of Referee Diamond!

My alleged crime is that I exposed Feltman and his firm, agents of the court, to be Judas, in the Temple of Justice!

For a consistent perfidious course of conduct over the years, not a single act like Judas or Benedict Arnold, they want almost \$200,000 from Puccini, the rape!

In Fall River (or was it New Bedford), they gang rape in the poolroom and justice is done in the courtroom!

In Supreme Court, New York County, the rape takes place in the courtroom, with the rapee paying the rapors for the privilege, and receive the active and overt cooperation of Referee Donald Diamond!

6a. In World War II, I did not care what uniform the person was wearing! If he told me he sunk 100 American and British ships, I knew he was on the other side!

b. At common law, judges and lawyers who betrayed their trust had to face charges punishable by death.

c. Presently, my only remedy is to request that the Feltman firm take a copy of their charges against me, and shove it up the corporate rectum of Kreindler & Relkin, P.C., the architects of this larceny of judicially entrusted funds!

Since I have no use for my copy of their charges, I, if they wish, can have my copy of their 21 page complaint, and they can shove it up Referee Diamond's rectum, for the 21 good reasons I have for such public interest proposal!

7a. Courthouse are where "cases and controversies" are resolved, not the forum for "pay-offs"!

b. It is also probably true that the Schneider diatribe does not advise you that they took over \$100,000 from their judicial trust, without entering an appealable judgment or order, because the stench would overwhelm the entire area surrounding 25th Street and Madison Avenue! My demands for the return of such monies have not produced any results.

8a. Subject to prior committments, I need only one day's notice for any hearing!

b. A hearing should also confirm the validity of the old Yiddish proverb, that "one who seeks to bury another, generally falls into the grave himself."

9a. My best to your colleagues in White Plains. One of my daughters, by happenstance, witnessed their "finest hour". It was a performance which makes me proud of being a member of the profession.

b. Your colleagues in White Plains did a complete investigation and know more about me than I do.

c. Enclosed (Exhibit "A") is what I found last year above my eldest child's desk, in lieu of my photograph to remind her of her father.

d. At the public hearing that I demand, I once more expect to rewrite the scriptures, I will do the nailing!

Very truly yours,

  
GEORGE SASSOWER

GS/h

cc: Donald F. Schneider, Esq.  
Feltman, Karesh & Major, Esqs.  
Kreindler & Relkin, P.C.  
Arutt, Nachamie, Benjamin, Lipkin & Kirschner, P.C.  
Rashba & Pokart, P.C.  
Hon. Robert Abrams  
Att: David S. Cook  
Hon. Ethel B. Danzig  
Hon. Ira Gammerman  
Hon. Martin Evans  
Hon. Thomas J. Hughes  
Hon. Xavier C. Riccobono  
Hon. Michael Dontzin  
Hon. Thomas V. Sinclair, Jr.  
Hon. Martin H. Rettinger  
Referee Donald Diamond  
Mr. Hyman Raffé

P.S. Obviously, by overpublication, I have waived any privilege in defamation. I need none, as long as truth is a recognized defense! Mail service of any summons is acceptable and preferred.

The reasonable man  
adopts himself to the  
world;  
the unreasonable one  
persists in trying to  
adapt the world  
to himself.  
Therefore ...  
all progress depends  
on the unreasonable  
man.