

GEORGE SASSOWER

ATTORNEY AT LAW

~~2125 MILL AVENUE~~ 51 Davis Avenue,  
~~BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11234~~ White Plains, N.Y. 10605

~~212 444-3100~~

9148949-2169

December 7, 1985

Hon. Joseph W. Bellacosa  
Chief Administrator  
Office of Court Administration  
270 Broadway,  
New York, New York, 10007

Re: Puccini Clothes, Ltd.

Honorable Sir:

1a. Welcome to "Puccini Clothes, Ltd.",  
sometimes sub-titled, "Corruption, Judicially  
Administered".

b. This is my Pearl Harbor Day missive!

2a. I first wish to thank your office for the  
pleasant and courteous telephone calls this past week,  
months after my initial communications to you, and years  
after your office should have known what was happening,  
which on this day, Pearl Harbor Day, has parallel  
significance!

b. Having cracked the code, and learning  
that an attack by the Japanese Imperial Navy was planned  
and would probably take place at or shortly after 7:00  
a.m. (Oahu time), the War Department in Washington, sent  
such information to General Short and Admiral Kimmel,  
the local commanders, by telegraph, despite the  
invention of the telephone during the preceding century.  
The telegram arrived on the 8th!

3a. We are now at the point in the Puccini  
litigation where "indulgences" have become the "coins of  
the judicial realm", as the carrot alternative for  
judicial and official barbarism!

b. The sale of "judicial indulgences" by  
administrative [mis]use of judicial power was  
inescapably predictable, when I first wrote you!



4a. Today, it is, I, the american, believing in the american way of judicial adjudication, who is prepared to drop the bombs after, unlike 44 years ago, clear and unambiguous notice that my attack was forthcoming, and your doing nothing!

b. Thus, not having heard from your office, during the intervening months, I communicated, and I am still in communication, with the criminal, federal and state, prosecuting authorities, the media, and others legitimately interested in the matter!

c. I have, sufficient evidence against more than twenty (20) jurists and judicially related officials, to support prosecution and/or presentment by the United States Department of Justice and Grand Jury, ranging from Grand Larceny to wilfull violation of civil rights (18 U.S.C. §242), for which, as you know, there is no immunity, judicial and/or official!

5a. On the state level, preparations have been made made for a presentment to the Grand Jury, pursuant to Article 1, §6 of the Constitution of the State of New York.

b. I direct your attention to the strength of such state constitutional provision, for it reads:

"The power of grand juries to inquire into the wilful misconduct in office of public officers, and to find indictments or to direct the filing of informations in connections with such inquiries, shall never be suspended or impaired by law."

c. While I have no problem in directing copies of this and future communications to your Inspector General, William J. Gallagher, Esq., or to John Brosnan, Esq., or Hon. Milton L. Williams, or to anyone else requested by your office, I desire that the original be directed to you personally.

6a. I have repeatedly stated, and do now again emphatically state, that I do not have the authority to compound criminal activity, or to aid or abet in its concealment, and I certainly have no intention of doing so, especially where, as here, my and my client's rights are involved!



b. I write you this letter at the request of your office, because while I will not agree to compound criminal conduct, I will give you some little time to investigate, remedy, and responsibly take a leading role against those who have and are transgressing.

c. That little time includes, as a precondition, your office assigning a responsible person, even if he/she be a half-blind high school graduate, to look at the judicially entrusted financial books and records of Puccini Clothes, Ltd., for at least fifteen minutes, and report to you the findings!

That function must be concluded, even if it be only by a tentative report, no later than Thursday, December 12, 1985, by 12:00 noon, and I am to be informed of such fact by 3:00 p.m.

d. This employee merely has to look at Puccini's check book, determine if monies were paid from Puccini's bank account between June 4, 1980 and February 1, 1982, and the task is completed, since all such monies were unlawfully disbursed and no monies were recovered by the court appointed receiver, or even attempted!

On further inspection, if such employee desires, he/she will immediately see that about 12 employees liquidated Puccini's inventory, over a seven month period, and the gross amount received by Puccini was \$512! Whether, as the ultimate trustee of Puccini, you choose to believe the aforementioned was the total collected or collectable, is your decision.

e. If you desire, I will supply you with further documentation, including confessions.

7a. You must remember, it is now five and one-half years since the assets and affair of Puccini became custodia legis, by Order of the Supreme Court, New York County.

b. Despite the uncontroverted documented, and indeed, judicially filed confessions, of grand larceny of judicially entrusted assets, perjury, corruption, and other criminal acts, no accounting, final or intermediate, has taken place!

c. Such function and responsibility, is administrative, not judicial (48A CJS §91, p. 700), and I do not demand copies of your reports or findings, only that it be handled responsibly!



d. It must be recognized that Puccini, albeit a judicially emasculated eunuch since June 4, 1980, is still a "person" within the meaning of the XIV Amendment of the Constitution of the United States (Antieu, Federal Civil Rights [2d ed.] §59, p. 96), entitled to due process and equal protection of the laws.

Consequently, the Court, in permitting its court appointed perfidious receiver to invariably take positions contrary to the legitimate interests of the judicial trust, including stonewalling all attempts in the return of such stolen assets, is criminally violating Puccini's civil rights (18 USC §242).

e. Mr. Bellacosa, what do you believe a Grand Jury would say, if I named more than 30 members of the Appellate Division and Supreme Court, who have actual knowledge that a massive larceny of Puccini's judicially entrusted assets had occurred and all these judicial officers said and nothing, except conceal such larceny? Can a court, judge, and/or trustee take a Kitty Genovese attitude to criminal activity, where a judicial trust is involved?

Mr. Bellacosa, what do you believe a Grand Jury would say, if I informed them that Puccini's statutory guardian in the Attorney General's Office, David S. Cook, Esq., did nothing to protect Puccini's rights because he was "commandeered" to simultaneously represent the very jurists that were actively aiding and abetting such larceny or concealing same?

Think of it, Mr. Bellacosa, your office and members of the judiciary, accepted the services of David S. Cook, Esq., and/or his alter ego, Irving I. Slonim, Esq., for exclusive, representation in the Puccini matter, when he was Puccini's statutory watchdog, and there were so many other Assistant Attorney Generals available!

Speak to Mr. Cook, who totally neglected and neglects each and every mandatory and discretionary obligation contained in Article 12 of the Business Corporation Law on behalf of Puccini, who has had actually notice of massive larceny of Puccini's trust assets for almost two years and done nothing to obtain restitution, or to compel an accounting, because he was thereafter assigned to represent you, your office, the Supreme Court, the Appellate Division, and members of those courts, in conflicting obligations!



Mr. Bellacosa, is there anyone that Dante found in the nine circles of The Inferno, whose infamy is so base and unredeeming? This unparalleled continuous conduct of infamy, I submit, earns for its participants a place in the Tenth Circle of Hell!

f. I suggest, that on this fact alone, the Grand Jury, as part of its report against you, your office, and a substantial portion of the bench, might adopt the imperious words of Oliver Cromwell to Parliament, words that were again uttered by Leopold S. Amery, M.P. to P.M. Neville Chamberlain, a friend of many years:

"You have sat too long here for any good you have been doing. Depart, I say, and let us have done with you. In the name of God, go!"

8. Very briefly and summarily, let me set forth the latest documented chapter of judicial conduct in the Puccini matter, which is both unconstitutional and barbaric!

9a. Mr. Justice DAVID B. SAXE, ran roughshod over my plea of "not guilty, double jeopardy, and invidious and selective prosecution", with regard to the assertions made that I violated the Order of Mr. Justice Ira Gammerman, as His Honor convicted, sentenced, and had me incarcerated, all without a trial, for purportedly bringing a particular law suit.

Every jurist in the United States, law school graduate or not, knows that as a matter of ministerial prohibition, every american court and judge cannot convict, sentence, and incarcerate a person without a trial, absent a plea of guilty, whether that person be saint or sinner! The confrontation clause is decisive!

b. That lawsuit was primarily intended to test the constitutionality of CPLR §5222(b), which permits third party restraint of "twice" the amount of a judgment.

c. The Supreme Court of the United States has observed that it never determined the issue of whether a state court "must" accept a §1983 cause of action (Martinez v. California, 444 U.S. 277, n. 7).



d. Kreindler & Relkin, P.C., who, with their clients, engineered the grand larceny of Puccini's judicially entrusted assets, had served two hundred (200) subpoenas, with restraining notices, against my client, Hyman Raffe, a multi-millionaire, against whom a judgment of \$10,000 was very easily collectable.

e. That firm, indeed, kept serving restraining notices, each for twice the amount, even when it knew where it could obtain full satisfaction, and indeed even after it restrained more than a sufficient amount to satisfy their judgment (cf. Lugar v. Edmondson, 457 U.S. 922; Warren v. Delaney, 98 A.D.2d 799, 469 N.Y.S.2d 457 [2d Dept.]).

Thus, such a procedure, potentially freezing \$4,000,000, or 400 times the face amount of the judgment, could ruin anyone's credit in the financial market, even one who is a multi-millionaire, was, in my opinion, both unconstitutional and tortious (Lugar v. Edmondson, supra)!

f. In addition to the aforementioned, the Kreindler firm, subpoenaed his wife, his accountant, and some of the corporations Raffe controlled.

g. Feltman, Karesh & Major, Esqs., followed a similar, but less drastic, procedure.

h. Thus, for causing the issuance of a summons, to test, inter alia, the constitutionality of the aforementioned, a motion to hold me in non-summary criminal contempt, was routed to Mr. Justice Saxe, who, despite Bloom v. Illinois (391 U.S. 194), which placed non-summary criminal contempt within the protection of the XIV Amendment, deprived me of my constitutional right of confrontation (Amendment VI, XIV, of the United States Constitution; Article 1, §6 of the New York State Constitution), and other fundamental rights.

i. Judge Saxe, as I can show you, believes that Puccini's trust assets, are but carrion for the insatiable appetites of the Feltman and Kreindler criminals!

10a. Mr. Justice Alvin F. Klein, for a substantially similar set of legally operative facts, convicted me, Hyman Raffe, and Sam Polur, Esq., for non-summary criminal contempt, and imposed sentence on each of 30 days, again without benefit of trial, for allegedly also violating the Order of Mr. Justice Gammerman.



b. Consequently, without risking further incarceration, there is no way that Raffe can stop this practice of restraining his bank accounts, even where judgments simply do not exist, as has been the Kreindler & Feltman practice, as well!

To repeat, the Kreindler and Feltman firms have placed restraints on Raffe's accounts, which the banks honor, in the sum of twice the amount, where judgments simply do not exist, and since Raffe is deprived of access to the courts for a judicial remedy, except by permission of Mr. Justice Gammerman, Raffe is compelled to make pay extortion.

c. By right or authority did Referee Donald Diamond and then Mr. Justice Ira Gammerman, by self-proclamation, crown themselves "Administrative Judicial Caesars", to whom all jurists must vow obedience (cf. Eskridge v. Washington, 357 U.S. 214; Balogh v. H.R.B. Caterers, 88 A.D.2d 136, 452 N.Y.S.2d 220 [2d Dept.]?)

Referee Donald Diamond and Mr. Justice Ira Gammerman have even terminated the inherent right of every judge and court to vacate their own decisions and orders based upon fraud and misconduct!

Can the Office of Court Administration, or any civilized judicial system, properly function if each and every jurist, can by a self-proclaimed ukase, make themselves the "angel of death", by requiring their administrative permission before their coordinate colleagues can act?

d. Consequently, I keep my money in a "non-interest bearing mattress" on which I sleep, but Raffe, a business-man, cannot protect his funds by that primitive method!

11a. Mr. Polur and I served our sentences at the Bronx House of Detention, where the entire inmate population were in unanimous agreement that no American judge can deprive one of the biblical (Acts of the Apostles, 25/16) and constitutional right of an "eyeball to eyeball" confrontation before the tribunal that determines guilt!



b. Some inmates expressed the opinion that they apparently know more basic constitutional law than Mr. Justice Saxe, Mr. Justice Klein, Referee Donald Diamond, and the Appellate Division, First Department, and that they belonged on the bench and the aforementioned jurists in jail -- an observation, on which, I presently do not desire to express a published opinion!

c. I also learned from an inmates that the Klu Klux Klan, even in its heyday of power, gave their untried prisoners a [drumhead] trial, which I later confirmed to be generally true (Briscoe v. LaHue, 460 U.S. 325, 340)!

12a. With Mr. Raffe, on the other hand, instead of incarcerating, the Kreindler and Feltman firms, in consort with members of the judiciary and the Sheriffs of the City of New York and Nassau County, began playing the "fugitive from justice" ruse.

b. It is analogous to execution of sentence by hanging one with "piano wire", the treatment Hitler gave to those who attempted to assassinate him, who parenthetically, were first afforded a public trial!

c. The scenario in the "fugitive from justice" barbarity is that deputy sheriffs, holding an obligatory, non-discretionary, warrant to arrest and incarcerate, instead visit your home, place of business, and neighbors homes, when they know that you are not there, leaving messages that you are a "fugitive from justice", that you "will be arrested if you do not settle the civil litigation", and periodically make embarrassing and harassing visits and telephone calls, even advising you when they are coming so that you can absent yourself.

Would you like to have your family, neighbors and employees told you are a "fugitive from justice"!

d. Thus, you and your family are constantly in a state of flux, emotional stress, and unable to make any definitive plans, since you are on a common law "outlawry" status.

e. Unlike Hitler, the victims of the Kreindler and Feltman firms offer to obtain for you a "judicial indulgence" from Administrator Xavier C. Riccobono, or Mr. Justice Klein, or from one of the other "fixable" judges in their stable, whose facade reads "The true administration of justice ..."



13a. Dramatic of the corrupt state of affairs, is the fact that recently I came into possession of a document held by Justice Klein, and the Kreindler & Feltman firms, dated July 31, 1985, which completely exonerates Raffe, and constitutionally compels Justice Klein to immediately vacate the aforementioned order of conviction (Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83).

b. It is my understanding that the culprits are holding, including Mr. Justice Klein, this document until Mr. Raffe submits to their demands, before exonerating him based on such four (4) month old document!

c. In my view this is extortion, in every sense of the word!

14a. The same Gammerman Order upon which Mr. Justice Saxe and Mr. Justice Klein bottomed their summary adjudications, also prohibits Raffe or myself from communicating with the Grievance Committee or any professional disciplinary organizations, with regard to these criminals, again under pains of incarceration, without a trial! Apparently the right to petition government (Amendment I of the United States Constitution and Article 1, §9 of the New York State Constitution), has been jettisoned, in what seems to be becoming "Beirut on the Hudson"!

b. There are two (2) Gammerman Orders, both dated January 23, 1985.

c. The "sewer odyssey" Order of January 23, 1985, was purportedly noticed for settlement at Special Term Part I.

The records reveal that such Order was not processed at Special I before it arrived at the Chambers of Mr. Justice Gammerman; the records reveal that such Order was not processed at Special Term Part I after it left Chambers; and the records reveal that it was not processed in the office of the County Clerk.

I found same three weeks later, in its pristine state, untouched and unmarked in the County Clerk's jacket, with only the Gammerman mark added.

Such Order, directed co-ordinate jurists to terminate any inquiry into the manner in which Lee Feltman, Esq. and Feltman, Karesh & Major, Esqs., were handling the judicial trust, including aborting a motion which was sub judice for about one month!



Is this the administrative route of judicial papers for which you and your office can remain silent?

e. The "out-of-orbit" Gammerman Order of January 23, 1985, entered January 24, 1985, was supposedly based on an "on the record" decision of December 19, 1984 by Mr. Justice Gammerman.

Nevertheless, the Order differs as much from the decision, as Hamlet differed from Hecuba!

According to the statements made by the Kreindler & Feltman firms to the Clerk in Special I who checked such order before sending it to Chambers, they had ex parte discussions with Administrator Riccobono and Mr. Justice Gammerman after December 19, 1984, and in effect they were told to prepare any order they desired, it would be signed! They did, and "hijacked" the judicial machinery in the process.

f. Parenthetically, the records at Special Term Part I reveal that the Clerks were checking orders on January 23, 1985, which were noticed for settlement for January 16, 1985!

g. Furthermore, the Attorney General's Office has conceded that such Gammerman Order is ineffective as against its office and judicial clients since they were not given notice thereof.

Nor did this Order have jurisdiction over D'Amato & Lynch, Esqs., representing one of the defendants, or of Raffe!

h. Consequently, my second demand is that you immediately make inquiry of the Feltman and Kreindler firms, and of Mr. Justice Gammerman and Administrator Riccobono, of the judicial-administrative events from December 19, 1984 to January 24, 1985 with respect to such Orders, or else perhaps the Grand Jury will!

Here again, you need not disclose the results of your inquiry to me, but only that by Monday, December 19, 1985, you advise me that such reports have been received, and that you will take expeditious responsible action!



15a. Finally, you are to make immediate demand of Referee Donald Diamond to make report of all his activities in the Puccini matter, and diligently investigate same, substantially completely such inquiry within two months.

b. I assure you any report can only read as something which could only occur in the courts of Cardinal Richelieu or Richard III (who, incidentally, was one of the best administrative monarchs England ever had).

c. Only one Diamond incident is set forth, because it is related to what has heretofore been said.

Referee Diamond makes his own rules for his "non-public courtroom", all of which blithely disregard the Constitution of the United States and every document thereunder.

I was dragooned into Referee's Diamond's non-public courtroom, after he blocked my access to Special Term Part II (ex parte applications), in order to obtain his permission to make two motions.

One such motion was constitutionally mandated, and he was denied permission for me making same!

In the other motion for which I requested permission to make, I offered to gratuitously increase Puccini's assets by a minimum of \$300,000 within 45 days, without cost, risk, or obligation! It was an offer that could not be refused, since no one could rationally refuse an offer to have his net worth increased by a minimum of \$300,000, without cost or risk!

Referee Diamond denied permission to make that motion also, assessing Raffe \$5,000, and directing that the Feltman firm submit to him an affidavit so that he could enter judgment against Raffe and myself for almost \$200,000!

No summons, no motion, no trial, no hearing, no nothing -- except the submission of an affidavit by the Feltman firm and Diamond would enter judgment!

d. Now you may understand why my money is in my mattress, and why Raffe has succumbed to a great extent!



Dec. 7, 1985

16a. Mr. Bellacosa, 44 years tomorrow, I stood on the longest line I have ever seen. Every one seemed to be on that line trying to enlist, and the pay was only a few dollars a week. We all knew our obligation to ourselves and our country!

b. Today, I stand on about the shortest line, prepared to fight these criminals, robed and unrobed, who have hijacked and hold hostage the "machinery of justice", and I am receiving less than I received in the army.

c. To those who demand that I surrender, I say, what was said to the same demand in the Ardennes on December 22, 1944 -- "Nuts"!

d. The complaint in three criminal contempt motions returnable this month, is that I do not surrender (and accept an "indulgence")!

e. December, especially, is not a month to surrender to infamy. In December 1941, there was no surrender because of the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor; in December 1944, there was no surrender at Bastogne; December, the month celebrating the birth of Christ, one who certainly did not surrender; and December, the Festival of Lights, the rededication of the Temple in Jerusalem, there was no surrender! I will not surrender in December, or any other month!

Surrender? I have just begun!

f. I suggest, Mr. Bellacosa, that in December you throw out the judicial fixers, and restore the rule of law in the judicial system or "in the name of God, go!

17a. I afford you some time to remedy the situation and restore the mandate of Article 6, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution as the "supreme law of the land", only because I believe you have the facilities to perform the job better.

b. That job will be done. If not by you, by me!

Happy Holiday.

Respectfully,

  
GEORGE SASSOWER



cc: Hon. Joseph W. Bellacosa  
Att: William J. Gallagher, Esq.  
Hon. Joseph W. Bellacosa  
Att: John Brosnam, Esq.  
Hon. Milton L. Williams  
Foreperson, Grand Jury, New York County  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Hon. Mario M. Cuomo  
Hon. Edward I. Koch  
Hon. Francis T. Murphy  
Hon. Theodore R. Kupferman  
Hon. Leonard H. Sandler  
Hon. Joseph P. Sullivan  
Hon. David Ross  
Hon. John Carro  
Hon. Sidney H. Asch  
Hon. Max Bloom  
Hon. Arnold L. Fein  
Hon. E. Leo Milonas  
Hon. Bentley Kassel  
Hon. Ernst H. Rosenberger  
Hon. Betty W. Ellerin  
Administrator Xavier C. Riccobono  
Mr. Justice Alvin F. Klein  
Mr. Justice Ira Gammerman  
Hon. Michael J. Dontzin  
Mr. Justice Martin Evans  
Mr. Justice Andrew R. Tyler  
Mr. Justice Thomas V. Sinclair, Jr.  
Mr. Justice Martin H. Rettinger  
Mr. Justice David B. Saxe  
Referee Donald Diamond  
Kreindler & Relkin, P.C.  
Feltman, Karesh & Major, Esqs.  
Arutt, Nachamie, Benjamin, Lipkin & Kirschner, P.C.  
D'Amato & Lynch, Esqs.  
Hon. Robert Abrams  
Hon. Robert Abrams  
Att: David S. Cook, Esq.  
Sheriff, New York County  
c/o Frederick A.O. Schwarz, Jr.  
Att: Robert Trachtenberg, Esq.  
Sheriff, Nassau County  
Mr. Hyman Raffe  
Sam Polur, Esq.  
Dean Robert M. McKay  
Pres. Association of the Bar  
Daniel C. Draper, Esq.  
Pres. N.Y. Co. Lawyers' Association  
Media (unidentified)