

GEORGE SASSOWER  
10 Stewart Place  
White Plains, NY 10603-3856  
914-681-7196

December 16, 1997

Steven Brill, Esq.  
Publisher, Content Magazine  
75 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, NY 10019

Dear Mr. Brill,

Responding to your solicitation published in the New York Observer, the matter here described is one of public concern, and without any restrictions or conditions may be republished, in whole or in part, without prior permission.

To further verify the correctness of the information and accusation, a copy of this letter is simultaneously being mailed to everyone named herein.

1. There was published in the New York Times an admittedly fraudulent "legal notice" (Exhibit "A"), which stated in sum and substance, that Lee Feltman, Esq., the court-appointed receiver for Puccini Clothes, Ltd., would present to NY Referee Donald Diamond his final accounting for approval and for other relief.

The accounting was 'phantom', and even if it did exist, which it did not, Referee Diamond, an at-will employee, had no legal authority to approve any accounting or grant the other relief requested (*NY CPLR §4317[b]*).

An accounting would have to include Puccini's assets, as of the date it was involuntarily dissolved, and all disbursements made since that date.

A Puccini accounting, if rendered by Feltman, would reveal that all its judicial trust assets were made the subject of larceny, disbursed mostly to "bribe" and "corrupt", leaving nothing for its nationwide legitimate creditors.

I do not press, at this time, the contention that the New York Times knew or should have known that Referee Diamond had no such legal authority.

However, shortly after the event, the Times was made aware of Referee Diamond's lack of legal authority, as well as the fact that the accounting was "phantom", and the "legal notice" was published with the intent to defraud.

The New York Times spent significant monies investigating the matter and found that my assertions were correct in every respect.

As of recent date, Arthur Ochs Sultzberger, Jr., publisher of the New York Times was also made personally aware, from correspondence by the Office of NY State Attorney General, Dennis C. Vacco, that there is still no accounting for the Puccini judicial trust (Exhibit "B").

I, personally, have no problem in accepting the fact that Mr. Sultzberger and his NY Times have the unbridled right not to publish anything they choose, even when publication is compelling.

However, having published a fraudulent "legal notice", which has and is causing substantial injury, Mr. Sultzberger and his newspaper have, in my opinion, the obligation to take some corrective measures, which they refuse to take.

2. In every court, in every jurisdiction, state and federal, a court-appointed receiver, an agent of the court, must account for his stewardship, it is an obligation which cannot be waived, excused, ignored or enjoined since the public is entitled to know whether its judges and/or its appointees are "crooks".

In New York, to satisfy this obligation to the public, a court-appointed receiver, an agent of the court, must file an accounting "at least once a year" (22 NYCRR §202.52[e]). None have ever been filed!

In New York, as a result of the practices during the reign of William Marcy ["Boss"] Tweed, the Grand Sachem of Tammany Hall, after his incarceration and death, the NY State Attorney General was made the statutory fiduciary of all involuntarily dissolved corporations, because stockholders and creditors were powerless when confronted by Tweed's cadre of corrupt judges and their appointees, as they are now.

The NY State Attorney General, as statutory fiduciary, has extensive discretionary authority to be exercised on behalf of those having an interest in these judicial trusts (e.g., *NY Bus. Corp. Law* §1214[a]) and some mandatory "duties", including the "duty" to make application after the expiration of eighteen (18) months, and compel a "final accounting" and distribution (*NY Bus. Corp. Law* §1216[a]).

Notwithstanding this mandatory "duty", the NY State Attorney Generals have never made a single application for such relief.

3. Additionally, as a result of the practices during the reign of Boss Tweed, a non-waivable statutory schedule of maximum fees that could be awarded to a court appointed receiver was enacted (*NY Bus. Corp. Law* §1217).

To help police such awards *NY Judiciary Law* §35-a was enacted which requires that all judges making awards report them by the week following to the Office of Court Administration, which reports are public records.

No such reports have ever been filed (Exhibit "C") because it would reveal, *inter alia*, Feltman and his law firm were intended "laundrymen", who received astronomical sums of monies, greatly in excess of the statutory maximum, primarily through Referee Diamond, as "kick-backs" for judges and officials.

4. The racketeers in the Teamster's Union have been and are confronted by the awesome power of government, while corrupt judges and officials employ that same awesome power, including the prestige of their offices, to have their frauds published in the NY Times.

5. I am not familiar with your publication, if indeed you have commenced publishing. I assume it will substantially mirror the Canadian publication bearing the same name, a copy of which I once read.

Good Luck.

Very truly yours,

  
GEORGE SASSOWER

cc: Arthur Ochs Sultzberger, Jr.  
229 West 43rd Street.  
New York, NY 10036-3959  
Referee Donald Diamond  
Supreme Court, NY Co.  
60 Center Street,  
New York, NY 10007  
Lee Feltman, Esq.  
152 West 57th Street,  
New York, NY 10019  
NY State Attorney General Dennis C. Vacco  
120 Broadway,  
New York, NY 10271