SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
APPELLATE DIVISION: SECOND DEPARTMENT

DORIS L. SASSOWER and CAREY A. SASSOWER,:

Plaintiffs-Respondents,:

-against
ERNEST L. SIGNORELLI,:

Defendant-Appellant,:

JOHN P. FINNERTY, WARDEN REGULA,
ANTHONY MASTROIANNI, and
THE NEW YORK LAW JOURNAL PUBLISHING
COMPANY,

Defendants.

## REPLY BRIEF FOR DEFENDANT-APPELLANT

ROBERT ABRAMS
Attorney General of the
State of New York
Attorney for DefendantAppellant
Office & P.O. Address
Two World Trade Center
New York, New York 10047
Tel. No. (212) 488-7410

Litigation Bureau: MELVYN R. LEVENTHAL Deputy First Assistant Attorney General

STANLEY A. CAMHI STEPHEN M. JACOBY Assistant Attorneys General Of Counsel SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK APPELLATE DIVISION: SECOND DEPARTMENT

----x

DORIS L. SASSOWER and CAREY A. SASSOWER, :

Plaintiffs-Respondents,

-against-

: Westchester County

ERNEST L. SIGNORELLI,

Index No. 3607-1979

Defendant-Appellant,

JOHN P. FINNERTY, WARDEN REGULA,

ANTHONY MASTROIANNI, and

THE NEW YORK LAW JOURNAL PUBLISHING

COMPANY,

.

Defendants.

----X

REPLY BRIEF FOR DEFENDANT-APPELLANT

THE DECISION BELOW SHOULD BE REVERSED

This Court's decision in the related case, George

Sassower v. Signorelli, decided with Sassower v. Sheriff

Finnerty, NYLJ 7/29/83 p. 13, c. 4, contains a clear statement of the broad absolute immunity of judges and, further, deals with the very memorandum decision published in the New York Law Journal which is the principal basis of suit here by Doris

Sassower. See Def. Br. 17. Plaintiffs, in their Brief, add no substantial law or relevant facts to what defendant-appellant has already addressed or to what this Court has considered in

Sassower v. Sheriff Finnerty.\* As to all aspects of the complaint in this case, the George Sassower decision of this Court (which may not be relitigated here) is dispositive, and compels reversal of the order below.

<sup>\*</sup> As to the published decision, plaintiffs now agree that something -- they limit it to a motion to hold George Sassower in criminal contempt -- was pending before Judge Signorelli on February 24, 1978. (Pl. Br. 12, 21). As to the alleged acts unrelated to the published decisions, plaintiffs now ascribe their commission to "lower eschelon [sic] employees" (Pl. Br. 15), nowhere described as employees of appellant, and attempt to justify suing Judge Signorelli regarding those acts simply because he is a "powerful official." Id. Of Course, that is no basis for suit whatever.

## CONCLUSION

THE DECISION BELOW SHOULD BE REVERSED AND THE COMPLAINT DISMISSED.

Dated: New York, New York September 13, 1983

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT ABRAMS
Attorney General of the
State of New York
Attorney for DefendantAppellant

Litigation Bureau:
MELVYN R. LEVENTHAL
Deputy First Assistant
Attorney General

STANLEY A. CAMHI STEPHEN M. JACOBY Assistant Attorneys General Of Counsel