

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

-----x  
In the Matter of

D-613

GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq.

An Attorney.  
-----x

1a. I, GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq., an honest man, come before this Court and respectfully assert that no man has ever been admitted to the bar of this Court more honest and with more integrity than your affirmant.

These are the only virtues I claim.

b. I oppose the present rule which seeks to disbar me as a member of this Court, and respectfully request that a Master be appointed to take testimony, otherwise some of the assertions contained herein would strain the outer limits of credulity.

c. My opposition to being disbarred by this Court, and the personal expense entailed in requesting a hearing, is not founded on any personal desire, except that honesty, integrity, and obedience to oath of office deserves better rewards.

2a. I have been truly honored by a state disbarment wherein I was deprived of about every fundamental trial right, including the right to subpoena witnesses and documents for my defense.



b. My right to show that the proceeding was retaliatory in nature, or that I was being made the subject of invidious and selective prosecution, were also denied.

c. In short, the disciplinary proceeding not only lacked due process, in every fundamental respect, they were irrational, as will be shown, because there was a pre-determination to convict.

e. The express holdings of the Referee were that if the same charges and evidence were submitted to twenty-five (25) different tribunals, and the verdict were other than guilty, in twenty-four (24) of such proceedings after fundamentally fair opportunities by the prosecutors at their presentment, and the twenty-fifth (25th) tribunal, convicted, without any due process to the accused, the twenty-four (24) vindications were irrelevant, and the twenty-fifth (25th) was conclusive!

Must more be said, except to show this Court this is the case at hand!

3a. I have been honored by being convicted five (5) times in less than one (1) year of non-summary criminal contempt, each time without benefit of a trial.

b. I have been honored by being incarcerated three (3) times in less than one (1) year, pursuant to such convictions.



c. If I should be convicted, under the aforementioned unconstitutional scenarios one hundred (100) times in the future, incarcerated each and every time, I shall consider that I have been honored one hundred (100) times more.

d. Four (4) of such trial-less convictions were from the state forum, three (3) of which were the basis of the disciplinary complaint against me.

One of such trial-less convictions for which I was disbarred by the state forum was a conviction from the federal forum.

e. The hand-picked Referee of the Appellate Division, correctly reported that I had been convicted four (4) times of non-summary criminal contempt, on which there was no dispute, except for the validity of such convictions.

These convictions were held to be conclusive, not subject to collateral attack.

Prior to confirmation, Sassower v. Sheriff (651 F. Supp. 128) was rendered, and only that particular disciplinary charge was deleted, although each and every other criminal conviction was constitutionally infirm in the same essential respect.



f. I respectfully assert to this Court what every American jurist knows, to wit., absent a plea of guilty, no person can be convicted of a crime unless there is a verdict after trial. There is no such thing in criminal law as a conviction without a trial, absent a plea of guilty.

In every one of the five (5) instances, including the federal conviction, the underlying facts reveal, that even on an ex parte inquest basis, no conviction could be rendered by any honest jurist, even without "confrontation rights".

g. I respectfully assert to this Court, what every federal jurist knows, including District Judge EUGENE H. NICKERSON, Chief Judge WILFRED FEINBERG, Circuit Judge IRVING R. KAUFMAN, and Circuit Judge THOMAS J. MESKILL, to wit., that Congress, by the Act of March 2, 1831 clearly intended to deprive every judge in a court that it created of the jurisdictional power to convict for non-summary criminal contempt, without a trial, absent a plea of guilty (Nye v. United States, 313 U.S. 33; Ex parte Robinson, 19 Wall [86 U.S.] 505).



Respectfully, I intend to be truly "the last victim" (Nye v. United States (supra, at p. 46), in "Feinberg's Fixable Forum", and any other judicial forum in the United States.

I challenge any jurist from the Second Circuit or any other Circuit, including those I accuse of usurping the limits of their jurisdictional power, to testify before a master appointed by this Court, that the power to convict, without a trial, exists, particularly in non-summary criminal contempt proceedings.

I challenge any jurist from the Second Circuit or any other Circuit, including those I accuse, to show a master appointed by this Court, how it would have been possible, even on an ex parte inquest basis, for your affirmant and his client, HYMAN RAFFE ["Raffe"], to have been convicted by Judge EUGENE H. NICKERSON.

h. I challenge any state or federal jurist, including those who convicted me, or affirmed such conviction, to testify before a master appointed by this Court, that the state power to convict me and/or my client, without benefit of a trial, exists in non-summary criminal contempt cases. (Bloom v. Illinois 391 U.S. 194).



i. In each and every instance, the convictions against your affirmant, Raffe, and SAM POLUR, Esqs. ["Polur"], were in favor of attorneys who over the years have been engaged in the larceny of judicial trust assets, perjury, extortion, and corruption, official and judicial.

There is no dispute about such fact, or that they have strong political and judicial connections.

4a. Dispensation for such criminal convictions is the payment of monies and/or other considerations to these "self-styled, self-annointed, self-appointed, public prosecutors".

b. Thus, although not noted in Sassower v. Sheriff (supra), there were two (2) Reports of Referee DONALD DIAMOND, the other against Raffe, mirrored the Report against your affirmant.

c. The Diamond Report against Raffe was never confirmed, nor was Raffe incarcerated under the conviction of Mr. Justice ALVIN F. KLEIN either, as was your affirmant and Polur, as part of a single document.



d. For the payments of hundreds of thousands of dollars, by check, the surrender of valuable rights worth in the millions, and other consideration to these "judicial indulgence peddlers", these "self-styled public prosecutors" agreed not to incarcerate Raffe, nor to confirm the Diamond Report, provided like some robot he continues to give obedience to their requests!

e. I pass no judgment on the actions of Raffe, my client, in compounding crimes where he is faced with a corrupt state and federal judiciary.

I do pass judgment on a judiciary which transgresses the limits of their legal authority in order to advance the criminal adventures of those engaged in larceny of judicial trust assets.

5a. Once Polur left the scene, the disciplinary proceedings against him, based on the trial-less conviction of Mr. Justice ALVIN F. KLEIN, were also effectively terminated.

b. I pass no judgment on Polur either, who must practice law as a livelihood, as does your affirmant.



c. Your affirmant chooses to breathe according to his own honest fashion; he will not negotiate on the basis of "judicial indulgences" with anyone, no matter what the consequences.

If the consequences for the refusal to purchase "judicial indulgences" are repeated incarcerations, then affirmant chooses to be repeatedly incarcerated.

If the consequence for the refusal to purchase "judicial indulgences" is disbarment, then affirmant chooses to be disbarred.

If the consequence for the refusal to purchase "judicial indulgences" is poverty, and indeed bankruptcy (Docket No. 86 Bkcy 20500, SDNY [HS]), affirmant chooses poverty and bankruptcy.

This is my choice, made willingly, and without regrets.

6a. Repeated Orders have been issued out of the forum wherein Peter Zenger was acquitted, directing the Sheriff of Westchester County to "break into" my premises, "seize all word processing equipment and soft ware", and "inventory" my possessions.

b. My bank assets have been seized pursuant to a "phantom" judgment.



c. Even my right to "jest" has been confiscated, for when, because of the aforementioned, I stated that I am compelled to keep my assets in my "non-interest bearing mattress", I was met with an application to have the Sheriff "break into" my residence and "tear apart" my "non-interest bearing mattress"!

When I testified that the statement was made in "jest", obviously to make a point, I was accused of perjury.

d. I have every intention of standing firm against the aforementioned barbarism, the actions of this Court or any other Court, vel non, notwithstanding!

7a. Pursuant to a judgment of \$9,300 against Raffe, a multi-millionaire, two hundred (200) subpoenas were issued, each one restraining "twice" the amount of this easily collectible judgment, potentially restraining almost four million dollars (\$4,000,000).

b. When I moved to have declared unconstitutional CPLR §5222[b], insofar as it permits restraints for "twice" the amount of a judgment, and such multiple restraints and other economic in terrorem tactics legally actionable, Mr. Justice DAVID B. SAXE, without a trial, convicted, sentenced, and incarcerated me for non-summary criminal contempt. In addition thereto, His Honor directed that such trial-less conviction be forwarded to the disciplinary authorities!



c. Such multiple restraints can and have created havoc for Raffe, albeit a multi-millionaire, who thereafter could not seek relief in the courts for fear that he also would be incarcerated without a trial, in addition to having his proceeding dismissed, as was done by Mr. Justice SAXE, a "hard core" corrupt jurist.

d. To repeat, I pass no adverse judgment against my client for being compelled to succumb because of these and other barbaric judicial tactics. Nevertheless, for myself, I will resist any attempt to deny me access to the courts for legitimate judicial relief, irrespective of the consequences.

8a. Twenty-six (26) days after Raffe and I were vindicated by Hon. MARTIN EVANS of non-summary criminal contempt, the same allegations, charges, and evidence were made the subject of a new proceeding.

b. This proceeding, through the intervention of Administrator XAVIER C. RICCOBONO ["Corruption Incarnate"] was compelled to be referred to Referee DONALD DIAMOND, who operates out of a non-public courtroom (see photograph Newsday, November 2, 1986), where I and others opposed to his corrupt practices are specifically excluded.

c. This proceeding was only one of multiple contempt proceedings, simultaneously pending based on the same allegations, charges, and evidence.



d. When, on January 27, 1986, the Order of Mr. Justice LESTER EVENS, the first of three simultaneous pending proceedings was entered, resoundingly vindicating me, within two (2) business days thereafter, in the Office of Staff Counsel of the Circuit Court of Appeals, I was served with four (4) more contempt proceedings based on the same charges, assertions, and evidence.

e. When all seven (7) of substantially simultaneous submissions resulted in vindications or verdicts other than guilty, Mr. Justice IRA GAMMERMAN, without any motion, without any order to show cause, without any supporting or opposing papers, without any trial, without any attempted compliance with Judiciary Law §756, or due process, without any anything, except corruption, His Honor convicted me and imposed criminal contempt sanctions.

f. Thereafter, when I was incarcerated, pursuant to an Order of the Appellate Division (see Sassower v. Sheriff, supra), I was made the subject of "double punishment", although such "double jeopardy" issue was not passed upon by the District Court in this matter.



g. In this period of one (1) year of judicial terrorism, there were results other than guilt, about twenty-five (25) times. About seventeen (17) times I consider constitutional "double jeopardy" triggered, and the rest statutory "double jeopardy".

h. Where "double jeopardy" values are not respected, vindication becomes a curse, rather than a welcomed blessing, since vindication only leads to more contempt proceedings, in geometric fashion.

i. Thus according to the Grievance Committee and the Appellate Division, it is irrelevant how many times one is vindicated, it is only the convictions that count, although the convictions were based on the same charges and evidence as the vindications!

Can your affirmant expect this or any other Court to believe the aforementioned, except at a hearing?

9a. PUCCINI CLOTHES, LTD. ["Puccini"], was involuntarily dissolved on June 4, 1980, more than eighty-two (82) months ago, its assets becoming custodia legis.

b. Multiple statutes and rules provide for an accounting, including Bus. Corp. Law §1216[a], which mandates, as a "duty" of the Attorney General to compel an accounting if not made within eighteen (18) months.



c. No true accounting can be rendered without revealing the massive larceny of judicial trust assets, the perjury, the extortion, the corruption, as long as affirmant has a tongue -- affirmant must be silenced, whatever the means, constitutional, civilized, or otherwise, is the obvious manifesto of the judiciary!

d. Affirmant chooses incarceration, rather than abdicating his professional obligation to "zealously" protect his client's interests, although his client is being held hostage; and will not abandon his professional obligation to report misconduct (Disc. Rule, 1-103), or compound any crimes.

e. Your affirmant will not permit the courthouse to become a "judicial inferno", and will not permit helpless constitutional "persons", to become "judicial fortune cookies", nor will he have any part of corruption, judicial or otherwise.

10a. The worst aspect of this situation is omitted from this recitation, for it must be seen, heard, and documented, by personal presentment, to be believed.

b. I only request of this Court, a fundamentally fair opportunity to be heard -- nothing more!

I wish to show this court that I was denied due process by the Appellate Division, Second Department, simply because I could not be convicted of anything, had I been afforded a fair trial.



c. If this Court disbars me without such an opportunity, it will not dishonor me, but itself.

d. These things that have happened to me, do not happen in my country -- nor will they ever happen again.

This was the vow I took on the Altar of God, as I fled my home in the middle of the night, as I did not know whether the Sheriff would give obedience to an Order to seize my word processing equipment and inventory my possessions.

e. I will resist corruption and barbarism, judicial or otherwise, with or without my thirty-seven (37) year old license.

11. I affirm the above statement to be true, under penalty of perjury.

Dated: April 10, 1987

---

GEORGE SASSOWER