In The SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK October Term, 1990

No. 90-

GEORGE SASSOWER,	X		
	Petitioner,		
-against-			42
FIDELITY AND DEPOSI	T COMPANY OF MARYLAND; et. el., Respondents.	Action	#1
were later with your color dark own made with fairs and judy that their dark dark their later	$ = 10^{-100} \mathrm{cm}^{-1} \mathrm$		
while have your date more first after their take their paint paint paint take well which date date.	AND DEC AND		
GEORGE SASSOWER,			
	Petitioner,		
-against-			
WHITEFORD, TAYLOR &	PRESTON; et. el.,	Action	#2
	Respondents.		
A second court court court sector sector active court court court sector sector court court court sector sector court sector sector court sector court sector sector court sector sector court sector sector court sector sector sector court sector se	X		
X	THE SAME SPICE THE SAME SAME SAME SAME SAME SAME SAME SAM	X	
PET	ITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI		
TO THE CIRCUIT	COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CI	RCUIT	
The same were well their state that their same were their same were	STATE OF THE STATE AND STATE AND STATE OF THE STATE AND	x	
	X was not the total was not		
	MOTION/AFFIRMATION		
	X see the see NO		

"... the imputation of knowledge, and its concomitant responsibility, may not be avoided by the simple expedient of closing one's eyes, covering one's ears, and holding one's breath" (Cohen v. Hallmark, 45 N.Y.2d 493, 500, 410 N.Y.S.2d 282, 286, 383 N.E.2d 1145, 1149 [1978]).

"JUDICIAL CORRUPTION IN THE FOURTH CIRCUIT"

- 1. This motion with respect to petitioner's petition of February 11, 1991, and related petitions and motions will leave little doubt of the extant judicial corruption at the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, as well as the District of Maryland and elsewhere.
- 2. This affirmation is made in support of a motion to expeditiously and summarily:

- (1) declare null, void and of no effect the proceedings wherein there was assigned to U.S. District Judge JOHN R. HARGROVE ["Hargrove"] and/or the proceeding wherein Judge Hargrove dragooned to himself, Action #2 wherein Judge Hargrove was a named corrupted jurist and wherein affirmant sought damages against those who corrupted His Honor (Dennis v. Sparks, 449 U.S. 24 [1980]);
- (2) mandamus the Circuit Court to expeditiously adjudicate affirmant's injunctive motion, where affirmant's is unlawfully being deprived of the access and use of necessary property, papers and documents:
- (a) Chief Judge CHARLES L. BRIEANT ["Brieant"], by a sua sponte, without any due process, edict affirmant is physically excluded from the Federal Building and Courthouse at White Plains, N.Y., a building which houses many of affirmant's papers and documents;
- (b) New York State Referee DONALD DIAMOND ["Diamond"], by a sua sponte, without any due process, edict affirmant is physically excluded from his non-public courtroom where public judicial papers are privately kept and secreted; and
- (c) District Attorney DENIS DILLON's ["Dillon"] of Nassau County, New York who unlawful has in his possession affirmant's needed personal property, documents and papers.
- 3a. From the moment that affirmant learned that Action #2, whose 28 <u>U.S.C.</u> §1915 filing had been approved by U.S. Magistrate U.S. Magistrate CLARENCE E. GOETZ ["Goetz"], had been re-assigned from and/or dragooned from U.S. District Judge

WILLIAM M. NICKERSON ["Nickerson"] to Judge Hargrove, affirmant strongly asserted to the District Court, as well as the Circuit Court of Appeals, that any adjudication by Judge Hargrove, a named corrupted jurist therein, was a manifest nullity (Liljeberg v. Health Services, 486 U.S. 847 [1988]; Aetna v. Lavoie, 475 U.S. 813 [1986]).

- b. An action for damages against those who corrupted Judge Hargrove to be adjudicated by Judge Hargrove is the ultimate absurdity, unconstitutional and void (<u>Dr. Bonham's Case</u>, 77 Eng. Rep. 647 [1610]; <u>Day v. Savadge</u>, 80 Eng. Rep. 235, 237 [1614]).
- c. Is Judge Hargrove supposed to simultaneously act as the neutral jurist as well as the essential witness ($\underline{Dennis\ v}$. \underline{Sparks} , 449 U.S. 24 [1980])?
 - To say more would be supererogatory.
- The "marching orders" given to Judge Hargrove by those who corrupted His Honor, included the instructions that no determinations were to be made on any appealable interlocutory motions (28 U.S.C. 1292[a][1]) prior to the dismissal of affirmant's actions.
- b. Such "marching orders" were known to affirmant, who petitioned the Circuit Court to compel Judge Hargrove to render a determination.
- c. The compelled inability of affirmant to "fully" make a judicial presentment renders the proceeding to be a nullity (<u>U.S. v. Throckmorton</u>, 98 U.S. 61, 65-66 [1878]).

- 3a. Chief Judge Brieant and Referee Diamond are inextricably involved in the larceny of judicial trust assets, criminal extortion, and other racketeering activity.
- b. To advance such criminal activity they, without any due process procedures whatsoever, have physically excluded affirmant from the Federal Building and Courthouse in White Plains, New York and the Referee Diamond courtroom in the Supreme Court, New York where he secrets public papers in the litigation involving PUCCINI CLOTHES, LTD. ["Puccini"] -- "the judicial fortune cookie".
- c(1) When the Sheriff of Westchester County New York refuse to give obedience to the orders of Referee Diamond "to break into" affirmant's "premises", "seize all word processors and software" and "inventory" affirmant's possessions, his coconspirators solicited the services of District Attorney Dillon of Nassau County for that purpose in a proceeding wherein jurisdiction was absent (People v. Alejandro, 70 N.Y.2d 133, 517 N.Y.S.2d 927, 511 N.E.2d 71 [1987]).
- (2) Despite an outstanding judicial order and direction that affirmant's property be returned, full compliance has not been given.
- (3) Thus, in addition to other property, District Attorney Dillon unlawfully holds in his possession some of affirmant's needed "data discs".
- 4. A stay motion, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Rules of this Court was denied on November 16, 1990.

5. The aforementioned is stated to be true under the penalty of perjury.

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully prayed that

affirmant's motion be granted in all respects.

Dated: February 16, 1991

GEORGE SASSOWER [GS-0521]

Petitioner, pro se

White Plains, N.Y. 10603

(914) 949-2169

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

On February 16, 1991, I served a true copy of this Motion/Affirmation by mailing same in a sealed postage paid envelope, first class, addressed to the Circuit Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit, Tenth & Main Streets, Richmond, Virginia 23219; Hon. Kenneth W. Starr, U.S. Solicitor General, 10th & Constitution Ave., Washington, D.C. 20530; Whiteford, Taylor & Preston, Esqs., Seven Saint Paul Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202-1626; Quinn, Ward and Kershaw, P.A., 113 West Monument Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201; Ass't. N.Y.S. Atty. Gen. Carolyn Cairns Olson, 120 Broadway, New York, New York 10271; Semmes, Bowen and Semmes, Esqs., 250 West Pratt Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201; Snitow & Pauley, Esqs., 345 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017, and Eccleston & Wolfe, Esqs., 729 East Pratt Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21207, at their last known addresses.

Dated: February 16, 1991

GEORGE SASSOWER
Petitioner, pro se
16 Lake Street,
White Plains, N.Y. 10603

(914) 949-2169