

In the  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
October Term, 1992  
No. 93-5045

-----x  
GEORGE SASSOWER,  
Petitioner,  
-against-

KREINDLER & RELKIN, P.C.; CITIBANK, N.A.;  
JEROME H. BARR; LEE FELTMAN; FELTMAN,  
KARESH & MAJOR; HOWARD M. BERGSON; ROBERT  
ABRAMS; EUGENE H. NICKERSON; THOMAS J.  
MESKILL; WILFRED FEINBERG; HELEN KAUFMAN,  
as executrix of the Estate of IRVING  
KAUFMAN; JAMES L. OAKES; CHARLES L.  
BRIEANT; FRANCIS T. MURPHY; XAVIER C.  
RICCOBONO; ANDREW J. MALONEY; WEST  
PUBLISHING COMPANY; MEAD DATA CENTRAL,  
INC.; and LAWYERS CO-OPERATIVE PUBLISHING  
COMPANY,

Respondents.  
-----x

x-----x  
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
to the  
U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT  
x-----x

x-----x  
DISPOSITIVE MOTION  
(Rule 21.2[b])  
x-----x

GEORGE SASSOWER  
Petitioner, pro se  
16 Lake Street,  
White Plains, N.Y. 10603  
(914) 949-2169

This affirmation, made under penalty of perjury,  
is in support of this Rule 21.2[b] motion which, if granted, will  
be entirely dispositive of this matter.

Affirmant expects the support of U.S. Solicitor  
General DREW S. DAYS, III, who purports to represent "the  
Government", in this matter, or an articulated reason for any  
failure on his part.

1a. The only issues involved in this petition is the right of affirmant to access to the courts for an original writ of error coram nobis, FRCivP 60(b)[4] and a Rule 60(b) independent proceeding.

b. KREINDLER & RELKIN, P.C. ["K&R"], who with its client, CITIBANK, N.A. ["Citibank"], engineered the larceny of the judicial trust assets of PUCCINI CLOTHES, LTD. ["Puccini"], openly flaunted that they "controlled" the judiciary, state and federal, and the documentary evidence confirms such assertions, as here briefly demonstrated.

2a. At the instance of K&R and Citibank, affirmant and HYMAN RAFFE ["Raffe"] were convicted of non-summary criminal contempt, without a trial, without the opportunity for a trial, without any confrontation rights, in absentia, without due process, without the right of allocution, without any live testimony in support thereof, without any constitutional or legal waiver of any right, and substantial fines were imposed upon them.

b(1) Two weeks thereafter, at the instance and request of FELTMAN, KARESH, & MAJOR, Esqs. ["FK&M"], the co-conspirators of K&R, also without any confrontation rights, in absentia, without due process, without the right of allocution, without any live testimony in support thereof, without any constitutional or legal waiver of any right, affirmant was similarly convicted of non-summary criminal contempt, with fines and terms of incarceration imposed upon affirmant.

(2) Affirmant fully served his term of incarceration, less good time allowance.

c(1) Even the Ku Klux Klan, at their heyday of power, with their drumhead trials, generally afforded their victims greater procedural rights (Briscoe v. LaHue, 460 U.S. 325, 340 [1983]).

(2) The 19th Century white sheets of the Klan, have turned into black robes in the 20th Century.

3. After these trialess convictions were affirmed, by the federal and state appellate tribunals, Raffé was threatened with incarceration unless he paid the imposed fines, including those due from affirmant, to K&R and its clients personally, rather than "to the federal courts".

4a. Notwithstanding such trialess convictions, the fines imposed and terms of incarceration, affirmant refused to submit or remain silent on the subject of judicial corruption.

b. Thus, these three non-summary criminal contempt convictions which, even if valid, were only "offenses", were elevated, ex post facto, into "serious" crimes, affirmant was not permitted to controvert their conclusive nature, and affirmant was disbarred.


5a. However, since the court-appointed receiver for Puccini could not account for his stewardship, in view of the K&R larceny, without exposing the judicial involvement in same, the rogue state and federal jurists were compelled to deny affirmant of access to the courts in an attempt to conceal their criminal activities.

b. Such total denial of access to the courts included where the remedy sought by affirmant were legally guaranteed, as a matter of right, such as habeas corpus, coram nobis, FRCivP 60(b)[4] and an independent FRCivP 60(b) action.

6. Affirmant, respectfully submits that whatever the decision of the courts, the vox populi will not tolerate the diversion of monies payable "to the federal court" to private pockets or incarcerations, at taxpayers' expense, to conceal judicial criminal activities.

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully prayed that this motion be granted in all respects, with costs.

Dated: July 6, 1993.




---

GEORGE SASSOWER  
Petitioner, pro se

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

On July 7, 1993 I served true copies of this motion by mailing same in a sealed envelope, first class, with proper postage thereon, addressed to Solicitor General of the United States Drew S. Days, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530; Kreindler & Relkin, P.C., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10118; and NY State Atty. Gen. Robert Abrams, 120 Broadway, New York, NY 10271, that being their last known addresses.

Dated: July 7, 1993



---

GEORGE SASSOWER