SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

----------x

In the Matter of

GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq.

An Attorney.

----------x

D-613

1a. Annexed is a copy of Affirmant's Notice of Motion and supporting papers in Raffe [Sassower] v. Feltman, returnable on June 4, 1987 in the Appellate Division, First Judicial Department, and is self-explanatory.

b. June 4, 1987 also commences the eighth (8th) year since PUCCINI CLOTHES, LTD. ["Puccini"] was involuntarily dissolved, and still no filed accounting!

2a. Affirmant's state disbarment is solely referable to his exposing judicial and official corruption.

b. Even disbarment has had no effect on affirmant's position that he will obey his professional mandate, with integrity (Wayte v. U.S., 470 U.S. 598; Thigpen v. Roberts, 468 U.S. 27).

3. This affirmation is executed under penalty of perjury.

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully prayed that this matter be set down for a hearing, so that the matter can be fully exposed in a judicial atmosphere, rather than in the pages and electromagnetic waves controlled by the media, together with any other, further, and/or different relief as to this Court may seem just and proper in the premises.

Dated: May 19, 1987

GEORGE SASSOWER

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
APPELLATE DIVISION : FIRST JUDICIAL DEPT.

HYMAN RAFFE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

[GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq.

Appellant,]

-against-

FELTMAN, KARESH, & MAJOR,

Defendant-Respondent.

HYMAN RAFFE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

[GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq. and SAM POLUR, Esq.

Appellants],

-against-

XAVIER C. RICCOBONO, DONALD DIAMOND,
FELTMAN, KARESH & MAJOR, Esqs. and
KREINDLER & RELKIN, P.C.

Defendants-Respondents.

HYMAN RAFFE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

[GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq. and SAM POLUR, Esq.

Appellants],

-against-

KREINDLER & RELKIN, P.C., Hon. WALTER
M. SCHACKMAN, "JOHN DOE", and "JOHN ROE",
names fictitious, persons intended to be
those who communicated with the Court,
ex parte,

Defendants-Respondents.

HYMAN RAFFE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

[GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq. and SAM POLUR, Esq.

Appellants],

-against-

DONALD B. RELKIN, Esq., MICHAEL J.
GERSTEIN, Esq., KREINDLER & RELKIN, P.C.,
CITIBANK, N.A. and JEROME H. BARR, Esq.,
individually and as Executors of the
Will of Milton Kaufman,

Defendants-Respondents.

S I R S:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that upon the annexed affidavit of GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq., duly sworn to on the 19th day of May, 1987, and upon all pleadings and proceedings had herein, the undersigned will move this Court at a Stated Term of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, First Judicial Department, held at the Courthouse thereof, 25th Street and Madison Avenue, in the Borough of Manhattan, City and State of New York, on the 4th day of June, 1987, at 9:30 o'clock in the forenoon of that day or as soon thereafter as the undersigned can be heard for an Order (1) respectfully requesting that Justice presiding THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN and/or the panel who heard the above appeals, to respond to the SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES in accordance with the movant's request of April 10, 1987; (2) vacating and reversing said Orders (113 A.D.2d 1038) based upon Sassower v. Sheriff (651 F. Supp. 128 [SDNY]); and/or (3) declaring that such affirmed conviction should receive no respect in any other tribunal; (4) together with any other, further, and/or different relief as to this Court may seem just and proper in the premises.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE, that answering papers, if any, are to be served at least seven days before the return date, with an additional five days if service is by mail.

Dated: May 19, 1987

Yours, etc.

GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq.
Attorney pro se.
51 Davis Avenue,
White Plains, New York, 10605
914-949-2169

To: Feltman, Karesh, Major, & Farbman, Esqs.
Kreindler & Relkin, P.C.
Nachamie, Kirschner, Levine, Spizz & Goldberg, P.C.
Hon. Robert Abrams
Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist (D-613)
Circuit Judge, James L. Oakes (87-8028)
Circuit Judge, Jon. O. Newman (87-8028)
Circuit Judge, Lawrence W. Pierce (87-8028)
Judge Vincent L. Broderick (M-2-238)
Judge I. Leo Glasser (87 Misc 0107)
U.S. Magistrate JAMES C. FRANCIS IV
George G. Gallantz, Esq.

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
APPELLATE DIVISION : FIRST JUDICIAL DEPT.

HYMAN RAFFE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

[GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq.

Appellant,]

-against-

FELTMAN, KARESH, & MAJOR,

Defendant-Respondent.

HYMAN RAFFE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

[GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq. and SAM POLUR, Esq.

Appellants],

-against-

XAVIER C. RICCOBONO, DONALD DIAMOND,
FELTMAN, KARESH & MAJOR, Esqs. and
KREINDLER & RELKIN, P.C.

Defendants-Respondents.

HYMAN RAFFE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

[GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq. and SAM POLUR, Esq.

Appellants],

-against-

KREINDLER & RELKIN, P.C., Hon. WALTER
M. SCHACKMAN, "JOHN DOE", and "JOHN ROE",
names fictitious, persons intended to be
those who communicated with the Court,
ex parte,

Defendants-Respondents.

HYMAN RAFFE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

[GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq. and SAM POLUR, Esq.

Appellants],

-against-

DONALD B. RELKIN, Esq., MICHAEL J.
GERSTEIN, Esq., KREINDLER & RELKIN, P.C.,
CITIBANK, N.A. and JEROME H. BARR, Esq.,
individually and as Executors of the
Will of Milton Kaufman,

Defendants-Respondents.

STATE OF NEW YORK)
)ss.:
COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER)

GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq., first being duly sworn, deposes, and says:

This affidavit is made in support of deponent's motion (1) respectfully requesting that Justice Presiding THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN and/or the panel who heard the above appeals, to respond to deponent's request dated April 10, 1987; (2) vacating and reversing said Orders (113 A.D.2d 1038) based upon Sassower v. Sheriff (651 F. Supp. 128 [SDNY]); and/or (3) declaring that such affirmed conviction should receive no respect in any other tribunal; (4) together with any other, further, and/or different relief as to this Court may seem just and proper in the premises.

1a. On April 10, 1987, deponent along with his response to the Supreme Court of the United States (Exhibit "A") respectfully caused to be served upon Justice Presiding THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN the following request:

"Honorable Sir:

1. Enclosed please find my response to the rule of the Supreme Court of the United States with respect to the above disbarment proceeding, wherein I claim entitlement to Brady v. Maryland (373 U.S. 83) material, and response to my United States v. Agurs 427 U.S. 97) demands.

2. Your Honor was Justice Presiding of the panel that affirmed my three (3) non-summary criminal contempt convictions, rendered without benefit of trial, including the one vacated in Sassower v. Sheriff (651 F. Supp. 128).

3. My few and simple demands, in addition to my Brady v. Maryland (supra) request, are:

1. Individually and on behalf of the Court, did Your Honor know, at the time Your Honor's Court unanimously affirmed the convictions of Mr. Justice ALVIN F. KLEIN and Mr. Justice DAVID B. SAXE, that I had been deprived of my confrontation rights, when those jurists convicted, sentenced, and had me incarcerated, without benefit of trial, although there was no plea of guilty?

2. Did Your Honor and his Court, then and now, have substantial evidence, conclusive or otherwise, that Kreindler & Relkin, P.C., and its clients, and FELTMAN, KARESH & MAJOR, Esqs., those in whose favor such criminal contempt convictions were rendered, had been engaged in the larceny of judicial trust assets, perjury, and corruption, judicial and official?

3. What has Your Honor or Your Honor's Court done, if anything, concerning the information that these criminal convictions are being compounded for private considerations, reaching into sums of hundreds of thousand of dollars, and with non-cash considerations, reaching into the millions?

4. Even on an ex parte, inquest basis, was there a prima facie case for conviction of HYMAN RAFFE, SAM POLUR, and/or myself, in the papers before Your Honor, for these convictions for non-summary criminal contempt?

5. Is there any significant fact in my response to the Supreme Court of the United States, which Your Honor takes exception to?

6. Is there any legitimate reason that Your Honor can advance for my not extensively publishing the happenings in this and related matters?

Respectfully,

GEORGE SASSOWER

cc: Chief Justice, William H. Rehnquist"

b. Exhibit "B" is the response deponent received on behalf of Justice Presiding THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, and thus this present motion.

c. Deponent contends that persons having testimonial knowledge, have the obligation to voluntarily come forward and give relevant evidence, particularly when, as here, it is a criminal or quasi-criminal proceedings (United States v. Bryan, 339 U.S. 323, 331; In re Ruffalo, 390 U.S. 544, 551).

d. During deponent's Disciplinary Proceedings, deponent was prohibited from subpoening the panel members, and others, on the subject of such convictions.

2a. Irrespective of His Honor's and the panel's beliefs as to the validity of such trial-less convictions, it is clear that with respect to the United States Constitution, the federal forums are the final arbiters on the federal constitution.

b. In Sassower v. Sheriff (supra), the federal court held that trial-less convictions for non-summary criminal contempt violate the United States Constitution (Amendment VI and XIV).

c. The federal forum also held, sub silentio, that since all the state courts in this state recognized the necessity of a trial before a lawful conviction under Bloom v. Illinois (391 U.S. 194), deponent had been deprived of equal protection of the laws.

d. In view of Sassower v. Sheriff (supra) the aforementioned convictions (113 A.D.2d 1038) were and are unconstitutional, and must be vacated.

e. The vacutur of such convictions would simply compel the respondents to afford affirmant a trial before a conviction cold be lawfully imposed.

3. The format of such trial would compel, upon demand, a jury, if the collateral effect would be "serious" (United States v. Craner, 652 F.2d 23 [9th Cir.]; State v. O'Brien, 704 P2d 905 [Haw], affirming 704 P2d 883; Fisher v. State, 305 Md. 357, 504 A2d 626).

4a. The law seems clear that such trial-less convictions "are not entitled to respect by any other tribunal" (Windsor v. McVeigh, 93 U.S. 274, 277; Ex parte Terry, 128 U.S. 289, 307; United States v. Lumumba, 741 F.2d 12, 15-16 [2d Cir.]).

b. In Ex parte Terry (supra, at p. 307) the Court stated:

> "It is undoubtedly a general rule in all actions, whether prosecuted by private parties, or by the government, that is, in civil and criminal cases, that ' sentence of a court pronounced against a party, without hearing him, or giving him an opportunity to be heard, is not a judicial determination of his rights, and is not entitled to respect in any other tribunal' Windsor v. McVeigh, 93 U.S. 274, 277".

5a. The sinister purposes behind such unconstitutional convictions are now crystal clear, to wit., to conceal the massive larceny of judicial trust assets, the perjury, and the official and judicial corruption involved with respects to the assets of PUCCINI CLOTHES, LTD. ["Puccini"].

b. June 4, 1987, the return date of this motion, will commence the eighth year since Puccini was involuntarily dissolved.

c. Despite multiple statutory provisions mandating an "accounting", "a final accounting", an "accounting each and every year", a verified statement of "assets" each and every year, no accounting has been rendered, nor a statement of "assets" filed (Bus. Corp. Law §1216[a]; §1207[A][3]; 22 NYCRR §202.52[e], 202.53)

6a. Business Corp. Law §1216, provides:

> "Final accounting; notice: duty of attorney-general" (a) Within one year after qualifying, the receiver shall apply to the court for a final settlement of his accounts and for an order for distribution, or, upon notice to the attorney-general, for an extension of time, setting for the reasons therefore. If the receiver has not so applied for a settlement of his accounts or for such extension of time, the attorney-general or any creditor or shareholder may apply for an order that the receiver show cause why an accounting and distribution should not be had, and after the expiration of eighteen months from the time the receiver qualified, it shall be the duty of the attorney-general to apply for such order on notice to the receiver."

b. 22 NYCRR §202.52(e), 202.53 provides:

> "Deposit of funds by receivers and assignees". "Receivers shall file with the court an accounting at least once each year. .... Trust accountings; procedure (a) Applications by trustees for interlocutory or final judgments or final orders in trust accountings or to terminate trusts shall be by notice of petition or order to show cause after the account has been filed in the county clerk's office."

c. Business Corp. Law §1207 (a)(C)(3) provides that the receiver shall:

> "On or before the first day of February in each year, for the preceding calendar year, and at such other times as the court shall direct, the receiver shall file with the clerk of the court by which he was appointed a verified statement showing the assets received, the disposition thereof, the money on hand, all payments made, specifying the persons to whom paid and the purpose of the payments, the amount necessary to be retained to meet necessary expenses and claims against the receiver, and the distributive share in the remainder of each person interested therein. A copy of such statement shall be served by the receiver upon the attorney-general within five days after the filing thereof." [emphasis supplied].

7a. The manifest purpose of these sham trial-less convictions was to compel HYMAN RAFFE ["Raffe"], SAM POLUR, Esq. ["Polur"], and your deponent to succumb.

b. It has been exposed and failed simply because deponent has failed, and refuses, to succumb to extortion and blackmail, employing the "machinery of justice" for such unlawful end.

8a. Raffe paid hundreds of thousands of dollars, surrendered considerations worth in the millions, and was not incarcerated, notwithstanding his sentence.

b. Polur was incarcerated, but when he left the scene, the disciplinary proceedings against him based upon such conviction, terminated.

c. Deponent, has remained fast, and consequently he is repeatedly and unconstitutionally convicted and incarcerated, and based upon such unlawful convictions he has been disbarred.

9a. This Court, notwithstanding its disposition on this application, will not affect deponent's conduct.

b. Deponent's honesty, integrity, and obedience of oath of office are simply not the subject of barter or negotiation.

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

GEORGE SASSOWER

Sworn to before me this
19th day of May, 1987

Notary Public

Certified in Westchester County
Commission expires 1/31/89

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 <u>honored</u> by a state disbarment wherein I was deprived of about <u>every</u> fundamental trial right, including the right to subpoena witnesses and documents for my defense.

Exhibit "A"

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 bankrupcy (Docket No. 86 Bkcy 20500, SDNY [HS]), affirmant chooses poverty and bankrupcy.

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 <u>all</u> 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 <u>Judiciary Law</u> §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 <u>Sassower v. Sheriff</u>, 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

Supreme Court Appellate Division
First Department
27 Madison Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10010
212-340 0400

Francis X. Galdi
Deputy Clerk

April 22, 1987

George Sassower, Esq.
51 Davis Avenue
White Plains, N.Y. 10605

Re: Matter of George Sassower in the Supreme Court of the United States

Dear Mr. Sassower:

Your letter of April 10, 1987 to Mr. Justice Kupferman, with enclosure, has been referred to me for a response.

You are advised that any relief you seek from this Court must be sought by way of formal motion on notice to all interested parties.

Very truly yours,

Francis X. Galdi

Francis X. Galdi

FXG:RS

Exhibit "95"

Docket No. D-613

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

In the Matter of

GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq.

An Attorney.

Affirmation & Exhibit.

GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq.
Attorney pro se.
51 Davis Avenue,
White Plains, N.Y. 10605
914-949-2169