

Suzanne McCormick  
Concert Pianist  
231 Clinton Avenue  
Dobbs Ferry, New York 10522

Via Certified Mail  
#7009 0820 0000 1120 1461

*Privileged and Sensitive*

April 26, 2010

Alan W. Friedberg, Chief Counsel  
Departmental Disciplinary Committee  
First Judicial Department  
61 Broadway  
New York, New York 10006

RE: Peter D. Raymond - Registration No. 1686377  
Docket No. 2009.2870

Dear Mr. Friedberg:

This will confirm the receipt of your letter dated March 25, 2010 (Postmarked "Mar 26 2010" via Pitney Bowes Meter Regular Mail) that was received on April 1, 2010 (Enclosure #1 - 3 pp. - including envelope) via Regular Mail. Your letter (Enclosure #1) allegedly is in response to my documented issues/complaints cover letter dated November 4, 2009 that you received on November 5, 2009 (Enclosure #2 - 3 pp. Without Enclosures detailing issues/complaints). Your office acknowledged the receipt of my letter via undated Postcard "Postmarked Nov 10 2009" and assigned the Docket No. 2009.2870 (Enclosure #3 - 1 pp. - both sides on one page) that I received on November 16, 2009 via Regular Mail. Further, I note that your office stated on this (Enclosure #3) Postcard "Due to the large volume of complaints filed in this office, it normally takes us *between 30 and 45 days* from the postmark date on this card to forward further information to you about the status of your complaint." (Emphasis Added)

For the record I want it stated that *I object and do not consent.*

My issues/complaints (Enclosure #2 and the attached evidentiary Exhibits) of November 4, 2009 apprised your organization of the fact that numerous inherent conflicts are pervasive in the matters that I have asserted. Although, I indicated the obvious conflicts of which you are aware, upon information and belief I have discovered that several attorneys who purportedly represent the Fraudulent Executor **Bankers Trust Company** have been or are a part of your organization. Yet, despite the notice of the blatant conflicts you stated that "The Committee arrived at this determination after the case was *submitted to a member of the Committee, an independent board of lawyers and non-lawyers* appointed by the Appellate Division, First Judicial Department. The Committee member concluded that no further investigation or action was warranted." (Emphasis Added) In that regard please provide me with the name or names of all the individuals that have been involved in this

*Privileged and Sensitive*

Alan W. Friedberg, Chief Counsel  
April 26, 2010

Page Two of Five Pages

Continued:

alleged investigation in any capacity of these issues/complaints. Mr. Friedberg, it is absurd to entertain the idea of your organization allegedly investigating yourselves or anything for that matter. particularly in light of the assertions of corruption that Ms. Christine C. Anderson detailed! This is precisely why I gave you (and Attorney General Andrew Cuomo) a good faith notice of the conflicts and demanded an independent party to investigate the evidence that I believe will ultimately be labeled of a criminal nature. I know that during this alleged investigation that was allegedly conducted no one ever contacted me to either interview me or provide additional evidence of any nature. Please send me a complete copy of the alleged investigation that was allegedly conducted under your auspices despite my documented warnings. Don't you see the egregious conflicts? The foxes can't be in charge of the hen house! Have you no ETHICS?

You stated in your letter (Enclosure #1) "Specifically, we have reviewed your complaint against the above-referenced attorney and have concluded there is an insufficient basis upon which to pursue further investigation." As you know, my issues/complaints (Enclosure #2 - without Exhibits) with evidence, part of the November 4, 2009-letter contained in my letter dated February 8, 2009 (Enclosure #4 - 8 pp. - without Exhibits) that listed numerous issues (with evidence) that were the basis of my November 4, 2009 (Enclosure#4) cover letter. For the purpose of this letter I choose at this time to merely enumerate three (3) of the catalogued issues/complaints (with evidence) that formed my total November 4, 2009-letter. A careful examination of my totally documented package of supported evidentiary material concerning the issues/complaints (with evidence) contained regarding the utter failure of Attorney at Law Peter D. Raymond to perform elementary due diligence as an Attorney at Law, defies logic. That the enumerated issues/complaints (with evidence) would be cavalierly ignored and arbitrarily dismissed, is troubling. I am aware that the documented issues/complaints that are an integral part of Enclosures #2 and #4 are of an extremely serious legal nature and you as an officer of the court (and all others) have been given notice of these matters and as such have responsibilities and duties. My letter dated February 8, 2009 (Enclosure #4) was written in good faith to Peter D. Raymond to address the issues. The fact that he choose not to respond was his choice as an Attorney at Law and surely he may have had good reasons in his own mind, however this is irrelevant and specious to the material issues/complaints with documented evidence raised and was not addressed.

**First** - Again, the blatant failure of Peter D. Raymond as an Attorney at Law, to perform basic due diligence while he allegedly represented me and discover the Fraud involving the Petition For Payment of Executor's Individual Claims Pursuant To SCPA 1805, dated February 7, 1989 filed by the law firm of White & Case for their "**Enduring Client**" **Bankers Trust Company** (See Enclosure #2) and the subsequent Order for Payment of Executor's Individual Claim dated March 6, 1989 (See Enclosure #4) is unbelievable. As you know, the result of these evidentiary events were that, although the law firm of White & Case was allegedly the estate attorney for the Estate of my husband Edmund J. McCormick, once White & Case filed the above documents on behalf of their "**Enduring Client**" **Bankers Trust Company** they abandoned the legal representation of the Estate of Edmund J.

*Privileged and Sensitive*

Alan W. Friedberg, Chief Counsel  
April 26, 2010

Page Three of Five Pages

Continued:

McCormick, despite their protestations to the contrary. The bias of White & Case has been evident based on their conflicted actions concerning my husband's Estate. As stated in my letter dated February 8, 2009 (Enclosure #4) the evidentiary documents confirm the material fact of the legal abandonment of the Estate of Edmund J. McCormick by the law firm of White & Case (the alleged estate attorney) in favor of their "**Enduring Client**" **Bankers Trust Company**, incontrovertibly documented by the fact that Westchester Surrogate Judge Albert J. Emanuelli divulged same during 1996. The irrefutable fact that the law firm of White & Case received \$250,000 propagated by **Bankers Trust Company** for the alleged payment of estate legal fees is at odds with the evidentiary documented facts surrounding the legal abandonment of the estate by the law firm of White & Case. The frauds are compounded. The details of this complete issue is well documented in my letters of November 4, 2009 and February 8, 2009 (Enclosures #2 & #4).

**Second** - The egregious failure of Peter D. Raymond an Attorney at Law to perform basic due diligence while he allegedly represented me to discover the material fact that the **Permanent Letters Testamentary** (still valid) issued by Westchester County Surrogate Court on January 25, 1989, contained a nonexistent illegal entity, **Bankers Trust Company of New York** (as of January 25, 1989) and not the nominated legal banking entity in my husband's probated Will (drafted by White & Case), **Bankers Trust Company**. This material fact is one of the tenants at the heart of the fraud involving my husband's Estate that I was forced to discover. Peter D. Raymond an Attorney at Law did not or if he did discover this material fact, he never revealed this material fraud to either me or the court. The details of this issue/complaint (with evidence) is well documented in my letters of November 4, 2009 and February 8, 2009 (Enclosures #2 & #4) including but not limited to an Exemplified Copy of the **Permanent Letters Testamentary**. What was the basis of his material omission in this critical matter? Was his motive not to open up a Pandora's box involving the convicted Federal Felon and Fraudulent Executor **Bankers Trust Company**, White & Case, Pillsbury Winthrop and the Westchester County Surrogate Court regarding this fraudulent material matter and others?

**Third** - As you know, Peter D. Raymond an Attorney at Law had a duty and responsibility to reveal the material fact that the Fraudulent Executor **Bankers Trust Company** became a convicted Federal Felony (as of July 26, 1999) and the fact that a Felon (3 Felonies) is legally enjoined from being a Fiduciary both under Federal and New York State Laws. However, he did not ever give me notice of the fact that **Bankers Trust Company** had in fact become a convicted Federal Felon and the vital significance that this material fact had on the ability of **Bankers Trust Company** to serve as a fiduciary in any capacity whatsoever was never disclosed to me who purportedly was his client. **Bankers Trust Company** also did not reveal this incriminating material fact. Again, I had to discover this critical pertinent material fact myself without any help or assistance from the alleged professionals. A Felon can't be a Fiduciary and a Fiduciary can't be a Felon. You may recall that during my testimony on September 24, 2009, Sen. John Sampson confirmed this material fact. Further, in my

*Privileged and Sensitive*

Alan W. Friedberg, Chief Counsel  
April 26, 2010

Page Four of Five Pages

Continued:

November 4, 2010 (Enclosure #2) letter to you I stated in the opening sentence that I had filed previous complaints with your Departmental Disciplinary Committee (DDC). As you know, since you were present, I effectively made a similar statement in my testimony before Senator John Sampson on September 24, 2009. Your assertion in your letter (Enclosure #1) that your “. . . records do not reflect any prior disciplinary complaints from you [me] to the Committee.” is extremely troubling in light of the evidence. ***I reiterate for the record I have made previous complaints to your DDC regarding attorneys at law and their law firms allegedly under your direct supervision.*** I particularly make this statement in light of a letter dated September 13, 2009 (Enclosure # 5 - 3 pp.) to The Hon. Eric H. Holder, Jr., et al., from whistle blower Ms. Christine C. Anderson, an Attorney at Law who formerly as you know was employed at your DDC office. Ms. Anderson in part stated that “This ‘***whitewashing***’ sometimes involved ***burying cases or destroying evidence***, so that certain complaints were inevitably, unavoidably, dismissed. ***I witnessed this destruction of evidence myself.***” (Emphasis Added) As you can understand as a direct result of the foregoing and other reasons I have no faith or trust in your DDC office, or the system for that matter, due to what I perceive as the conflicted nature and betrayal of the public trust. Having been present at the hearing on June 8, 2009 and September 24, 2009, where I heard creditable articulate witnesses testifying about the corruption of the NYS Court System and involving Attorneys at Law, I have had my eyes opened. One of the most shocking, if not the most shocking testimony was that of a sitting NYS Supreme Court Judge - Hon. Duane Hart (the “Emperors New Clothes”). Additionally, as you know the DDC is in conflict and as such your ability to investigate is compromised and, in my opinion, your actions are in egregious bad faith with unclean hands.

With regard to your letter dated March 25, 2010 (Enclosure #1) and specifically the second paragraph in which you allegedly respond to my issues/complaints and evidence I find it totally non-responsive. Your failure to address the body of the issues/complaints and evidence is extremely sad, but since I understand the fact that you are conflicted you didn't disappoint me - this is one of the reasons why I demanded (and continue to demand) an independent entity to examine the issues/complaints and evidence. The alleged facts that you assert are immaterial and irrelevantly specious and therefore egregiously disingenuous in an attempt at a cover-up and whitewashing of my issues/complaints and evidence. In my opinion you are aiding and abetting in a pattern and practice of obstruction of justice. Again, you are conflicted and, therefore, in no ethical position to investigate anything in my opinion - an independent entity is the only logical ethical answer since I believe you have abrogated your oversight mandates.

A complete independent investigation would seek to answer the issues/complaints documented with material evidence that I have specifically detailed. Were these obfuscations and obstructions of justice part of some arrangement, cover-up with regard to these material facts and others that I believe that the Attorneys et al., never expected in their widest dreams that I, or for that matter anyone, would discover. Any investigation should also address the salient issues of “Malfeasance” and “Nonfeasance” I reiterate my demand for a complete

*Privileged and Sensitive*

Alan W. Friedberg, Chief Counsel  
April 26, 2010

Page Five of Five Pages

Continued:

independent investigation and the ultimate sanction and disbarment of Peter D. Raymond. It is my further understanding that the DDC has the authority to direct Peter D. Raymond to refund any funds allegedly paid for legal services.

As you know I am not an attorney and not part of the "club," and as such don't claim to have the alleged superior knowledge and information that you allegedly may assert. I do however have logic and wisdom and presented documented evidence that is not going to disappear. Mr. Friedberg, you as an Attorney at Law and an officer of the court must know that the truth is more powerful than a thousand lies and that you have a specific duty to deliver honest services. And in closing I restate that ***I continue to object and do not consent*** and this letter is written in good faith.

Sincerely,  
  
Suzanne McCormick

SM/nc

cc: Attorney General Andrew Cuomo

Enclosures:

1. - Copy of a letter dated March 25, 2010 from Alan W. Friedberg to Suzanne McCormick with envelope - 3 pp.
2. - Copy of a letter dated November 4, 2009 from Suzanne McCormick to Alan W. Friedberg and Hon. Andrew Cuomo - 3 pp. - Without Exhibits.
3. - Copy of a Postcard undated but "Postmarked Nov 10 2009" from Departmental Disciplinary Committee, Office of the Chief Counsel - 1 pp. - both sides on one page.
4. - Copy of a letter dated February 8, 2009 from Suzanne McCormick to Peter D. Raymond - 8 pp. - Without Exhibits.
5. - Copy of a letter dated September 13, 2009 from Christine C. Anderson to Hon. Eric H. Holder, Jr. et al., from "iviewit.tv" website - 3 pp.

Via Certified Mail  
#7009 0820 0000 1120 1461

Ms. Suzanne McCormick  
231 Clinton Avenue  
Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522

Alan W. Friedberg, Chief Counsel  
Departmental Disciplinary Committee  
First Judicial Department  
61 Broadway  
New York, New York 10006

7009 0820 0000 1120 1461

7009 0820 0000 1120 1461  
PLACE STICKER AT TOP OF ENVELOPE TO THE RIGHT  
OF THE RETURN ADDRESS, FOLD AT DOTTED LINE  
**CERTIFIED MAIL™**



U.S. Postal Service™  
**CERTIFIED MAIL™ RECEIPT**  
(Domestic Mail Only: No Insurance Coverage Provided)

For delivery information visit our website at [www.usps.com](http://www.usps.com).

**OFFICIAL USE**  
NEW YORK NY 10006

Postage	\$ 1.56	0142
Certified Fee		
Return Receipt Fee (Endorsement Required)	\$2.80	
Restricted Delivery Fee (Endorsement Required)	\$0.00	
Total Postage & Fees	\$4.36	

Alan W. Friedberg, Chief Counsel

Sent to Depart. Disciplinary Com.

Street Apt No. 1st Judicial Depart.  
or PO Box No. 61 Broadway

City, State, ZIP+4  
New York, N.Y. 10006

PS Form 3800, August 2006 See Reverse for Instructions

Reverse for Instructions  
10006  
Postmark Here  
USE  
www.usps.com  
PT  
Prage Provided)

