

Docket No. 94-
28 U.S.C. Complaint.
U.S. Circuit Court Judge Carolyn D. King
U.S. Circuit Court Judge Rhesa H. Barksdale
U.S. Circuit Court Judge E. Grady Jolly

I make this 28 U.S.C. complaint against U.S. Circuit Court Judges Carolyn D. King, Rhesa H. Barksdale, and E. Grady Jolly, for usurpation of lawful authority and conduct prejudicial to the effective administration of the business of the courts, which complaint is of a criminal magnitude.

The following are some of the essential facts, all documented, uncontroverted, and indeed admitted and confessed, necessary for the proper understanding of this complaint.

i. More than \$1,000,000 was paid or authorized to be paid in "bribes" by Kreindler & Relkin, P.C. ["K&R"] and Citibank, N.A. ["Citibank"], they being those who engineered the larceny of all of the judicial trust assets of Puccini Clothes, Ltd. ["Puccini"], a corporation in which I have, inter alia, a contractually based, constitutionally protected, money judgment.

ii. All the monies payable "to the federal court", including those paid on my behalf, under the Order of U.S. District Court Judge Eugene H. Nickerson of the Eastern District of New York, were diverted, without judicial process, to the pockets of K&R and Citibank, and the federal court received nothing. My financial debt to the federal court/government remains unsatisfied by reason of such criminal diversion.

iii. More than \$2,000,000 in "extortion" monies have been paid by Hyman Raffe ["Raffe"], my former client, to K&R-Citibank and their co-conspirators, in order to avoid his incarceration under a criminal conviction. The amounts of these payments are correlated to my activities in an attempt to compel my inactivity and silence.

Part "A"

2a. In my mandamus petitions (94-00112/00154), with crystal and emphatic clarity, I stated that I had no desire or intention of depriving the federal courts/government of any fees due by reason of such filings, but desired that procedures be taken to obtain such monies from, Kreindler & Relkin, P.C. ["K&R"] and/or Citibank, N.A. ["Citibank"], or those who engineered the larceny of all of the assets of Puccini Clothes, Ltd., crediting such payments from them on their obligations due me under my money judgment against Puccini.

b. The factual assertions contained therein, were uncontroverted and unopposed.

c. Rather than deprive those, in the first instance, those who bribe and corrupt state and federal judges, Judges King, Barksdale & Jolly, defrauded the federal court/government of monies due it by granting me *in forma pauperis* status.

d. The fact that I financially benefitted from the procedures adopted by Judges King, Barksdale & Jolly, is irrelevant. I do not seek or desire undeserved philanthropy at anyone's expense, particularly the taxpaying public, when constitutionally guaranteed alternatives exist, to wit., vindication of my private contractual assets.

e. In my view, the robe, is not emolument of office which permits the federal purse to be defrauded, to aid and abet the egregious criminal activities of other corrupt judges and officials, their bag-men and cronies (cf. 18 U.S.C. §4).

Part "B"

3a. In 94-00112, I moved motion for:

" (1a) a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction, issued by this Court, directed against WEST PUBLISHING COMPANY, THE MEAD CORPORATION, LAWYERS COOPERATIVE PUBLISHING COMPANY, and NEW YORK LAW JOURNAL COMPANY, and/or (1b) to mandamus Chief U.S. District Court Judge BAREFOOT SANDERS and U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS to issue a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction against WEST PUBLISHING COMPANY, THE MEAD CORPORATION, LAWYERS COOPERATIVE PUBLISHING COMPANY, and NEW YORK LAW JOURNAL COMPANY in Cohen & Sassower v. West Publishing Company, et al. (ND Tex. Docket No. 393CV2546H); (2) to mandamus respondents to adjudicate and/or grant petitioner's unopposed motion, with its uncontroverted Rule 5.2 Statement, for summary judgment money damages, liquidated and unliquidated, against CITIBANK, N.A. ['Citibank']; (3) to mandamus respondents to adjudicate and/or grant petitioner's money damage partial summary judgment against EUGENE H. NICKERSON, WILFRED FEINBERG, THOMAS J. MESKILL, and WILLIAM C. THOMPSON, without prejudice to petitioner's contention that Citibank is liable for all damages sustained ...".

b. Having granted me *in forma pauperis* status, Judges King, Barksdale & Jolly were compelled to address the merits of this unopposed application, with its uncontroverted facts set forth therein.

c. Instead, it ignored to adjudicate or even mention the substantive issues presented for adjudication (cf. *Cohens v Virginia*, 19 U.S. [6 Wheat] 264, 404 [1821]).

d. If nothing more, it confirmed, albeit tentatively, the corruption of Chief U.S. Circuit Court Judge Henry A. Politz.

4a. Along with my motion for a rehearing, I filed another mandamus proceeding (94-00154), which requested that Chief U.S. District Court Judge Barefoot Sanders adjudicate:

"(1) unopposed motion of May 7th, 1994 pursuant to FRCivP Rule 52, 59, 60(b)[1]-[6], 65, FRAppP Rule 8, without prejudice to a FRCivP Rule 60(b) action and/or the filing of an Amended Complaint (FRCivP Rule 15), with respect to the Court's disposition of April 28, 1994 ...'; (2) 'unopposed recusal motion of May 26, 1994'; and ...".

b. As far as I am aware, albeit unopposed, no order bearing the above docket number was ever issued, or the issues presented therein, adjudicated.

c. Since my appeal is from the Order which adjudicates my Rule 52 motion, not the original order/judgment, an appeal will be presented to this Court both from the initial order, and thereafter, if such motion, which will be presented in the form of a Rule 60(b) motion, is denied, from such denial.

d. Such misconduct is clearly prejudicial to the effective administration of justice.

Dated: October 31, 1994

GEORGE SASSOWER
16 Lake Street,
White Plains, NY 10603
914-949-2169

Certified Mail Z 756 712 034