

Docket No. 94-
28 U.S.C. Complaint.
Chief U.S. District Court Judge Barefoot Sanders

I make this 28 U.S.C. complaint against Chief U.S. District Court Judge Barefoot Sanders ["Sanders"], based on three (3) discrete items, and as general background for this complaint incorporate by reference my complaint of May 31, 1994 (Docket No. 94-05-372-0031).

For reasons disclosed in my May 31, 1994 complaint, copies of such complaint was also served upon Strassburger & Price, L.L.P., U.S. Attorney Paul Coggins, NY State Atty. Gen. G. Oliver Koppell, and Kreindler & Relkin, P.C., in addition to Chief Judge Sanders, and nothing contained therein was controverted by those served or by anyone else, at any time or place.

Part "A"

2a. On June 10, 1994, ten (10) days after making my May 31, 1994 complaint, upon receipt of a copy of the District Court's Docket Sheet, dated June 7, 1994, I recognized that, inter alia, my May 7, 1994 motion had not been entered on the Docket Sheet, and caused the following letter, with enclosures, to be sent:

" 1. I received today a copy of the Clerk's Docket Sheet, as of June 7, 1994, and noticed that plaintiffs' motion #3, dated May 7, 1994, was not docketed, although supplements No. II (Docket #48) and No. III (Docket #49), which made reference to such May 7, 1994 were docketed.

I assume that my supplemental submission No. IV, dated June 6, 1994, has also been docketed.

2. I here enclose in duplicate, copies of said May 7, 1994 motion, together with the letter of the same date, which was enclosed with said motion. The Notice of Appeal which was also enclosed, has been superseded by an Amended Notice (Docket #45).

3. Unless I hear to the contrary, I assume that copies of plaintiffs' motion #3 mailed to U.S. Attorney Paul Coggins and NY State Attorney General G. Oliver Koppell were received by them. I am also mailing a copy of said motion to Strassburger & Price, L.L.P., who thereafter appeared.

4. I would appreciate it if you would have same docketed and forwarded to Chief Judge Sanders for disposition.

Most Respectfully,

GEORGE SASSOWER"

b. Copies of such covering letter was mailed to, *inter alia*, this Court, and exists in this Court's file, as confirmed by Ms. Susan Vaughn ["Vaughn"], the Case Manager of this court, by letter dated August 1, 1994 (Item No. 6).

c. The duplicate set of papers, mailed by Certified Mail was also not entered on the Clerk's Docket Sheet, or acted upon by Chief Judge Sanders.

d. There is substantial evidence that this motion, which affects the jurisdiction of the Circuit Court was intentionally "hijacked", "waylaid", "secreted" and/or "shredded" with the knowledge and consent, express, implied and/or ratified, by Chief Judge Sanders.

e. "Hijacking", "waylaying", "secreting", and "shredding" legal papers, particularly when they affect appellate jurisdiction, is conduct prejudicial to the effective administration of the courts, and is of a criminal magnitude.

Part "B"

3a. Among the clearly established, documented and uncontroverted facts is the following:

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 were diverted, without judicial process, to the pockets of K&R and Citibank, and the federal court received nothing. My debt to the federal government remains unsatisfied by reason of such 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 incarceration under a criminal conviction. The amounts of these payments are correlated to my activities in an attempt to compel my silence.

b. In my 28 U.S.C. §1915 affirmation of June 6, 1994, a copy of which was mailed to the Circuit Court (see Vaughn letter of August 1, 1994, Item 4), I requested that K&R-Citibank be directed to pay such appellate fees, debiting my contractually based, constitutionally protected money judgment against Puccini.

c. Rather than imposing such fee payment, in the first instance, upon those who bribe and corrupt judges, and ultimately upon myself, Chief Judge Sanders chose to defraud the federal court by permitting me to appeal, in forma pauperis.

d. That I financially have benefitted by the procedure adopted by Chief Judge Sanders is irrelevant. The fact is that the federal sovereign's purse has been deprived of a fee rightfully due it, by the failure and refusal of Chief Judge to make demand upon K&R-Citibank for such fee in the first instance.

Part "C"

4. My FRCivP Rule 52 papers seeking to rectify this fraud upon the federal purse, was apparently also "waylaid", although docketed, and Chief Judge Sanders has failed and/or refused to adjudicate such motion, based upon the duplicate set of papers provided His Honor.

Dated: October 31, 1994

Respectfully submitted,

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

Certified Mail Z 756 712 034