STATE OF NEW YORK

SUPREME COURT

COUNTY OF ALBANY

CENTER FOR JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY, INC., and ELENA RUTH SASSOWER, Individually and as Director of the Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc., acting on their own behalf and on behalf of the People of the State of New York & the Public Interest,

Plaintiffs,

Index No. 5122-16

-against-

ANDREW M. CUOMO, et al,

Defendants.

BEFORE: HON. DENISE A. HARTMAN

Acting Supreme Court Justice

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs:

ELENA RUTH SASSOWER 10 Stewart Place, Apartment 2D-E White Plains, New York 10603

For the Defendants:

HON. ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN

Attorney General of the State of New York

The Capitol

Albany, New York 12224-0341

BY: HELENA LYNCH, ESQUIRE

Assistant Attorney General

Transcript of ORAL ARGUMENT taken in the

above matter held at the Albany County Courthouse,

Albany, New York, on March 29, 2017.

1 (Proceedings commenced in open court on 2 March 29, 2017, as follows.)

2.0

THE COURT: Thank you all. Please be seated.

All right. This is Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. versus Andrew M. Cuomo. It's index number 5122-16. This Court issued a decision I believe it was in December of this year dismissing most of the causes of action but allowing one to proceed.

motion filing by Order to Show Cause which is pending, and today she has asked to present another Order to Show Cause to bring on another motion in this matter and I have -- our chambers has granted her time to present her case today and will allow you 10 minutes to explain the purpose of this Order to Show Cause and, particularly, the only issue today really is your request for temporary relief and I'll give you 10 minutes to present your case.

Before we do that, however, I'd like to have counsel put their names on the record at this point and, Miss Sassower, put your full name on

the record before we proceed with argument. 1 2 MS. SASSOWER: My name is Elena Sassower. I am the unrepresented individual 3 plaintiff in this citizen taxpayer action and I am 5 not an attorney. 6 THE COURT: Thank you very much. 7 MS. LYNCH: Good afternoon your Honor. Helena Lynch with the attorney general's office for the defendants. 9 10 THE COURT: All right. Anything further 11 before we proceed with allowing Miss Sassower to 12 present her argument? MS. LYNCH: No, your Honor. 13 14 THE COURT: Thank you. Again, please 15 confine your argument today to the issue of the temporary relief you request in this Order to Show 16 17 Cause. 18 MS. SASSOWER: At the outset I'd like to 19 address this Court's jurisdiction with respect to 2.0 granting a Temporary Restraining Order and my Order to Show Cause recites -- quotes State 21 22 Finance Law 123-e(2) which says in pertinent part: 23 A temporary restraining order may be granted pending a hearing for a preliminary injunction 24

notwithstanding the requirements of Section 6313 of the Civil Practice Law and Rules where it appears that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result unless defendant is restrained before a hearing can be had, unquote.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

I would like to draw to the Court's attention that not only does that provision give you the authority, the jurisdiction, to grant the powerful relief of a TRO in recognition that public monies have to be safeguarded and they have to be protected, and so this kind of relief is appropriate, and certainly at issue in this case is a state budget of over \$150 billion, but I'd like to additionally address CPLR 6313 with respect the TRO issue and that is that its restriction relates to enjoining a public officer from performance of statutory duties. At issue here on this Order to Show Cause are not statutory duties. They're constitutional requirements. Statutes have no bearing here. It's the constitution that governs. And with respect to the injunctive relief, it is based on violations of Article 3, Section 10 as well as Article 7, Sections 4, 5 and 6. So CPLR 6313 doesn't even

apply. We're not talking about discharge of statutory duties but constitutional requirements.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

Now, recognizing how serious the granting of a TRO is, I actually came prepared for an evidentiary hearing because the entitlement here is one of summary judgment. As I stated at the outset of the verified supplemental complaint, all that is necessary to establish the violations of Article 7, Sections 4, 5, 6 relating to how the Legislature may -- well, it may not alter, it may not alter the governor's budget bills, appropriation bills, except in certain specific ways, and that is laid out in those provisions. It can reduce, it can strike. It cannot add to the bill. And the interpretation of the Court of Appeals in the case that your Honor actually cited in the December 21, 2016 decision in the citizen taxpayer action of Pataki against Assembly, which is a consolidation of the two cases, Pataki against Assembly and Silver against Pataki, the Court of Appeals was unequivocal that Article 7, Section 4 means what it clearly means. It cannot alter in ways that are not permitted and made clear that the non-alteration provisions here

relate not only to appropriation bills but
non-appropriation bills and relate to not just the
money sum, the dollar sum, but the language. You
have only to compare the amended bills, the Senate
and Assembly amended bills with the governor's
bill and you see that the Senate and Assembly,
even were those legitimate bills, their content
constitutionally is defiant of the constitution,
must be so declared.

2.0

So, for example, they have added sums directly to the bills, not separately stated, and they have changed language, removed language, added language in appropriation bills and I believe non-appropriation bills, but what is clearly understood in the constitutional provision is that appropriation bills are not to be altered except in specific ways.

Now, why is that? The reason is because the governor sets the budget, and once he sets the budget and provides the bills and they strike out and reduce, the Senate and Assembly reconcile their different bills and it never goes back to the governor. It takes effect immediately. It has the force of law immediately.

So the budget, what has happened is that the budget is entirely off the constitutional rails. The Senate and Assembly do whatever they want to do in complete disregard of Article 7, Section 4, 5 and 6, and have gotten away with it.

In addition, the constitutional provisions of Article 7, 1 through 7, lay out a process that is open and transparent. Hearings, legislative hearings where if the Senate and Assembly have questions or take exception to certain aspects of the bill, they can call — they can request the governor to appear or the governor can on his own appear and they can confront publicly, in public view, the differences, the problems, the issues. They can be worked out publicly. It is an open process. And what has happened is that the Legislature in collusion with the governor and others have driven the budget process off the constitutional rails wholesale.

THE COURT: Miss Sassower, I just want to suggest to you that your 10 minutes is almost up and I would like you to address specifically what temporary relief you are asking for today.

MS. SASSOWER: Well, okay. Firstly, I

2 4

2.0

1 would like to say that there is a second issue 2 because you have content of the bills and I have 3 brought here today because I hoped that we might have an evidentiary hearing. That's why I said to the attorney general's office, I gave notice --5 6 THE COURT: Miss Sassower, in my letter 7 to you, I indicated that there would be -- I would allow you time to present your Order to Show Cause 9 and that is exactly what I am doing today. 10 MS. SASSOWER: Okay. 11 THE COURT: And only that. 12 MS. SASSOWER: All right. But obviously 13 it's such a serious relief that you want to see 1 4 the -- I would think that you would want to see 15 the proof, perhaps, and so I arranged to bring 16 three sets of the bills, Senate amended bills, Assembly amended bills, so they could be compared 17 with the governor's bill. 18 19 THE COURT: Are those -- no, no. 2.0 those bills exhibits to your documents that you've submitted with your Orders to Show Cause? 21 22 MS. SASSOWER: They are free-standing 23 exhibits. I have them, of course. I brought

24

them.

1	THE COURT: Have you indicated they are
2	exhibits in the materials that you've given me
3	today or are you bringing these separately as
4	exhibits?
5	MS. SASSOWER: Well, I said in my papers
6	that all that is necessary is comparison of the
7	governor's bills and the Senate and Assembly bills
8	to establish prima facie the violations of Article
9	7, Section 4, 5 and 6.
LO	THE COURT: All right. So what are you
L 1	asking me to do today?
L 2	MS. SASSOWER: So what I am saying is
L 3	that I came prepared for an evidentiary hearing.
L 4	Okay? Now, I can establish and have okay. I
L 5	have
L 6	THE COURT: I am denying your request
L 7	for an evidentiary hearing today.
L 8	MS. SASSOWER: Okay.
L 9	THE COURT: What relief do you want
2 0	based on the papers?
2 1	MS. SASSOWER: Well, we have a second
2 2	issue and that is the evidence that the bills
2 3	never went through any process
2.4	THE COURT: Miss Sassower

1 MS. SASSOWER: They were fraudulently 2 amended. There was no meeting, no vote --3 THE COURT: Miss Sassower --MS. SASSOWER: -- by a single 5 legislator. 6 THE COURT: What temporary relief do you What do you want me to enjoin? 7 want? MS. SASSOWER: Okay. As I indicated in 8 9 the Order to Show Cause, and it is numbers three, 10 four, five and six, the relief being sought and 11 specifically to enjoin any further actions, budget 12 actions, on the constitutionally violative, 13 fraudulently amended, no evidence that they were 1 4 ever amended, there was ever a vote by a single legislator. There is no information as to who 15 introduced the amended bills. It was never on any 16 17 agenda. There was never any notice to members. 18 There was never any meeting at which members of 19 the Senate Finance Committee or the Assembly Ways 2.0 and Means Committee or any other committee deliberated on the motion to amend the governor's 21 22 bill, voted on it. All of these are 23 constitutionally required because, again, Article 10 -- Article 3, Section 10 says the doors of the 24

Legislature shall remain open.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: I have listened to your arguments on the merits of your claims.

MS. SASSOWER: Okay.

THE COURT: I'm going to give you 30 seconds to sum up at this point because I've given you significantly more than 10 minutes, and then I'm going to give the attorney general a chance to respond.

MS. SASSOWER: Okay. As I said in my papers, this is prima facie summary judgment and evidentiary, and I came today with the evidence prepared to proceed with an evidentiary hearing so the Court could discharge its responsibilities in view of the facts and the law and the evidence before it. And I went out of my way, and the Court is aware, to make sure that appropriate personnel at the attorney general's office was here, fully knowledgeable, ready to argue. Remember, they could have brought Speaker Heastie, Temporary Senate President Flanagan or any other legislator to say that these bills were amended with -- actually amended. That there were votes. There's not a single vote. How can we have

further proceedings on something that is

fraudulent and violative of the constitution.

THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Sassower.

MS. SASSOWER:

2.0

THE COURT: Thank you very much. All right. Miss Lynch.

Thank you, your Honor.

MS. LYNCH: Thank you, your Honor. Just two things. First general and then specific. So generally I did not hear from Miss Sassower any argument as to what the irreparable harm would be and also any argument as to likelihood of success on the merits or any argument as to the balance of the equities.

As the Court is well aware, and we agree with Miss Sassower that the Court has jurisdiction generally to grant a TRO, but the movant must show a likelihood of success on the merits, must show irreparable injury, and must address the balance of the equities, and from what I can gather, we are talking about a request to essentially shut down the government. And then -- and Miss Sassower has not made any showing.

Now, specifically in the Order to Show Cause there appear to be six specific items. Now

1 the first two I didn't hear addressed today, but 2 numbers three through six appear to relate primarily to the many amendments. So what I'd 3 like to say to the Court is that I realize that at this juncture, this is merely a representation 5 6 from counsel for assigning it the appropriate 7 weight. My understanding is that what Miss Sassower is referring to as amendments are 8 9 not actually amendments, that they are markups for 10 internal discussion so -- which raises two issues. 11 First, the amendments are not amendments 12 so they don't implicate Sections 4, 5 and 6 of Article 7, and they're also markups for internal 13 discussion which render them a nonjusticiable 14 15 issue. 16 At this juncture the defendants don't have anything else to say aside from that. 17 18 THE COURT: All right. Thank you very 19 much. 2.0 MS. SASSOWER: May I reply? THE COURT: You may have one minute. 21 22 MS. SASSOWER: Success on the merits? 23 have summary judgment and I can prove it here and now because I've produced the bills, the Senate 24

and Assembly amended bills. I have the originals of the governor. And if the assistant attorney general here is representing that these amended bills are internal documents, wow. I'd like her legal authority for that.

No, I'm not seeking to shut down the government and the postscript addresses that. remedy is clear. The government, the Senate and Assembly, will take the governor's bills and amend them as Article 7, Sections 4, 5, 6 dictate and those amended bills that they will reconcile will take effect immediately. They never go back to the governor. We have a rolling budget. As I said in my postscript, historically and in the not far distant past, we had budgets that went to August. The government doesn't shut down. it will do is force the Senate and Assembly to respect their duties under the constitution, and the Court of Appeals unequivocal decision, unequivocal, as well as in the Banker's case which also reiterates --

THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Sassower.

MS. SASSOWER: -- that even with

agreement by the governor --

22

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

1 4

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

23

```
1
                   THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Sassower --
                   MS. SASSOWER: -- fraud viciates
         everything it touches.
 3
                   THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Sassower.
         Thank you. I'm going to take this request for an
 5
 6
         Order to Show Cause under advisement. I will
 7
         release any Order to Show Cause within the next
         half hour or so.
 9
                   MS. SASSOWER: Thank you. I am
10
         prepared --
                   THE COURT: If I grant -- if I provide a
11
12
         time schedule for a response to the motion that is
13
         being brought on by Order to Show Cause, will 30
1 4
         days be sufficient for the State to --
15
                   MS. LYNCH: Thirty days should be
         sufficient, your Honor.
16
17
                   MS. SASSOWER: Thirty days? Excuse me.
18
         This is a citizen taxpayer action. It must
19
         proceed --
2.0
                   THE COURT: Miss Sassower, you may speak
21
         when you are asked to speak.
22
                   Is there an earlier date, earlier than
23
         30 days, by which the State can reasonably
24
         respond?
                  I understand that there are at least six
```

```
different requests for relief here so it is not a
 1
 2
         simple response.
                   MS. LYNCH: I believe three weeks should
 3
         be sufficient. Anything shorter than that might
 5
         be too --
 6
                   THE COURT: Let's take a look at this
 7
         calendar.
                   MS. LYNCH: -- putting too much pressure
         on the part of the defendants.
 9
10
                   MS. SASSOWER: May I just alert the
11
         Court that the defendants have been aware of all
12
         these issues with respect to the budget for fiscal
13
         year 2016 and '17, okay? This was all presented
1 4
         largely in the March 23rd --
15
                   THE COURT: Miss Sassower.
                   MS. SASSOWER: -- 2016 second
16
17
         supplemental complaint, the prior --
18
                   THE COURT: Miss Sassower, I've
         dismissed most of the causes of action in your
19
2.0
         original complaint here.
                   MS. SASSOWER: Yes. And I have
21
22
         demonstrated that --
23
                   THE COURT: And I am not revisiting
24
         those at this moment on this TRO. All right?
                                                         So
```

1 I am going to give the State until the 21st of 2 April to file and serve a response and I will also 3 then establish -- may I ask, Miss Lynch, how you have been serving your papers on Miss Sassower so I know if I need to build in time for mail? 5 6 MS. LYNCH: I believe we've been mailing 7 them, your Honor. THE COURT: Then I will --8 9 MS. SASSOWER: And e-mailing it, and so 10 the e-mail makes it very efficient. THE COURT: I'm going to suggest that 11 12 you e-mail your responsive papers to Miss Sassower 13 by the 21st and I will give Miss Sassower until 1 4 the 27th to file a reply. 15 MS. SASSOWER: Excuse me, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: You may make a request as 17 long as it is, as you're thinking about it, 18 reasonable. MS. SASSOWER: Well, since your Honor 19 2.0 has come out of the attorney general's office, you know that the attorney general's office has about 21 22 500 attorneys perhaps. I am a nonlawyer that have 23 sought the representation of the attorney general

in this citizen taxpayer action pursuant to the

```
citizen taxpayer action statute as well as
 1
 2
         Executive Law 63.1.
                   THE COURT: I'll give you until the
 3
         28th.
                This is a reply. You have already put in
 5
         your papers and now the State has a response.
 6
                   MS. SASSOWER: But they have polluted --
 7
         their record is to pollute the judicial process
         with lies and frauds just as --
 9
                   THE COURT: Miss Sassower --
10
                   MS. SASSOWER: -- Miss Lynch here for
11
         her to report --
12
                   THE COURT: Miss Sassower, do not speak
13
         over me, please.
1 4
                   MS. SASSOWER: All right.
15
                   THE COURT: I will read your papers
16
         thoroughly and I will read the State's papers
17
         thoroughly and I'll give you a reasoned decision.
18
         All right?
19
                   MS. SASSOWER: And what has become of
2.0
         the TRO?
                   THE COURT: You will find out after I
21
22
         take it under advisement for a few minutes in my
23
         chambers and look over your papers a little more
24
         carefully. And if you will wait outside of my
```

```
courtroom, you may pick it up at 4:00, 4:15.
 1
 2
                   MS. SASSOWER: This is prima facie
         summary judgment both procedurally and --
 3
                   THE COURT: This is a TRO.
         Miss Sassower, this is a TRO application. This is
 5
 6
         not a merits determination. It is -- you're
 7
         speaking -- you're asking for temporary relief
         while I consider the merits of your application.
         That's what's going on here and that is -- and
 9
10
         that's why we are so limited today in what kind of
11
         arguments and evidence that you can --
12
                   MS. SASSOWER: But she's purported that
13
         I haven't shown the likelihood of success on the
14
         merits. I've shown summary judgment.
                   THE COURT: If that is shown on your
15
         papers, I'll take that under consideration.
16
17
                   MS. SASSOWER: Thank you. I believe
18
         it's laid out adequately by my affidavit in
         support with its cross referencing --
19
2.0
                   THE COURT: Miss Sassower.
21
                   MS. SASSOWER: -- to the supplemental
22
         complaint.
23
                   THE COURT: Miss Sassower, this is not
24
         the time for conversation on this. All right?
```

will read your papers. Do you understand? 1 2 MS. SASSOWER: Mm-hmm. THE COURT: And I will read the State's 3 papers when they come in and I will give you time to get further papers in and I will read those as 5 6 well. 7 MS. SASSOWER: Okay. THE COURT: All right? And I would like 9 you to e-mail those papers to me also on the 28th. 10 I'll put those dates in the Order to Show Cause. 11 MS. SASSOWER: What I am simply 12 indicating, your Honor, is that if this Court does 13 not grant the TRO, it should proceed expeditiously 1 4 with the preliminary injunction as to which I 15 believe I'm entitled to a hearing, and I am requesting that if the TRO is denied, that we put 16 17 this on for a hearing on the preliminary injunction Friday. Friday. I have a copy of the 18 bills. We can examine the alterations made and 19 2.0 establish the constitutional violations. You have 21 the FOIL requests. 22 THE COURT: I have your request. I will 23 consider it.

MS. SASSOWER: Thank you.

```
1
                   THE COURT: I assume when you say
 2
         Friday, you mean this week?
 3
                   MS. SASSOWER: Absolutely, your Honor.
         There's plenty of time for the Senate and Assembly
 4
 5
         to redo their bills.
                   THE COURT: Anything further?
 6
 7
                   MS. LYNCH: No, your Honor.
 8
                   THE COURT: All right. At this point we
 9
         stand adjourned. Thank you.
10
                   (Proceedings concluded at 3:36 p.m.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
2 4
```

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	<u>CERTIFICATION</u>
7	
8	
9	I, Cindy Affinati, Official Court Reporter for
10	the Unified Court System, Third Judicial District of
11	the State of New York, do hereby certify that I
12	attended and reported the foregoing proceedings; that
13	it is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings
14	had therein to the best of my knowledge and ability.
15	
16	Cerid, affinal
17	Cindy Affinati
18	Official Court Reporter? April 4, 2017
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	