## CENTER for JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY, INC.

P.O. Box 69, Gedney Station
White Plains, New York 10605-0069

Tel. (914) 421-1200 Fax (914) 428-4994 E-Mail: judgewatch@aol.com Web site: www.judgewatch.org

Elena Ruth Sassower, Coordinator

## **BY PRIORITY MAIL**

Certified/Return Receipt: 7099-3400-0001-2734-2090

March 2, 2001

Luke Bierman, Director Standing Committee on Judicial Independence American Bar Association 541 North Fairbanks Court Chicago, Illinois 60611

Amicus and other assistance in the appeal of the public interest Article 78 proceeding, Elena Ruth Sassower, Coordinator of the Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc., acting pro bono publico, against Commission on Judicial Conduct of the State of New York (NY Co. #108551/99; Appellate Division, First Dept. Cal #2000-5434)

## Dear Mr. Bierman:

This is to request your assistance in securing *amicus* and other assistance from the American Bar Association and its Standing Committee on Judicial Independence in the above-entitled public interest appeal against the New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct, sued for corruption.

As you will see from the enclosed Appellant's Brief and Appendix, this appeal not only underscores the *sine qua non* of judicial independence: a fair and impartial tribunal, free of such external considerations as a complete lack of judicial tenure<sup>1</sup>, but does so in the context of a case whose object is to vindicate the public's right to an effective state judicial disciplinary mechanism.

Examination of the Brief will convince you that the Commission has NO legitimate defense to this appeal – and that the *only* way it can survive the evidence of its corruption, established by the record of the Article 78 proceeding, is if New York's Appellate Division, First Department replicates the lower court's subversion of judicial independence by fashioning a factually fabricated, legally insupportable decision.

See Brief, pp. 27, 46-48.

The ABA's involvement will ensure that this politically-explosive appeal, whose criminal ramifications reach to the Governor, is decided as it should be: on the facts and the law. This is what judicial independence is all about. The ABA's ability to build a coalition of organizational support and to garner media coverage for the important issues of governmental integrity this appeal presents will make it more difficult for the Appellate Division to "throw" the appeal by a fraudulent judicial decision – as it did last November in deciding another appeal involving the Commission, Michael Mantell v. New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct (NY Co. #108655/99, Appellate Division, First Dept. Cal. #2000-3833)<sup>2</sup>.

A copy of the Appellate Division's decision in *Mantell v. Commission*, as reported by the November 20, 2000 New York Law Journal, is enclosed, annexed to CJA's December 1, 2000 memorandum to the Commission and its attorney, the State Attorney General, calling upon them to move to vacate that decision for fraud.

The status of the instant appeal is that the Attorney General requested additional time to respond to my Appellant's Brief. The January 11th stipulation I signed, giving the Attorney General until March 23rd and myself until April 27th, puts the appeal over to the June term. A copy of the stipulation is enclosed. Also enclosed is my January 10<sup>th</sup> letter to Attorney General Spitzer, calling upon him to disavow his representation of the Commission and to join in support of the appeal and in a motion to ensure that it is heard by a fair and impartial tribunal. Additionally, enclosed is my January 11<sup>th</sup> letter transmitting my faxed signature on the stipulation.

Should you wish to see the lower court record in the appeal -- encompassing the lower court record in *Mantell v. Commission* - or the appellate papers in *Mantell v. Commission*, including my dispositive motion to intervene therein -- I would be pleased to transmit them forthwith.

I look forward to discussing with you the powerful contribution the ABA and its Standing Committee on Judicial Independence can make in advancing both judicial independence and accountability by this historic public interest case.

Yours for a quality judiciary,

ELENA RUTH SASSOWER, Coordinator Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)

Elena Rage Sossare

Enclosures: As indicated, plus CJA's informational brochure

The lower court decision in *Mantell v. Commission* appears at 299-307 of the Appendix, with CJA's analysis thereof appearing at 321-334.

	Coverage Provided)				
. ப	Cuto Rio			=	
· <b>_</b>	Cute Bierman, Drector				
273 233	Postage	\$ 5.15			
1	Certified Fee	1.90	TA STIHM W		
001	Return Receipt Fee (Endorsement Required)	1.57	Postmark Store	A IN	
	Restricted Delivery Fee (Endorsement Required)		171 -0/		
400	Total Postage & Fees	\$ 8.55	377. 9998 NO		
<u>։ տ</u> լ	Name (Please Print Clearly) (to be completed by mailer)				
닏	341 WW	Tair bank	La Const	4	
Ì	City, State 21P+4	,,,,		1	
	S Forn 3800 July 1999	11111/013	60611		

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY			
■ Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired.  ■ Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.  ■ Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.  1. Article Addressed to:  LIKE BOMBA CONTROLL  STANGED CONTROLL  ARECORD BY ASSOCIATION  ARECORD BY ASSOCIATION  ARECORD BY ASSOCIATION  AND CONTROLL  ARECORD BY ASSOCIATION  ARECORD BY ASSOCIATION  AND CONTROLL  ARECORD BY ASSOCIA	A. Reverved by (Please Print Clearly)  C. Signature  X			
Chicago, Illinois 60611	3. Service Type  Certified Mail			
2. Article Number (Copy from service label)  7099 - 3400 -000/ -2734 -2,090				
PS Form 3811, July 1999 Omestic Feturn Receipt 102595-00-M-G				