1	SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
2	COUNTY OF NEW YORK
3	x
4	DORIS L. SASSOWER, : Index No.
5	: 109141/95 Petitioner, :
6	-against-
7	COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,
8   9	Respondent. :
LO	x
L1	60 Centre Street - Room 309-M New York, New York 10007 May 11, 1995
L2	BEFORE:
L3 L4	HON. JULIUS BIRNBAUM, Special Referee
L 5	APPEARANCES:
L 6	DORIS L. SASSOWER, ESQ. Petitioner, Pro Se
L7	283 Soundview Avenue White Plains, New York 10606
18	OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE
L 9	STATE OF NEW YORK Attorney for Respondent
20	120 Broadway New York, New York 10271 BY: OLIVER W. WILLIAMS, ESQ.
21	Assistant Attorney General
22	ALSO PRESENT: ELENA SASSOWER
23	
24	FREDERIC C. CANTOR,
25	Official Court Reporter

THE REFEREE: I have before me the original Article 78 of the Petition for Doris L. Sassower which is directed to various agencies, particularly the Attorney General of New York State, District Attorney of New York County, New York State Ethics Commission, United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, which requests that those agencies to intervene in the proceeding. And I'm looking at the Notice of Right to Seek Intervention dated April 10, 1995 from the petitioner to those aforementioned agencies.

Now this matter was originally on the calendar on May 3rd, 1995. And on that day, as I recall, an application was made to adjourn the matter by the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Williams. And he appeared before me downstairs in Room 130 at which time I heard him and I adjourned the matter to a date in June. I can't see the exact date, because it's been crossed out, and I directed that the Attorney

General serve all opposing papers in hand upon the petitioner by a date also blacked out.

Subsequent to that matter, I received a telephone call from the law secretary to Justice Herman Cahn, who advised me that Justice Cahn had had a communication from the petitioner, who was, we will say, upset about the adjournment granted by me to a date in June. And it was at the direction of Justice Cahn's Chambers that this matter was put on the motion calendar for May 11, 1995.

I appeared downstairs this date, and I was asked by the petitioner to have this argument or this application put on the record.

Is that a fair statement of what has transpired in the past?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir, it is.

MS. SASSOWER: The application being by the respondent represented by Mr. Williams for an adjournment of this matter, which he indicated he wished to make to

your Honor.

2 |

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE REFEREE: Yes. But what I stated, is that a fair statement of the history of this matter up until this time?

MS. SASSOWER: I did not hear you identify in any way the basis on which the adjournment application was made to your Honor.

THE REFEREE: I don't recall the basis of the application. I saw it was the first time on, and the Assistant Attorney General appeared before me as many, many lawyers do over the years, and they make applications. I don't note any basis for making when I adjourn the matter, particularly if it's on for the first time. So I didn't note it, and I don't recall exactly about it, except I would hazard an educated guess that it appeared that Mr. Williams told me that he didn't have sufficient time to prepare a response to the matter, and that it was on that basis that I adjourned the matter, undoubtedly. But correct me if I'm wrong about that, sir.

MR. WILLIAMS: You are correct.

However, I would like to interject one other thing that did transpire during our conversation on May 3rd. As I approach you, I'll let you know up front that it was not a consensual request, that the petitioner did object to it. I did notify her through her daughter that I would seek an adjournment. I did not talk to her, but I did talk to her daughter who said that she was authorized to speak on her mom's behalf.

THE REFEREE: You recall the daughter's name?

MR. WILLIAMS: Elena, who is here, and who has been designated as Mrs. Sassower's paralegal.

THE REFEREE: Okay. You've stated the record, but, of course, since I hear so many applications downstairs, I don't recall what happened ten days or maybe I'm slipping, maybe I don't even recall what happened yesterday. But I generally have an excellent memory. So, therefore, we are

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

here today, we are up in my courtroom, and is it the intention of the Attorney General to make another application today?

MR. WILLIAMS: That's correct, your I'm making the application on the same basis in which I made at the initial application, which was I told the paralegal to Mrs. Sassower, the daughter, the night prior to -- maybe a week or so prior to seeking the adjournment was that due to whatever cuts one may consider in our office, my section was now fifty percent staffed, half staffed, and that I saw at that early date that considering the appellate briefs, the hearing, the trial and the second circuit briefs that I'm presently working on right now, that I would not be able to timely and adequately prepare a defense to their Article 78 Petition that posed constitutional issues and several other issues that needed to be substantially researched and addressed.

THE REFEREE: Can I interrupt you for a moment? One of the agencies mentioned is

the Attorney General. Is it the intention of the Attorney General to appear for the other agencies mentioned? I probably will be told no, since I'm sure District Attorney Morganthau has people that might want to step in. But what is the intention at this time of the Attorney General to appear for the other parties?

MR. WILLIAMS: The Attorney General will be appearing specifically on behalf of the Commissioner of Judicial Misconduct, no other.

THE REFEREE: And for itself, since the Attorney General is mentioned also.

MR. WILLIAMS: And for itself.

However, it is my understanding that the request for intervention was simply to put the Attorney General on notice that there is a constitutional challenge to a state provision.

THE REFEREE: But looking through
these papers very quickly this morning, it
would appear that petitioner is asking that
the Attorney General and Morganthau's

office to appear and the U.S. Attorney's

Office here in the Southern District to

appear, concerning the complaints that she

forwarded to the Ethics Commission, which

had been dismissed without investigation or

hearing.

MR. WILLIAMS: Correct. That is what she is saying. However, my appreciation from the extent of which I read the Petition is that she seeks our intervention on her behalf.

MS. SASSOWER: On behalf of the public interests.

MR. WILLIAMS: And we are representing the Commission on Judicial Conduct, which she alleges refused to investigate complaints that she had forwarded to it in regard to certain judges or a particular judge's alleged misconduct. So we will be filing papers on behalf of the Commission on Judicial Conduct.

And as I just told the Court and mentioned to Ms. Sassower when I told her I thought I would have an adjournment until

\_ ,

the 15th of June with the return of the

papers on or about the 5th of June, as I

told her daughter in a previous

conversation prior to applying for the

adjournment on May 3rd, that the case load

and the other responsibilities that we have

throughout the entire office just would not

permit me to give the kind of response and

the kind of defense that I needed to move

forward with the defense of the case.

THE REFEREE: So are you making an application to adjourn this matter to the very same day that I granted the application on May the 3rd?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor, I am.

THE REFEREE: And I directed that you serve your opposing papers in hand by what date?

MR. WILLIAMS: June 5.

THE REFEREE: And the motion was put over until June the 16th or 15th?

MR. WILLIAMS: Returnable on the 15th with papers to and in the petitioner's hand on June 5.

THE REFEREE: Okay. And the basis for the application is the very same as you mentioned, your work load in the Attorney General's Office?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor.

That's the same basis I had before, because that's the reason for it, and nothing more, nothing less.

THE REFEREE: Is there anything else you want to say in regard to the application?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. The Attorney
General yesterday received a fax, a threepage fax from Miss Sassower alleging she
was not notified of the previous
adjournment that I requested on the 3rd.
For the purpose of the record, that is
incorrect. Her daughter was aware that we
were going to seek more time. The only
time in which we could do it was on the
return date, which was May 3rd. The day
after or the day of the adjournment that I
thought I had obtained on May 3rd, I called
Miss Sassower to let her know of the

adjournment, and at that time, I think it was the day after, she let me know that was incorrect, that the matter had been put back on the calendar for the 11th of May, which is today. I checked with the Court Motion Clerk. He said that was an error, that it was indeed the 15th. I received, I think it was Monday or yesterday, a notice, maybe Monday, from the Court saying that at the Judge's behest, the matter had been put back on the calendar for the 11th of June--I'm sorry, the 11th of May.

THE REFEREE: For the record, you did call me a day or two ago and asked me whether I had anything to do with the, moving the matter up to May 11.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, because I had no knowledge that it had been done. I didn't have any papers in my hand. No one had notified me that someone was going to apply to the Court for a change of date, and I was trying to find from you the reason for it. And at that time, you advised that you didn't know.

THE REFEREE: What did I tell you?

MR. WILLIAMS: You said, "I don't know. All I know is what's here, written on the papers."

THE REFEREE: But it was actually Justice Cahn's chambers that moved the matter back on the calendar for today.

Okay, Miss Sassower, what is your statement to the application of the Attorney General to adjourn this matter?

MS. SASSOWER: Before I present my statement, your Honor, inasmuch as Mr. Williams has made reference to a conversation had with my daughter, paralegal assistant, I wish her to be heard so that your Honor can have direct personal knowledge on her part of that conversation, because my understanding is--

THE REFEREE: (Interrupting) What does your daughter, your paralegal wish to say for the record?

State your name, please.

THE WITNESS: Elena, E-L-E-N-A, Ruth
R-U-T-H, Sassower, S-A-S-S-O-W-E-R. At

25

approximately 7:30 p.m. on April the 20, the phone rang and it was Mr. Williams who identified himself as calling on this matter. We had a discussion about it, because due to the lateness of the hour, my mother was not available, and Mr. Williams identified the fact that he was representing the Commission on Judicial Conduct, and in fact that he had a note from the Commission from Miss Jean Savanyu, who is a senior attorney at the Commission on Judicial Conduct, together with some notation apparently from Gerald Stern. that it was indicated to him that he was to make a cross motion to dismiss. requested additional time. I told him that as far as we were concerned, we would not give additional time to make a dismissal motion to an Article 78 Proceeding, which was fully meritorious. And I asked him additionally who was appearing, what was the position of the Attorney General insofar as the motion for intervention. Mr. Williams identified that in his very

person, he was passing on both the People's right to the protection of the Attorney General's Office in this matter, as well as the defense of the Commission on Judicial Conduct. I told Mr. Williams that the Commission on Judicial Conduct had their own counsel, and that if they were able to put in a defense to this Article 78 Proceeding, they should do their own dirty work, because I didn't think it could be done.

Mr. Williams was quite amiable in his conversations with me as I was with him, and he suggested that it might be in the interest of all concerned that a meeting be arranged, that there be some sort of, I think he characterized it, as an informal conference. I told him that we would be most agreeable to sitting down with the Attorney General's Office and to give them all assistance in understanding the significance of this Article 78 Proceeding.

Mr. Williams told me that he had, at that point, not had the opportunity to read

24

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2 the papers. He was not in the position to discuss them per se, and he agreed that he 3 would be calling sometime during the following week. Again, the conversation 5 that we had together was in the evening hours of April 20, and it was understood that he would be calling, and he would be 8 speaking with my mother at that time, but that our position certainly was that we 10 11 would be opposing any adjournment application. With that expectation that we 12 would be hearing from Mr. Williams the 13 14 following week, we concluded. 15

Thereafter, I received no communication from Mr. Williams, and to my knowledge, my mother, likewise, received no communication from him.

MR. WILLIAMS: May I respond to that, your Honor?

THE REFEREE: Yes.

Incidentally, did you not once appear before me downstairs in Room 130 on another matter?

THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor.

21

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

23

24

\_

THE REFEREE: I granted an application.

THE WITNESS: You initially granted a week's adjournment, you are absolutely correct. You initially granted a week's adjournment on a case of Doris Sassower against Malamut. However, upon the objection of defense counsel, you indicated that an application could be made directly to the Judge presiding on that case. That a request could be made--

THE REFEREE: (Interrupting) Did they go up and make an application?

THE WITNESS: No. When I got home, and I informed my mother that you had initially agreed to a week's adjournment, but then said no, you were going to mark it "submitted," but we could put in papers before the Judge and request oral argument, the Judge informed us in the Malamut case, Judge Crane, Judge Crane's Chambers informed us that he does not take oral argument. And they marked it a default. And, as a matter of fact, your Honor, we

made the representation in our papers that you had said that we could put in the additional submissions before the Court requesting the additional argument.

THE REFEREE: I do recall you having appeared before me on some other matter downstairs.

THE WITNESS: I would conclude by saying it was because it was not on the record, your Honor, that at first counsel took the position that there was no reservation made by you that an application could be made to the Judge directly with the right to submit an oral argument.

THE REFEREE: Actually, I'm giving the parties in this matter an unusual opportunity. I think out of a thousand applications that I've heard within the last year, I've only had about three on the record of a thousand.

MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor, for the sake of clarity, when I spoke with the paralegal to Mrs. Sassower, it was her suggestion that I get back in touch with

her so that I could read the Petition and understand it and then have the Attorney General to change the position of representing the Judicial, the Commission on Judicial Conduct. I read the Complaint, I saw it, I understood what it said. I saw no reason to contact her. It was my understanding that she was very much aware that I was moving forward with a request for an adjournment. She was representing her mom, as she said, and I expected her to tell her, and that's the end of it.

THE REFEREE: Okay. Now I'll let you,
Miss Sassower, the petitioner, make a
statement. I take it this will be in
opposition to the application by the
Attorney General to adjourn the matter from
today?

MS. SASSOWER: Yes, in strenuous opposition, your Honor.

Before I do that, I would just like to clarify for your Honor the essential importance of having a Court Reporter, because in that other case of Sassower

against Malamut, referred to by your Honor, the consequences of that omission were disastrous for me, because the Court accepted the false statement of the three law firms that were representing defendants in the case and defaulted me.

THE REFEREE: Did you make an application to the Court so that you could put papers in to vacate the default?

MS. SASSOWER: I did. The Court disregarded and granted judgment of dismissal as to a number of the defendants. And I have-- it has taken almost a year and thousands and thousands of dollars in legal time for me to present further motions now which were filed in February, still pending before the Court to get to first base, so I could have my day in Court, so that I could be heard.

THE REFEREE: So let's get back to this matter now.

MS. SASSOWER: Thank you, your Honor.
With respect to this matter, it has
now been conceded by Mr. Williams that he

was less than candid with you.

THE REFEREE: He's not conceding anything. What's your opposition?

Basically on May 3rd, this was the first time this matter was on the motion calendar. And so now we are here eight days afterwards, and Mr. Williams is again making a motion or an application to adjourn the matter. What is your statement on that?

MS. SASSOWER: Well, your Honor, before I give you my statement on that, which I fully intend to do, so your Honor will understand the seriousness of what has taken place here, I do want to get before your Honor the lack of candor on the part of Mr. Williams in his statement, until my daughter stated what occurred he would have had your Honor believe, and doubtless gave that representation to your Honor when he appeared before you on May 3rd without a Court Reporter present, that there had been some communication by him with me relative to the fact that he was seeking an

adjournment of the Court on May 3rd. clearly now is conceded not to be the case at all. What he called at that time on April 20 for the Commission having been served on April 11 was my consent to such an adjournment, such a stipulation of adjournment. He did not have it. He knew he did not have it. He knew he told my daughter he hadn't had time to read the papers and that he would call me back and let me know whether or not we could have an informal conference whether or not we could resolve this matter without burdening the Court at all. But at the very least, to give me whatever notice this Court's rules require, unequivocally, and I ask that the rules of this Court, which I have before me, be marked.

THE REFEREE: I'll take judicial notice of it.

MS. SASSOWER: And I quote that, "Oral requests for adjournments not on consent shall not be made without prior notice on adversaries." And this is repeated again

2324

20

21

22

\_ -

in the next paragraph again, and this is a quote, "Again, notice of an oral application for an adjournment must be given to all parties in advance."

THE REFEREE: But it doesn't say it's got to be done by a written notice to your adversary.

MS. SASSOWER: Not at all, but he didn't give me oral notice. He admitted he never called me back. He never said he was going to go ahead on May 3rd and request the Court to grant an application. That's the whole point of the rule. So that the other side, when the other side, he knows, is not consenting is going to be able to be present to oppose it.

Now the rule has a further statement following that one, and that is emphasized by underscoring, and I quote, "It is the expectation of the Court that counsel will confer with one another and resolve scheduling difficulties on their own and with professional courtesy."

Now that rule is promulgated by this

\_ -

Court, the Administrative Judge, and disseminated to all parties, litigants, attorneys, so that the Court will not be burdened needlessly so that the course of litigation shall not be needlessly escalated. This, unfortunately, was not respected by Mr. Williams.

And this was made known to Judge
Cahn's Chambers. And Judge Cahn's Chambers
advised that upon the direction of the
Administrative Judge, this matter would be
restored to the calendar because its rule
had been violated. And thereafter
confirmation of that restoration was
received by me and, as Mr. Williams has
conceded, by him. And I have a memorandum
notification, and I will ask that that be
marked.

THE REFEREE: No, I have that in the folder also. There is a memorandum right here in the folder.

MS. SASSOWER: Very well. To accomplish that restoration required several hours' time, burden on the Court,

Clerks, etcetera, including the
Administrative Judge's Office. All of that
was, however, disregarded once again by Mr.
Williams when, for the second time, he
violated the rule, and on Monday called me,
and this time informed me that he was going
to make an oral application for an
adjournment once again on May 11, when the
case was restored. And when I asked him to
tell me the details as to the extent of the
adjournment and the basis for it, he
refused to give me that information and
arrogantly hung up on me.

As your Honor can imagine, that is a rather upsetting blatant violation of this Court's rules.

THE REFEREE: Let me ask you a direct question. Suppose Mr. Williams had asked you to go back to the original adjournment that I had granted on May the 3rd. In other words, that the Attorney General would be directed to serve their papers in hand by June the 5th, final, and that the matter would be adjourned over to June the

15th. What would have been your response to that?

MS. SASSOWER: My response would have been unequivocally, "No."

THE REFEREE: Why?

MS. SASSOWER: That would be outrageous, because this is an Article 78 Proceeding. This is pursuant to a statute that was intended to protect the public interest in the integrity of the functioning of its governmental agencies and which provides for a special proceeding which is summary in nature, which must be handled with speed, dispatch and at minimum cost to the petitioner.

THE REFEREE: I understand that. But it is in the nature of a mandamus, isn't it?

MS. SASSOWER: Mandamus and prohibition and declaratory relief, because the Commission is operating under an unconstitutional rule in violation of the clear mandate of the statute. They have converted a mandatory duty to investigate

every complaint of judicial misconduct except those that they determine are facially frivolous and without merit.

THE REFEREE: But your complaint --

MS. SASSOWER: (Interrupting) -- into a discretionary optional right on their part to simply dismiss fully meritorious complaints without investigation.

THE REFEREE: But your complaints go back years, don't they?

MS. SASSOWER: I actually have-THE REFEREE: (Interrupting) I mean
from a quick reading by me this morning.

MS. SASSOWER: I have complaints that go back years to 1989, a five-year period. They dismissed every complaint fully meritorious and documented complaints without investigation.

But in 1994 I made four complaints, once again fully documented and fully meritorious, and these complaints were again dismissed without investigation on December 13, 1994 and January 1995. That's quite recent.

And in fact those--

THE REFEREE: (Interrupting) So you brought your Article 78. There is no time limitation to bring on an Article 78 on a constitutional question, as I recall. And even if there was a limitation, you brought it on within four months anyway. So, therefore, it's not like you have delayed. You have been very prompt in this Article 78. And again, it goes back to my question what is the opposition to my original granting of the adjournment to permit the Attorney General to put in all opposing papers by June the 5th in hand, serving them in hand?

Incidentally, I made that stamp up myself so that it's clear, "Serve all opposing papers in hand." I created that stamp when I was assigned to the Motion Application Part, and I've been stamping that and telling lawyers that they have to obey with the directive of myself to oppose motions.

So again, it is, what T did is not

2 unheard of to mark a matter "final" the first time on -- I mean, that's unusual to 3 mark it "final." But I did that after I 4 5 glanced at your papers on May the 3rd in the courtroom downstairs, and I 6 7 specifically put the word "final" down against the Attorney General. 8 I did not, I don't believe that I unduly prejudiced you 9 10 by giving the Attorney General at that time about five and a half weeks to serve their 11 12 papers in hand and giving you ten days to 13 reply. 14

MS. SASSOWER: With all due respect to your Honor, the standards and procedures applicable to Article 78 Proceedings are different from those applicable to ordinary motions. And perhaps that is where your Honor strayed from in exercising what you may regard as your discretion, inadvertently, I'm sure.

Your Honor should understand firstly that I am performing not only a service on behalf of myself in connection with my own complaints, but a service on behalf of the

21

20

23

24

people of this state who have likewise, 2 many of whom have likewise filed serious 3 complaints of judicial misconduct with the Commission on Judicial Conduct, only to 5 find like myself that complaints that they 6 7 have labored over, spent money for counsel to assist in their preparation, documented, 8 provided transcripts, have set forth acts and omissions on the part of judicial 10 officers of our state which are criminal 11 and constitute official misconduct under 12 the Penal Law, Section 195, have 13 nonetheless gone down the drain by a 14 15 commission that includes as a member of its 16 body a member of the Appellate Division of 17 the Second Department. 18

Now, my complaints included complaints against the Second Department and included specifically that member of the Commission. I can only tell you that the public is suffering every day because judges against whom legitimate complaints exist and certainly sufficient to warrant investigation, complaints which are not

24

25

frivolous on their face, are being dismissed out of hand by the Commission. And the Commission's own annual report, from which I quote in 1993 in my petition, admits that -- I'm sorry, it was in 1994 the annual report, the latest report available, which I quoted from at paragraph 30 of my petition, "Members of the public filed 1,457 complaints with respondent. And that report identifies that number. quote their own words, "-- as the largest number ever, " the number increasing every The Commission has dismissed last year 1,275 complaints of the 1,457 complaints that were filed against judicial officers without investigation and without any determination that the complaints on their face lacked merit. And this number represents 87 and a half percent of all complaints filed against it.

Now in the first place, with that kind of volume of complaints ongoing, increasing steadily and nothing being done about it by the watchdog agency that the legislature

created following constitutional amendment of our judiciary article in 1978 means that something has to be done about it, and it has to be done expeditiously, and a TRO has to be granted as a condition to any adjournment request that would be made by the respondent in this matter, number one.

THE REFEREE: TRO?

MS. SASSOWER: It would have to be stayed from continuing these dismissals without investigation and without any determination that these complaints are without merit on their face, which they do not do at the present time.

THE REFEREE: Your Petition doesn't ask for a TRO.

MS. SASSOWER: I expected that speed and the statutory procedure of special proceedings, and particularly in Article 78 Proceedings would be followed by the Court. And I gave, pursuant to the CPLR 7804, I gave the required time to the respondent to answer which actually an Article 78 is you have to serve the respondent twenty days

before the return date, at least twenty days before, and they must answer at least five days before or move in that time. And in special proceedings, other than Article 78, you must give only at least eight days' notice and the respondent must give the papers at least six days before the return date. The legislature has already allowed the state agencies a longer time to address the complaints, the petitions in Article 78 Proceedings, because everything must be done, the motion or answer must be done at least five days before the return date. So they get fifteen days.

It should be borne in mind that counsel-- the Commission on Judicial Conduct has its own counsel. And in past practice, the public agencies that have their own counsel, when they appear by counsel, the Attorney General is saved the necessity of appearing for them and is in a position to protect the public interest.

If it concludes, on the basis of an independent evaluation unconflicted by any

23

24

25

duty to represent the agency, that the agency is operating unconstitutionally, it can spring forward and protect the public as it is intended to do by the legislature, and, in fact, it has done that in the past, well, it has declined representation of the public agency in a case in which I was acting as pro bono counsel for the petitioners, the case of Castracan v. Colavita. And I ask that this letter sent to me by the state agency in that case which was the State Board of Elections dated October 31, 1990 setting forth the fact that the Attorney General would not be representing that agency and that they would be representing themselves, I ask that that be marked as an exhibit so that--

THE REFEREE: (Interrupting) We don't need that as an exhibit. You are referring to it.

MS. SASSOWER: I'm referring to it, and I have shown your Honor so that you can understand that there is an option if the Attorney finds he is too busy to protect

the public interest and he is too busy to defend the agency within the allowable time that the legislature has set forth as required in such a serious proceeding as Article 78 Proceedings, the Commission itself, which is staffed with lawyers, is perfectly capable of representing itself and preparing the necessary response if it had a legitimate response to make.

The fact is, I made an offer to Mr. Williams, because I don't have the time, the luxury of that time or staff at all. have no staff, in fact, other than my daughter. And I offered to him, when he first spoke with me on May 5th, when we spoke by telephone, I stated to him that, and subsequently as well the day before yesterday, and yesterday when we spoke, that I would withdraw this Petition if he would give me a legitimate basis for the dismissal motion he intends to make. He would not discuss it with me. He does not have any--

THE REFEREE: (Interrupting) I don't

understand.

MS. SASSOWER: I'm not looking for needless litigation. I don't have the time or resources to do it. I do it only as a public service to attempt to get the agency that is designed to protect the public to do its job or to account for its dereliction. And that's the purpose of this proceeding.

Now I sent a letter yesterday on May 9 to the Administrative Judge, Judge Ostrau of this Court, because of Mr. Williams' absolute disrespect to the rules of this Court which I quoted and the procedures set forth in the Article 78 Statute, and my offer to withdraw if he had the Petition, if he had— if he gave me evidence of any legitimate defense. All he wants to do is make a motion to dismiss for failure to show cause. It is dilatory and needlessly going to increase, escalate this litigation and oppress me maliciously in the process.

I would like this letter to be part of my application.

-

•

THE REFEREE: You sent that to Justice Ostrau.

MS. SASSOWER: I'd like to give you this copy, this is May 9. And I pointed out that the refused to discuss with me the basis for the application, and I told him that last Friday when we spoke on the 5th, that he had best have his papers here on or before the 11th, or I would ask for a default.

I further told him yesterday that if he wanted a week so that he could put in papers, I was willing to do that so that I would not have to come to Court today, because I had other litigation deadlines. I did not wish the Court to be burdened. I see no reason why the Referee has to be burdened.

Mr. Williams adamantly refused and hung up on me, again told me he'd see me in Court, and he is paid for his time. I, as a taxpayer of this state, contribute to that compensation he receives. I receive no pay. Neither does my daughter for my

3

\_

\_

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

appearance here today or for any of the work that I do to improve the quality of the judiciary.

Now I am-- it is my request, therefore, that no adjournment be granted, and indeed that no adjournment can be granted, no adjournment could have been granted when Mr. Williams appeared, because at that time as now, he was already in This Court could not treat it as default. just a motion default. It was a pleading default. He had to be excused for that default with good cause shown, with an Affidavit of Merit, so that this Court does not go on wasting taxpayers' money on an ongoing basis while this courthouse is in such a state of disrepair that people who come here are so shocked and look with disrespect on the Empire State, which has a courthouse that is broken and disruptible to look at.

Under Article 78--

THE REFEREE: (Interrupting) You've made your statement.

MS. SASSOWER: I'm entitled to a default. And the Court must rule on that, not-- your Honor, with all due respect, as I understand it, from CPLR 7804(e), where the papers have not been filed by either Answer or Motion in response to the Petition--

THE REFEREE: (Interrupting) That would be up to Justice Cahn, not for me.

MS. SASSOWER: That's right. So therefore, I have served, my daughter has served Mr. Williams with a copy of my Affidavit in Support of Default Judgment. I have handed this for the Court.

THE REFEREE: Do you want to put this into the folder?

MS. SASSOWER: It should be referred to Judge Cahn, yes, so that he can rule on it. And I would like to be heard.

I called to ask if we could, following your ruling on his application for an adjournment, we could proceed to a conference before the Court so that my application for default judgment could be

heard. I was told that we could call up.

In addition, I have an Order to Show

Cause for a stay with a TRO which I would

like to have immediately while his Honor is

cogitating--

THE REFEREE: Who is this for?

MS. SASSOWER: This is to go before

Judge Cahn. I just show it to your Honor
so you can be aware that I am trying to
protect the public interest in a proper way
and do the job that the Commission on

Judicial Conduct and the Attorney General
of this state and the Ethics Commission are
simply not doing.

THE REFEREE: Okay. I believe that you are sincere.

MS. SASSOWER: Thank you, your Honor.

THE REFEREE: And I believe that Mr. Williams is sincere. I will take his application for an adjournment under advisement, and you will be notified by mail of the application the same way as this matter was transmitted.

If you want, it can be faxed instead of

THE REFEREE: (Interrupting) You can go see Judge Ostrau's law secretary.

MS. SASSOWER: I refer your Honor to 7804(e) relating to default. "A person in default has no right to make an adjournment. He has no standing." It's a very clear-cut situation.

THE REFEREE: So, therefore, let's see what happens. And we are adjourned at this time. You will have my decision by fax this afternoon.

MS. SASSOWER: Under 7804 subdivision f, the respondent can no longer make a motion.

THE REFEREE: He's already made an application. It's not a motion.

MS. SASSOWER: He is making an application so that he can make a motion. But the law is black and white. He cannot make a motion any longer. At best, the Court could allow him to put in an Answer if he shows good cause, which he hasn't, because he has already admitted--

THE REFEREE: (Interrupting) You've

made that statement on the record already. Again, we are concluded at this time, and each of you will get my decision on the application by fax this afternoon.

MS. SASSOWER: I wish to proceed with Mr. Williams to Judge Cahn's Chambers as there is a default.

THE REFEREE: I cannot direct Mr. Williams to go to Judge Cahn's Chambers.

MS. SASSOWER: I'm giving him notice.

If he chooses not to appear, I have to stay here, because I am up in White Plains. I can't come again to present my Order to Show Cause if your Honor is going to entertain an application for adjournment.

THE REFEREE: I've entertained it. What are you talking about?

MS. SASSOWER: You should read my papers in support of a default judgment so you would know that he has no standing.

THE REFEREE: I will read your papers during lunch.

MS. SASSOWER: May we return at 2 o'clock, because I won't be home to receive

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the fax?

THE REFEREE: All right, 2 o'clock.

2 o'clock instead of faxing my decision.

MR. WILLIAMS: Can you fax it anyway?

THE REFEREE: If you want to appear here, I'll have my Reporter here at 2 o'clock inasmuch as I have a continued hearing on a legal fee issue, and I'll put it on the record, and if you want it faxed to you, fine.

MR. WILLIAMS: I'll be back at 2 o'clock.

THE REFEREE: Fine, I'll see you then. (Whereupon, the matter was adjourned until 2 p.m.)

## AFTERNOON SESSION

THE REFEREE: Mr. Williams, inasmuch as I didn't provide you with any opportunity to make a reply to the petitioner's lengthy statement, is it your desire to make any reply at this time?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, I do have a desire to respond. Simply this: That first of all, at all times notice was given prior to each of the adjournments that I attempted to obtain. As I previously said, for the purpose of the record, Miss Sassower's paralegal, who is her daughter, unequivocally said and stated to me in our first conversation I had with her that she had authority to speak on her mother's behalf. I thought that pursuant to that authority, she would notify her mom that there would be an application for an adjournment.

Secondly, prior to the second adjournment, I did talk to Miss Sassower herself about the adjournment, and at that time I told her daughter, who had answered

the telephone, that, "I need to talk to your mom and not to you." And I gave her the message, and she was aware of the second adjournment, because I spoke to her personally.

We did, and indeed did discuss the merits of my defense.

She would hear none of it. And I told her insofar as she would not listen, I cannot get a word in, I'm terminating the conversation and hung up the telephone. It was not the malicious and vicious disrespect that she would like the Court to believe.

Based upon my prior statements in regard to my application for an adjournment, I have nothing further to say, and I rest upon the merits of my request.

THE REFEREE: Okay. At this time-MS. SASSOWER: (Interrupting) Excuse
me, your Honor. May I just say briefly--

THE REFEREE: No, you can't say
anything further. I permitted you to go on
for over twenty minutes, and Mr. Williams

Э

Ω

has only made a two-minute reply.

I'm not going to have this going on and on and on. I mean, taking everything into consideration, it's my decision on the Attorney General's application to grant the application and direct the Attorney General to serve its papers by June 1, 1995, which is, I moved the matter up four days from previously June 5th. So now it's June 1st, 1995.

Those papers from the Attorney General must be served personally at the home address of the petitioner.

As I understand, you don't have any office address and you are pro se.

So it would be served on or before June 1, 1995 by 5 p.m. on that day. And that the new return date is June 12, 1995 in Room 130.

This will be the only application permitted and granted to the Attorney General. And this is my ruling, based upon all of the-- based upon everything that was made of argument on the record this

morning.

And I will return the file to the Clerk's Office this afternoon with the notation, as I stated before, "June 1, 1995, final for respondent's papers, and June 12, 1995 for the return date to permit the petitioner to reply."

MS. SASSOWER: What papers are you referring to, your Honor? Is it an Answer or is it a motion you are giving an extension for?

THE REFEREE: All opposing papers in hand on June 1.

MS. SASSOWER: The statute explicitly states that he can only-- on a default which is the case here, since no motion and no Answer was timely filed on the May 3rd return date, he was in default at that time.

THE REFEREE: I know, you said that.

MS. SASSOWER: It specifically states,

"The Court and not the Referee may either
issue a judgment in favor of the petitioner
or order that an Answer be submitted."

Those are the only two options.

THE REFEREE: I made my ruling on the application. You may now go and see Justice Cahn or the Administrative Judge if you wish, but that is your option to do, and we are concluded at this time.

MS. SASSOWER: I gave Mr. Williams
notice before lunch that I would apply for
an Order to Show Cause with a TRO seeking a
default judgment, and that would be
immediately now before Judge Cahn, or
alternatively, the Administrative Judge,
and I'm asking him if he wishes to
accompany me so we can do this with him
having the right to oppose it.

THE REFEREE: All you have to do is give the Attorney General notice.

MS. SASSOWER: I gave him notice.

THE REFEREE: He is not required to go. He makes up his own mind.

MS. SASSOWER: I just wanted it on the record.

THE REFEREE: If he wishes to go, he will go. Otherwise, not.

## Proceedings

And we are concluded at this time.

MS. SASSOWER: He does not wish to state whether or not he's going to be there.

THE REFEREE: Right.

MS. SASSOWER: Then we will not detain you or him any further, and I thank you, your Honor.

THE REFEREE: Thank you very much.

Certified to be a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings.

Frederic C. Cantor,

Frederic Po-Kon

Official Court Reporter