

## 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: [judgwatch@aol.com](mailto:judgwatch@aol.com)  
Web site: [www.judgwatch.org](http://www.judgwatch.org)

Elena Ruth Sassower, Coordinator

BY FAX: 631-843-2953 (3 pages)

July 30, 2002

Zachery Dowdy  
Newsday  
235 Pinelawn Road  
Melville, New York 11747-4250

RE: An expose of the Readily-Verifiable Corruption of the NYS Commission on Judicial Conduct, encompassed by the public interest lawsuit against it at the Court of Appeals

Dear Zachery:

As discussed, enclosed is Friday's Albany Times-Union article on the just-released 2002 Annual Report of the NYS Commission on Judicial Conduct, in which I am quoted.

I would most appreciate if you would follow-up with Jordan Rau, who, on May 1<sup>st</sup>, responded with interest when I visited him in the press room at the Capitol with my story proposal about the hoax of Eliot Spitzer's public integrity unit. That electorally-significant story is integrally-connected to the evidence of the corruption of "merit selection" to the Court of Appeals, involving Governor Pataki, about which I tried to interest Jordan in November 2000, after he wrote a piece about the Governor's appointment of Victoria Graffeo to that Court [*"Pataki's Justice Pick"*, 11/3/00]. Likewise, it is integrally-connected with the evidence of the corruption of the NYS Commission on Judicial Conduct, the story about which we have been talking together since April.

Each of these stories – about Mr. Spitzer's public integrity unit, about the corruption of "merit selection" to the Court of Appeals", and about the NYS Commission on Judicial Conduct – not only stand on their own, but can most easily be managed by separate reporters, working as a "team" to weave together their interrelated stands. Indeed, "team" is the word you used to describe how reporters combine in handling investigative stories.

I would appreciate your assistance – including as a conduit to your editors – as to who should be handling the independent story of the *readily-verifiable evidence* of the Commission's corruption. As my public interest lawsuit against the Commission has been pending at the Court of Appeals for THREE months, time is of the essence.

*Elena*

 [E-mail story link to a friend](#)  [Printer-friendly version](#)

# Gavel falls on judges

Albany – Commission on Judicial Conduct disciplined 26 last year, including eight from Capital Region; watchdog group claims system favors high-ranking figures

By **ANDREW TILGHMAN**, Staff writer  
First published: Friday, July 26, 2002

Twice as many judges statewide were disciplined last year compared with the year before, and nearly a third of the judges cited for misconduct were from the Capital Region, according to a new state report.

The state Commission on Judicial Conduct publicly disciplined 26 judges in 2001, up from 13 in 2000. No judges last year were removed from the bench, but instead were censured or publicly admonished for violations such as failing to adhere to the law, making biased remarks or exhibiting conflicts of interest.


Out of the 26 judges disciplined, eight were from the Capital Region. The commission censured state Supreme Court Justice Joseph Teresi of Albany, Grafton Town Court Justice Gary Moore and Moreau Town Court Justice Edward Tracy. Five other town and village justices from the area were admonished.

The commission's chief lawyer, Gerald Stern, said the increase in disciplinary actions does not reflect a rise in misconduct among the state's nearly 3,400 judges, and the rise is not statistically significant.


"To me, it's about the same rate it has been," Stern said. "From one year to another, that doesn't mean anything."

The commission disciplined a total of 18 judges in 1999 and 22 in 1998, according to the commission's annual report released this week. Four were removed in 2000, four in 1999 and three in 1998.

Stern also said there was no explanation for why upstate judges in the Capital Region would face sanctions more often than their downstate counterparts. But critics of the commission pointed to the disparity as evidence that the panel is reluctant to take action



Click on logos below to see newspaper ads for Friday, July 26:



NEWSPAPER ADS

ALL TODAY'S ADS

THE WEEK'S ADS

against the state's most prominent judges.

"It's because they don't have the influence and the protection that some of the more powerful and politically connected downstate judges have," said Elena Sassower, coordinator for the Center for Judicial Accountability, a watchdog group based in Westchester County. "Connections, that is the name of the game."



Sassower pointed to the commission's failure to remove any judges this year as evidence that it rarely metes out harsh punishments.

Stern said local town and village judges, who are publicly elected and do not have to be lawyers, often bear the brunt of the commission's discipline because they do not have the same level of legal training and support staff as higher-level judges.

The commission received 1,308 complaints last year, conducted 340 preliminary inquiries and fully investigated 208 cases. The majority of complaints are thrown out because people mistakenly raise matters of law that should be brought before an appellate court rather than an allegation of judicial misconduct, Stern said.

Removal is the most severe disciplinary action the commission can take against a judge. Censure and admonishment, although public, do not impair a judge's ability to continue serving on the bench. In less serious cases, the commission can opt for a letter of caution, a disciplinary action which is not made public.

The commission, a 10-member panel appointed by the governor, Legislature and state bar association, is often criticized as ineffective because its annual budget of about \$2.2 million annually is low compared with other states. For example, in California, there are only about 1,950 judges and the judicial conduct commission handles fewer complaints, but it has a budget of \$3.7 million, according to the commission's annual report released this week.

Most judges in New York are publicly elected, and critics say that has allowed the judicial system to become tainted by local politics.

"There are those who say this process has an inherent level of corruption in it and needs to be reformed," said Francis Menton, a Manhattan attorney and head of the state bar association's Committee on Judicial Administration.

"But there is a perfectly reasonable counterview, which is, 'Tell me your alternative process, and how is that any better?' " he said.

"Yes, this system is flawed. Is there a better one?"