| 1   | SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA           |  |  |
|-----|--|--|--|
| 2   | CRIMINAL DIVISION                                    |  |  |
| 3   |  |  |  |
| 4   | x  |  |  |
| 5   | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA :                           |  |  |
| 6   | : Criminal Action Number                             |  |  |
|     | ;  |  |  |
| 7   | ELENA RUTH SASSOWER, : M 4113-03                     |  |  |
| . 8 | Defendant. :   |  |  |
| 9   | x  |  |  |
| 10  |  |  |  |
| 11  | Washington, D.C.                                     |  |  |
| 12  | Wednesday, August 20, 2003                           |  |  |
| 13  |  |  |  |
| 14  | The above entitled action came on for a trial before |  |  |
| 15  | the Honorable MARY ELLEN ABRECHT, Senior Judge, in   |  |  |
| 16  | Courtroom Number 217, commencing at 1:54 p.m.        |  |  |
| 17  | APPEARANCES:   |  |  |
| 18  | On Behalf of the Government:                         |  |  |
| 19  | AARON MENDELSOHN, Esquire                            |  |  |
| 20  | On Behalf of the Defendant:                          |  |  |
| 21  | PRO SE   |  |  |
| 22  |  |  |  |
|     |  |  |  |
| 23  |  |  |  |
| 24  |  |  |  |

Deposition Services, Inc.

6245 Executive Boulevard Rockville, MD 20852 (301) 881-3344

25



2300 M Street, N.W. Suite 800 Washington, D.C. 20037 (202) 785-1239

## PROCEEDINGS

|     | THE DEPUTY CLERK: | Sassower, | case number | M4113- |
|-----|-------------------|-----------|-------------|--------|
| 03. |                   |           |             |        |

THE COURT: Ms. Sassower, this is Judge

Abrecht. Now that we're officially on the record and

you're on speaker phone, would you identify yourself for

the record by stating your full name and your location?

THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon. My name is

Elena, Elena Ruth Sassower. I am the criminal Defendant
in the case of United States of America against Elena
Ruth Sassower, on a charge of disruption of Congress. I
am calling by leave of Court from White Plains, New York.

THE COURT: All right. Would the Government -

MR. MENDELSOHN: Aaron Mendelsohn for the United States.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Sassower, could you hear Mr. Mendelsohn?

THE DEFENDANT: Barely.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to actually ask you to come around in front, and, perhaps, stand right here in front of the Court. Excellent. All right. Mr. Mendelsohn, would you identify yourself again, and we'll see if she can hear you now?

MR. MENDELSOHN: Aaron Mendelsohn for the

United States.

THE COURT: Okay. For Mr. Mendelsohn's benefit I will explain, as Ms. Sassower indicated, that yesterday afternoon I had my chambers contact Ms. Sassower and give her leave to appear by speaker phone this afternoon. And since the matters that we need to attend to this afternoon seem to be the sort that could be handled in this manner, I had chambers inform her that it was not necessary for her to make the trip. I've reviewed the file, and I'd like to make a few preliminary remarks about our procedures and the status of this case before I address both the Government and the Defendant and need some responses.

I do not know, Ms. Sassower, whether the motions that you faxed to the Court, and I believe to the Government, have ever been officially filed or not. They certainly have not been filed in the official court jacket as of yet, and I want to be certain, Ms. Sassower, that you understand that no motion is appropriately before the Court until it has been appropriately filed in the criminal clerk's office pursuant to our local criminal rule 47(i). And at the time of filing, you need also to arrange for service, and mail is certainly appropriate, of a Courtesy copy on the Government for sure, and if you want, as a Courtesy, to also fax a copy

that will just get there faster on any motion that's urgent, that is it is all right, but it does not constitute filing, and, so, that's something you should be aware of. We don't --

THE DEFENDANT: May I be heard?

THE COURT: -- operate by faxed filings.

THE DEFENDANT: May I be heard, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Just a moment. I just want to explain some things in general.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

talked and mentioned that you were copying and attaching various discovery requests that you had made in the faxed copy that the Court received. It's not attached, but, in any event, that's not necessary. Under our rule 16 discovery procedures, you should begin simply with requests exchanged between the Defendant and the Government, and the Court is not involved in the discovery unless and until there is a dispute that can only be resolved by a motion to the Court, but your requests back and forth should be just that, back and forth between the Defendant and the Government. And often, in many cases, matters can be resolved informally without the Court ever being involved, but if the Court does need to be involved you can file a formal motion,

2.5

but I will not comment on or get involved in the initial stage of your request versus their response and that kind of thing.

Also, in any motions that you choose to file, you should be citing District of Columbia law. New York law and practice is certainly not binding on this Court, but I can assure you it's not even persuasive on the Court when it's different in any respect from D.C. law. So, the only law that's generally relevant and should be relied on is District of Columbia law.

The other point I want to explain, and this is just for curiosity, I'm not the least bit surprised, Ms. Sassower, that you've been confused by the parade of judges that have handled this case. This is unusual, but it has nothing to do with your case. It simply happens that the particular misdemeanor calendar that this case is assigned to, calendar one, was assigned to me in January of 2003, and I retired at the end of the month and took senior status, and we are awaiting confirmation of new judges. And in the meantime, this misdemeanor calendar one has simply been assigned to available judges as they are available, and there is absolutely nothing sinister or nothing having to do with your case, in particular, that has caused there to be so many judges involved. And also, this situation continues into the

fall, so, even when we do set a trial date, we will not know for certain when the date is set who the judge is who will preside over the case. It will be whoever is handling misdemeanor calendar one at the time. And for both the Government and the Defendant, it's probably simplest on the caption of any papers you file not to use a judge's name, but simply to say misdemeanor calendar one, and that way whoever is handling the calendar at the time will look at it. I just wanted to explain that because I realize that anyone looking at the record of this case might have been confused, as you seem to be, by the number of changing judges. All right.

I'd like now between the Government and the Defendant to handle as many outstanding issues as we can today. Obviously, the Defendant's motion that I don't think has been officially filed yet, but we received a fax of asking for re-argument and a continuance of today's hearing is moot now given the fact that we are having the hearing, but have allowed you to appear by telephone.

The other two issues raised in what was faxed to the Court that again has not to my knowledge been officially filed yet, were Ms. Sassower's request for a disqualification of Judge Eilperin and her transfer of this case to a different venue.

I'll direct my next question first to the Government. If these concerns of Ms. Sassower, if we can resolve them orally today, I'd be happy to. If the Government, on the other hand, wants to await the filing of the formal motion, and have their 10 days to respond, we can handle it that way as well, but if it's something that we can handle orally today, I'm available to do so. What's the Government's position on that?

MR. MENDELSOHN: Your Honor, we'd be happy to resolve them orally today. I am a little confused, though, that we are having this conference --

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I can barely hear Mr. Mendelsohn.

THE COURT: All right. Shout. Shout, Mr. Mendelsohn.

MR. MENDELSOHN: We'd be happy to resolve these orally today. I am confused, though, that we're having this conference over the telephone. I was unaware of that until we began this conference, especially in light of Judge Eilperin's order that she be here in person today.

THE COURT: I understand. No, the order did not say that she'd be here in person. The order says that her request for a continuance was denied, and that the hearing would be held today and that she had to

| -  | 1 appear.   |
|----|---|
| 2  | MR. MENDELSOHN: It says, further ordered that             |
| 3  | the Defendant shall appear in Court on August 20, 2003    |
| 4  | for the scheduling conference.                            |
| 5  | THE COURT: I understand, and I have                       |
| 6  | interpreted that to permit her appearance by telephone.   |
| 7  | Anyway, that's moot. That's done.                         |
| 8  | MR. MENDELSOHN: We can resolve everything                 |
| 9  | orally.   |
| 10 | THE COURT: All right. Ms. Sassower, did you               |
| 11 | understand Mr. Mendelsohn has                             |
| 12 | THE DEFENDANT: Yes, he                                    |
| 13 | THE COURT: just said that he's willing to                 |
| 14 | hear from you and respond orally to your other two        |
| 15 | requests?   |
| 16 | THE DEFENDANT: I don't believe that that is               |
| 17 | appropriate in view of the serious and substantial nature |
| 18 | of the relief that I am seeking by way of                 |
| 19 | disqualification and transfer. However, with all          |
| 20 | respect, Your Honor, I would like to address the various  |
| 21 | issues which you have put forward. So, if you would       |
| 22 | permit me?  |
| 23 | THE COURT: I'll hear you.                                 |
| 24 | THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. As to your first                |
| 25 | point, I was advised as to the proper procedures, and I   |

| believe I have followed them. That is, both the August    |
|---|
| 6th motion to adjourn the conference for ascertainment of |
| counsel, as well as the August 17th re-argument motion,   |
| and for disclosure, and disqualification and transfer     |
| were express mailed each of them to the Court and to the  |
| clerk's office. I, as to the                              |

THE COURT: All right. What is the --

THE DEFENDANT: So, they should, they should have been filed by the clerk's office.

THE COURT: All right. I will ask the courtroom clerk to call up to the clerk's office and see. That could very well be. There often is a stack of motions that don't get filed timely. So, I'll have the courtroom clerk check on that.

THE DEFENDANT: I, I, I do wish to assure the Court that I did not merely fax and e-mail both of these motions to adverse counsel, but I mailed to adverse counsel, as well as to the ACLU, copies of both motions as well as mailing to the Court, and it certainly should have been filed. However --

THE COURT: All right. I understand Mr. Mendelsohn has received a copy of the motions, is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Now --

THE COURT: Just a minute. Just a minute. Let

usc

| 1  | me ask. Mr. Mendelsohn, did you receive a copy of         |
|----|---|
| 2  | MR. MENDELSOHN: We did receive a copy of the              |
| 3  | motions. I might ask, though, that when you e-mail me     |
| 4  | these motions, I am unable to open any of them, so it     |
| 5  | would suffice if you mailed and faxed them to me.         |
| 6  | THE DEFENDANT: Each were mailed and faxed.                |
| 7  | THE COURT: All right. All right. And you can              |
| 8  | dispense in the future even the effort of the e-mail.     |
| 9  | THE DEFENDANT: Okay.                                      |
| 10 | THE COURT: All right.                                     |
| 11 | THE DEFENDANT: But I would also point out to              |
| 12 | the Court that our next motion was the receipts           |
| 13 | reflecting that the motions had been mailed, faxed and e- |
| 14 | mailed.   |
| 15 | THE COURT: All right. All right.                          |
| 16 | THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Now, as to the second                |
| 17 | point, but, preliminarily, I should reiterate that I am a |
| 18 | Defendant in a criminal case and have invoked my right to |
| 19 | counsel. I believe that that is a right which             |
| 20 | THE COURT: Ms. Sassower, there's no dispute               |
| 21 | about that. My understanding from the record is that you  |
| 22 | turned down the opportunity to have Court-appointed       |
| 23 | counsel here, and you will not be required to go to trial |
| 24 | until you get your own counsel. But that's not the issue  |
| 25 | that we're addressing right now. The issue I want to      |

| 1   | hear from you now is anything further you want to say    |
|-----|--|
| 2   | about your motions                                       |
| 3   | THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely.                               |
| 4   | THE COURT: that we want to resolve this                  |
| 5   | afternoon  |
| 6   | THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.                                |
| 7   | THE COURT: number one the disqualification               |
| 8   | of Judge Eilperin, and number two the transfer of the    |
| 9   | case to a different venue.                               |
| 10  | THE DEFENDANT: Okay. But you have cited                  |
| 11  | various procedural issues which obviously are better     |
| 12  | addressed by counsel or by me                            |
| 13  | THE COURT: Okay. But we're not dealing with              |
| 14  | those right now.   |
| 15  | THE DEFENDANT: Okay. As to the second point,             |
| 16  | the discovery demands that I                             |
| 17  | THE COURT: We're not talking about discovery             |
| 18  | this afternoon either.                                   |
| 19  | THE DEFENDANT: No, no, you, you I do want                |
| 20  | to say you said informal resolution. I have not received |
| 21  | as yet any response from                                 |
| 22  | THE COURT: Ms. Sassower, I don't want to hear            |
| 23  |  |
| 24  | THE DEFENDANT: Okay. All right.                          |
| 2.5 | THE COURT: about your discovery issues this              |

| 3  | afternoon.   |
|----|--|
| 2  | THE DEFENDANT: Okay. I, I just do want to say            |
| 3  |  |
| 4  | THE COURT: That  |
| 5  | THE DEFENDANT: that, that it was, it was                 |
| 6  | sent to Mr. Mendelsohn by                                |
| 7  | THE COURT: I don't want to hear that, Ms.                |
| 8  | Sassower.  |
| 9  | THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Okay. Fine. Now, as,                |
| 10 | as to the third issue as relates to my motion, and the   |
| 11 | advisability of citing D.C. law, obviously, I'm not a    |
| 12 | D.C. lawyer. To the extent that my, my instant motion of |
| 13 | August 17th cites New York law and practice, it is       |
| 14 | because of the principles, I believe, are equally        |
| 15 | applicable in D.C.                                       |
| 16 | THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Sassower, we don't                  |
| 17 | THE DEFENDANT: I, I understand that what I               |
| 18 | have cited is not binding as law or persuasive, but I    |
| 19 | believe that the Court, in its discretion recognizing    |
| 20 | that I'm a non-lawyer and not from D.C                   |
| 21 | THE COURT: And when you choose                           |
| 22 | THE DEFENDANT: will recognize, will                      |
| 23 | recognize the principles for which I am citing these New |
| 24 | York cases as  |
| 25 | THE COURT: Ms. Sassower, when you choose to              |

| 1  | appear before the Court without your counsel, you are  |
|----|--|
| 2  | held to the same standard as counsel; we do not make   |
| 3  | allowances.  |
| 4  | THE DEFENDANT: I, I, with all respect, Your            |
| 5  | Honor, I have not chosen to appear here today without  |
| 6  | counsel. I appear here today at the direction of the   |
| 7  | Court  |
| 8  | THE COURT: And I want you to argue your                |
| 9  | motion.  |
| 10 | THE DEFENDANT: and I, I appreciate that you            |
| 11 | have permitted me to appear by telephone. However, I,  |
| 12 | nonetheless  |
| 13 | THE COURT: Let's use the time appropriately            |
| 14 | THE DEFENDANT: (Indiscernible.)                        |
| 15 | THE COURT: and will you please begin                   |
| 16 | arguing your motion?                                   |
| 17 | THE DEFENDANT: Okay. As to the parade of               |
| 18 | judges, that's the fourth point that you made          |
| 19 | THE COURT: You don't need to comment on that.          |
| 20 | That was just for your information. Would you please   |
| 21 | argue your motion?                                     |
| 22 | THE DEFENDANT: I, but I am, I am unclear, Your         |
| 23 | Honor, with all respect, how it is that you come to be |
| 24 | presiding in the conference today.                     |
| 25 | THE COURT: Because I am assigned to                    |

misdemeanor calendar one.

THE DEFENDANT: You said you, you had retired at the end of the month. Which, which month were you referring to, Your Honor?

THE COURT: And took senior status. I am sitting as a Senior Judge and assigned to misdemeanor calendar one this week.

THE DEFENDANT: This, this week. And what happened to Judge Eilperin?

THE COURT: He is also a Senior Judge, and he is not currently sitting.

THE DEFENDANT: I had been told last week when I was called by, by the Court that Judge Eilperin had not only denied my motion, but he was going to be the assigned judge on this case.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Sassower, you may have

THE DEFENDANT: Was that, was that an error?

THE COURT: I don't know who told you what, but

Defendants do not have any control over judicial

assignments. This case is assigned to misdemeanor

calendar one, and whatever judge is available for any

particular matter may be assigned to handle it, and it is

not something that we can, on this particular calendar,

predict. It is also quite common in this Courthouse.

Every judge in this Courthouse has the same authority as every other judge, and it is quite common, even if cases are assigned to a given judge, if that judge is busy on a given day the case may be certified to another Courtroom. So, do not worry so much about who the judge is. You are appearing before the Superior Court, and any judicial officer who presides over your matter has the same authority as any other.

THE DEFENDANT: And are the judges being, and yourself included, being randomly assigned, Your Honor, or are they being selected in particular for given cases?

THE COURT: They are not selected for given cases.

THE DEFENDANT: All right. Now, lastly, insofar as the August 17th motion, obviously, with respect to the first branch that seeks re-argument of Judge Eilperin's order, yes, that is moot. However, not the fact that what he did, I believe, is without any warrant in fact and law, and is evidence, I believe, of a biased if not interest requiring not just his disqualification, but of the transfer of this case outside of the D.C. circuit.

Now, I have, I have asked for disclosure as to Judge Eilperin. And with all respect, Your Honor, it is incumbent upon me to ask whether or not you would make

disclosure, because I believe that there are facts which 1 2 preclude --3 THE COURT: Disclosure of what, ma'am? 4 THE DEFENDANT: -- which preclude you from any 5 contact with this case. 6 THE COURT: What is the disclosure, ma'am? 7 puzzled. 8 THE DEFENDANT: Well, are there any reasons you 9 feel that you could not be fair and impartial in this 10 case? 11 THE COURT: None whatsoever. 12 THE DEFENDANT: All right. I, as reflected in 13 my correspondence, and I, with, with the Court, including with Mr. Sweet (phonetic sp.) yesterday, and I was under 14 15 the impression that your name was spelled A-L-B-R-E-C-H-T. I subsequently learned that your name is spelled A-B-16 R-E-C-H-T. And I am aware of the fact that the former 17 chief of capital police has that last name, and I would 18 19 ask you to disclose whether or not there is any family 20 relation. 21 THE COURT: Happily. That is my husband, and he left the capital police three years ago, and he had no 22 23 authority --24 THE DEFENDANT: How --

THE COURT: -- or responsibilities with the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

capital police at the time of your case.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I, I am aware that he is no longer chief of police, but he did serve eight years, but, more particularly, your husband dismissed a police misconduct complaint against capital police, as well as against capital police, which I filed in September of 1996. The misconduct that was complained of is directly related to the misconduct here at issue. What is involved in this case is a, a false arrest, a malicious arrest, and now a, a malicious prosecution on a completely bogus charge against me. I am happy to supply you if -- let me just say that to the extent that, I mean obviously you are aware that this is a matter involving disruption of Congress, and my arrest was by capital police, but you may not be aware of the particulars which are highlighted, certainly, in the discovery demand. You have indicated that you have not seen the hard copy of the motion that was express mailed, and I believe should have been delivered and filed by the clerk's office. However, were you to see it you would understand that there is certainly a strong appearance that you could not be fair and impartial, and I respectfully submit that it is inappropriate under the circumstances for you to preside here. And I am happy to provide a copy, by the way --

1 THE COURT: Just a moment. 2 THE DEFENDANT: The discovery demand includes, 3 as an item, excuse me for one moment, it, it includes as an item a demand, quote, any and all records pertaining to the investigation and disposition of Elena Sassower's 5 6 September 22, 1996 police misconduct complaint by both 7 capital police (internal affairs case number 96-01) and 8 metropolitan police, and I am happy to provide a copy of 9 that overwhelming complaint which your husband dismissed. THE COURT: Okay. Let --10 11 THE DEFENDANT: All of the, all of the --THE COURT: Let me interrupt for just a moment. 12 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 14 THE COURT: I will not be presiding over any 15 discovery disputes this afternoon, there being no 16 discovery disputes that are right. I would agree with 17 you that if it becomes relevant and an issue in this case 18 as to how that 1992, did you say? 19 THE DEFENDANT: 1996. 20 THE COURT: 1996. Okay. 21 THE DEFENDANT: September 1996 dismissed by 22 your husband --23 THE COURT: Okay. Okay. 24 THE DEFENDANT: -- by letter dated February 18,

1997, which I am looking at right now.

THE COURT: All right. If any issue concerns that 1996 matter, I would recuse in a moment. You know, I will not handle that. That is not what's before me today.

THE DEFENDANT: With all respect --

anticipation that any discovery dispute that may be filed a few months from now would ever come before me, and that would be the only time that that would be relevant. I also have no particular reason to believe that that would either be an issue at trial, or that I would be assigned to try this case. So, we don't need to resolve that issue this afternoon because nothing that I am prepared to handle this afternoon bears any relationship to what may or may not have happened in 1996.

THE DEFENDANT: (Indiscernible) with respect to disqualification is for all purposes, any contact.

THE COURT: Ma'am --

THE DEFENDANT: Once it's made known --

THE COURT: Ma'am, your only motion is to disqualify Judge Eilperin. Is there anything you'd like to argue about that?

THE DEFENDANT: I respectfully submit, Your Honor, that you are disqualified by reason of your relationship with your husband whose conduct as chief of

police in investigating the complaint which underlies this present prosecution, it is directly germane to my arrest on this charge of disruption of Congress.

THE COURT: Ma'am, moving on, do you have any argument to make about your motion for a transfer of the case to a different venue?

THE DEFENDANT: I would like Mr. -- normal and customary procedures in New York is where a motion has been made and filed as mine has been made and should have been filed, is for the, the adverse side to, to also submit papers. I am unwilling to accept any procedure which allows the, the Assistant U.S. Attorney to get by without submitting proper papers responding opposing papers. I have made a submission on papers, so must he.

THE COURT: All right. That is not correct, and I am going to allow him right now to make his argument in opposition if he has one.

MR. MENDELSOHN: Your Honor, with regard to the disqualification of Senior Judge Eilperin, we believe that, one, that issue is moot based on the revolving of calendar one, and, two, we believe that the Defendant has shown no reason why Judge Eilperin should be disqualified in this case.

With regard to transfer of venue based on case law, D.C. Superior Court is a single unitary district.

All of the relevant facts occurred in D.C. There is no prejudice to the Defendant if the trial were to be held in D.C., and there is no other appropriate venue for this case.

THE DEFENDANT: May I be heard, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes, you may.

THE DEFENDANT: He's, he, his characterizations are not sufficient as a matter of law. I have made a fact-specific motion. I have made two fact-specific motions to which his duty is to respond with equivalent specificity.

Now, on the disqualification issue, he refers to some legal authority. Let him brief the legal authority. As far as I am aware, the Court, the D.C. Court gets its funding from Congress. This is a case whose ramifications are such as to, as to be seriously detrimental to some of the most influential members of the Senate, the very senators who vote on the appropriation of this Court.

I would, additionally, say that capital police seems to be an entity that is within the control of Congress, and not independent of Congress. And this case is not only about the misconduct of the capital police, but it is also about whether such misconduct was at the behest of various members of the Senate.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There is no question to me, in my mind, that there is an appearance that this Court would be subjected to substantial pressures as a result of the ramifications of this case on the senators, on capital police that takes orders, perhaps, from senators. There are other venues. The most important thing in the judicial process is the appearance of, of neutrality, of fairness and impartiality. It's not even the actuality of bias. not even the actuality of whether you, Your Honor, can be fair and impartial. It's the appearance, and I respectfully submit that Mr. Mendelsohn should be required if, if, if, if you are making a substantive ruling that Mr. Mendelsohn can simply disregard a written, a written motion, two written motions, does not -- and, and can just engage in characterizations, full conclusions, generalizations and that's decisive. Well, there is no, there is no judicial process that, that I can feel has my faith and confidence, and certainly wish the, the public could feel any faith and confidence in.

So, with all respect, Your Honor, I would, I would request that, that, that, that you expect what I believe is in any case you would expect, which is once a formal motion is made, I have expended the time, effort, energy, money on formal, on two formal motions. Mr., Mr. Mendelsohn has waived his opposition to the first motion,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and that motion there was, as I set forth in my reargument papers, no fair and impartial tribunal could have denied that motion. And with all respect to Your Honor --

THE COURT: That issue is moot. Let's move on to the --

THE DEFENDANT: In, in, with all respect, Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- change of venue.

THE DEFENDANT: With all respect, Your Honor, each of these adjudications, even the adjudication of, of even the phone call that I received yesterday that I could appear by phone was a surprise to me, because my right of counsel is, is sacrosanct, and these proceedings are taking place with complete disregard of my asserted right to the assistance of counsel. I do not waive it. And to the extent that Your Honor made reference to the fact that I, I waive the assistance of Court, of a Court attorney, I'm not eligible for the assistance of a Court The eligibility rests on, on financial need. I do not meet the financial parameters which would permit me to have Court-assisted counsel. So, that's, that never was any kind of issue, but I am not made of money, and on this important public interest case involving fundamental citizen rights, I have sought the pro bono

assistance of the ACLU and other organizations.

THE COURT: Okay. Just a minute. Before we get to that issue, let me hear response from Mr.

Mendelsohn on the change of venue motion. And let me also say, Ms. Sassower, that it is a very common practice in this Court that motions in misdemeanor cases be resolved by oral argument. It is not uniformly required that if the matter can be handled expeditiously orally in Court that there always be a written response. And I will hear further now from Mr. Mendelsohn.

MR. MENDELSOHN: Your Honor, my case precedent with regard to the transfer of venue motion is <u>Catlett v. United States</u>. The cite is 545 A.2d 1202. That's a 1988 case. Welch v. United States. The cite is 466 Atlantic Second 829. That's a 1983 case. <u>Edwards v. United States</u>

THE DEFENDANT: That may be readily distinguishable, so I would have to have an opportunity

THE COURT: All right. Just a minute.

THE DEFENDANT: -- to review that.

THE COURT: It's not your turn to speak. You'll have another opportunity. Go ahead.

MR. MENDELSOHN: Edwards v. United States. The cite is 430 A.2d 1321, and that is a 1981 case. I have

25

the jurors.

1 nothing further, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: All right. Do you have anything 3 particular to argue from those cases? 4 MR. MENDELSOHN: Only those cases state the 5 proposition that a change of venue is not appropriate in the District of Columbia because it is a single unitary 6 7 district. 8 THE DEFENDANT: What were the circumstances of, in those cases? Maybe they are readily distinguishable. 9 10 Maybe they don't involve a case with political, explosive 11 political ramifications on, on powerful members of the Senate or their, their, their police entity called 12 13 capital police as this case does. 14 MR. MENDELSOHN: Your Honor, I might add that 15 there has been, to my knowledge, no major publicity related to this case. Furthermore, in Washington, D.C. 16 17 if there's any bias, it's against Congress. 18 THE DEFENDANT: There is what? 19 THE COURT: Say that louder, Mr. Mendelsohn. 20 MR. MENDELSOHN: If there's any bias in 21 Washington, D.C., it's against the Congress. 22 THE DEFENDANT: I'm talking about bias in 23 interest on the part of the judges, not on the part of

THE COURT: Well, Ms. Sassower, I can add that

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

our continuing to sit as judges of the Superior Court is not under the control of Congress at all --

THE DEFENDANT: You're financed --

THE COURT: -- although the initial appointment is approved on the Hill, thereafter, we have our own judicial tenure commission, and Congress does not have a say in that.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, but you have an interest that it not be exposed how sham and corrupt the processes of Senate confirmation are, because members of the Court go through that similar confirmation process. So, you have a further interest there. But the institutional interest relates as to the funding of the Court, which, as I understand it, is, has a direct, but this is a matter which is probably resolved on papers by a written decision, and I was put to the burden. I am a non-lawyer criminal Defendant, and it, and I was told that I have to make a formal motion for relief. And if the Court's position is that a non-lawyer Defendant, criminal Defendant has to be burdened with a motion, but the prosecution doesn't have to reply to such formal motion in a, in a cognizable way on papers is going to be excused of all, of all requirements to which, to which the non-lawyer Defendant is held, then that can only be an expression of, of some sort of profound bias by the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Court. I am an unrepresented criminal Defendant. an absolute right to the assistance of counsel. I have placed before the Court the fact that the ACLU has this matter on its agenda for September 18th. I asked for a conference to be scheduled for September 19th at which I would be present either represented by the ACLU or other pro bono counsel who are assisted by the ACLU, or, and/or pro bono counsel, or I would have the retained services of Mr. Goldstone (phonetic sp.). Nothing could have been more fair, more reasonable under the circumstances. and this Court, this Court is riding roughshod over my asserted right to counsel. I, I am not in a position to, I, I, I have gone over and beyond what any criminal Defendant, unrepresented criminal Defendant to, to be expected to do. No one looking at those motions could, could deny the, the burden to which I have been subjected, and which I have successfully met. Let Mr. Mendelsohn meet his burden. Let him respond on formal papers. He has already waived as to the first motion, the August 6th motion. That went in unopposed and has to be granted as a matter of law. There was no prejudice to him. He didn't deny or dispute there was no prejudice to him by putting this matter over to September 19th. asserted prejudice, and I am prejudiced. If this Court's position is that we have to somehow proceed, and, and

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

this Court is telling me, and, Ms. Sassower, you have to 1 cite to D.C. law, I have asserted my right to counsel, and there is no reason for, for the Court to, to, to tell 3 me how, how I must put in motions when I am an 4 unrepresented Defendant that has sought the aid and assistance of counsel. You have that in front of you. That ends matters. The matter, this case should be, is, is imposing on, on, on precious time that should be better spent on other matters. THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Sassower, we'll move on

to the ascertainment of counsel in just a moment --

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

THE COURT: -- but as to the argument on your filed motion for a change of venue, the argument of the Government counsel is being recorded here, as is your argument, and that is a matter of record, and I am prepared to rule on that motion.

THE DEFENDANT: But you don't even know the facts of this case let alone -- are you familiar with those legal authorities to which he cited?

THE COURT: Ms. Sassower, I am prepared to rule on that motion at this time. Is there anything further you want to say on that motion?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, well, without your ruling, the fact that you are willing, you, you think it

25

appropriate to rule is, is evidence that you are not fair and impartial, because it is reasonable to expect that on such a serious issue Mr. -- there is no prejudice to the Court, none whatsoever, to require Mr. Mendelsohn to interpose papers in response, including a memorandum of law. That's his burden. I have met my burden. I have put in formal papers.

THE COURT: Ma'am, although a motion that is even unopposed, and this is not unopposed, but even one that is unopposed may be treated conceded. That is not a requirement. Motions are resolved by the Court on their merit or lack of merit whether or not there is a response from the opposing party --

THE DEFENDANT: Well, you don't know --

THE COURT: -- and here the opposition has been given orally, and you've had a further opportunity to argue it, and I'm prepared to rule. Is there anything else you want to say?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that you are not familiar underlying facts of this case beyond the cursory comments that I've herein made, so how can you rule on such a serious and substantial motion without being fully aware of the facts? Wouldn't you like to see the criminal complexity the policeman conduct complaint that your husband dismissed? Wouldn't you like to see how

it's germane to this case?

THE COURT: Ma'am --

THE DEFENDANT: Wouldn't you like to see how this, how this case impacts on capital police under your husband and on, on, on the Senate on which this Court receives direct appropriations? Wouldn't you like to have further submissions from me? I mean you're ready to, to -- you're so hasty. What is the rush on such an important matter?

THE COURT: Mr. Mendelsohn, do you have anything further?

MR. MENDELSOHN: I do not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Sassower, your motion for a change of venue to some unspecified Court outside the District of Columbia is denied. I do not find your arguments persuasive, and D.C. is unique in that we have only one Court here to handle District of Columbia matters, and if the case --

THE DEFENDANT: (Indiscernible) --

THE COURT: Just a minute, Ms. Sassower.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And there simply is no precedent for removing the case outside the District of Columbia, a case even of this nature.

THE DEFENDANT: You're not familiar with the

1-1400-E31

nature of this case, Your Honor. You haven't even seen
(indiscernible) --

THE COURT: Ma'am, you have very thoroughly in your motion spelled out the nature of this case, and I understand your arguments, but I do not find them persuasive. That motion is denied. Now, let's move on to the issue of ascertainment of counsel.

You indicate that the ACLU was making a decision on September 18th. You have proposed that we could meet as early as September 19th to choose a trial date and do other scheduling matters, and I just wonder if the decision isn't made until the 18th whether, in fact, there will be a lawyer available if they do decide to represent you to come to Court the very next day.

THE DEFENDANT: I agreed, I offered the date of September 19th to show how, to show to Mr. Mendelsohn and the Court that we could proceed with great confidence.

THE COURT: Is that realistic?

THE DEFENDANT: Is it realistic? I, I don't know, but I have advised, the ACLU has been cc'd on all the motions, has been sent the motions, has been sent the correspondence. Excuse me, by the way, when Mr.

Mendelsohn began this conference and said he didn't know that I would be appearing by telephone, excuse me, is he representing that he did not get the fax that I sent

yesterday?

 $\vdash$ 

 $\sim$ 

 $\sim$ 

4

2

9

7

 $\infty$ 

6

10

17

 $\alpha$ receive you did Mendelsohn, Mr. afternoon? COURT: THE yesterday fax

Sweet? Sweet, about which U.S yesterday the talking Mr Mr up, Was to not called calling me Н but memo before Or н. В Honor, already know whether Mendelsohn my Attorney of in Your copySweet had afternoon, Mr. that he K U.S. to that Mr. DEFENDANT: like the Mridentified what I'd contacted yesterday say and So, THE should contacted, Attorney. fact, morning, not Н And Was in

MR. MENDELSOHN: Well --

12

13

14

began he when said, he when objecting DEFENDANT: byconference by, THE this

10 need don't We minute. Q Just but that, COURT: of THE any resolve

16

17

18

6869-159-000-1 - 000-1-

19

20

22

21

23

24

25

2

 $\vdash$ 

credibility to goes it Well, DEFENDANT: THE Honor Your

THE COURT: -- but --

THE DEFENDANT: It goes to credibility

THE COURT: Did you receive any fax?

p.m. receive to 2:00 have didn't the would regarding Н Defendant from White Plains Honor, Was Your the received that MENDEL SOHN: and trains Н fax conference, last catching MR. The start Court fax.

| 1  | THE COURT: Yeah.   |
|----|--|
| 2  | MR. MENDELSOHN: at 6:00 a.m. this morning.               |
| 3  | That's the last fax that I received. I was not aware     |
| 4  | until I came to Court this afternoon that the conference |
| 5  |  |
| 6  | THE DEFENDANT: Well, I, I will identify to the           |
| 7  | Court that this morning I sent to Mr. Sweet's attention  |
| 8  | the fax and e-mail receipt from my yesterday's           |
| 9  | transmittal  |
| 10 | THE COURT: All right. But                                |
| 11 | THE DEFENDANT: to Mr. Mendelsohn that                    |
| 12 | THE COURT: All right. I will                             |
| 13 | THE DEFENDANT: That, that transmittal was in             |
| 14 | the early afternoon                                      |
| 15 | THE COURT: I will  |
| 16 | THE DEFENDANT: However, is the office saying             |
| 17 | that he did not get a phone call from Mr. Sweet?         |
| 18 | THE COURT: I will accept your representation             |
| 19 | that you faxed something to Mr. Mendelsohn.              |
| 20 | THE DEFENDANT: The only thing Mr. Sweet didn't           |
| 21 | get  |
| 22 | THE COURT: I assume he does not have a                   |
| 23 | personal fax at his desk, and that it could very well be |
| 24 | in a large office such as he works for that the fax was  |
| 25 | received, and misfiled and didn't come to his attention  |

| 1  |   |
|----|---|
| 2  | THE DEFENDANT: And did the Court                          |
| 3  | THE COURT: but we don't need to go into                   |
| 4  | that.   |
| 5  | THE DEFENDANT: Did the Court not instruct its             |
| 6  | law clerk, Mr. Sweet, to call Mr. Mendelsohn? Because     |
| 7  | that was what I understood from Mr. Sweet                 |
| 8  | THE COURT: Yeah. It                                       |
| 9  | THE DEFENDANT: that he had called Mr.                     |
| 10 | Mendelsohn prior to calling me. Indeed, I would say that  |
| 11 | last week when I  |
| 12 | THE COURT: it doesn't matter one way or the               |
| 13 | other. Let's move forward                                 |
| 14 | THE DEFENDANT: Well, so                                   |
| 15 | THE COURT: We're  |
| 16 | THE DEFENDANT: Okay. So                                   |
| 17 | THE COURT: Let me say something. I am going               |
| 18 | to continue this matter until a reasonable date after the |
| 19 | ACLU meeting on September 18th. I simply want it to be a  |
| 20 | reasonable date, and I don't want you to promise to come  |
| 21 | on September 19th, and then be here without a lawyer, but |
| 22 | with knowledge that a lawyer will take your case but      |
| 23 | needs time to get here. So                                |
| 24 | THE DEFENDANT: All right. Well, as the tape               |
| 25 | has reflected, I was planning to, I had offered to come   |

| -  | down to the ACLU for their September 18th meeting, make  |
|----|--|
| 2  | personal presentation, to sit in the hallway outside     |
| 3  | their meeting room if necessary, but just to be availabl |
| 4  | to them.   |
| 5  | THE COURT: But that's not the issue.                     |
| 6  | THE DEFENDANT: So, it was my intention to be             |
| 7  | down there in any respect, in any, in any event, but if  |
| 8  | the Court deems it prudent to put it off a week          |
| 9  | THE COURT: The ACLU is meeting here in                   |
| 10 | Washington?  |
| 11 | THE DEFENDANT: Yes, the eighth                           |
| 12 | THE COURT: I see.  |
| 13 | THE DEFENDANT: we're talking about the                   |
| 14 | capital chapter  |
| 15 | THE COURT: Okay.   |
| 16 | THE DEFENDANT: of the ACLU.                              |
| 17 | THE COURT: All right. So, is September 19th              |
| 18 | the date you are requesting?                             |
| 19 | THE DEFENDANT: I am, I am not requesting that            |
| 20 | date, no. I offered                                      |
| 21 | THE COURT: What date are you requesting for              |
| 22 | THE DEFENDANT: I offered, I offered that date,           |
| 23 | and Mr. Mendelsohn's response was that I would have to   |
| 24 | come down to D.C. on August                              |
| 25 | THE COURT: Ms. Sassower, we don't need to go             |

| 1  | over the past history.                                    |
|----|---|
| 2  | THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Otherwise, make a                    |
| 3  | motion, okay.   |
| 4  | THE COURT: Just tell me what your proposed                |
| 5  | date is, and then I'll see if that date is good for Mr.   |
| 6  | Mendelsohn's calendar.                                    |
| 7  | THE DEFENDANT: It's whatever the, you know,               |
| 8  | with all respect, I                                       |
| 9  | THE COURT: We want to move this case forward.             |
| 10 | We want you to have a lawyer                              |
| 11 | THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.                                 |
| 12 | THE COURT: and we   |
| 13 | THE DEFENDANT: Then, then you can be                      |
| 14 | assured that legal counsel's first, first step will be to |
| 15 | either advise me as to how to proceed in light of the     |
| 16 | Court's disposition on my                                 |
| 17 | THE COURT: Yes, but                                       |
| 18 | THE DEFENDANT: motion, my first motion.                   |
| 19 | THE COURT: the first date is what date can                |
| 20 | you be in Court with counsel?                             |
| 21 | THE DEFENDANT: The only problem that I have               |
| 22 | relates to the Jewish holidays which fall in September    |
| 23 | and October, but, if you want I'll pull out a calendar,   |
| 24 | but I'm, I'm perfectly prepared to appear on September    |
| 25 | 19th  |

THE COURT: All right.

THE DEFENDANT: -- but if you want to put it off for a week after that, that's fine. Hold on. If you'd be kind enough, I'll look at the calendar.

THE COURT: Mr. Mendelsohn?

MR. MENDELSOHN: Your Honor, I want to state for the record that, on --

THE COURT: Just a minute. She's looking --

THE DEFENDANT: Hello?

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Well, the, the Jewish holidays are not until the end of the month on the 27th, so, which is two weeks after the -- but, no, it's the week following, so that would not be good. Whatever the Court deems appropriate.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Mendelsohn?

MR. MENDELSOHN: Your Honor, on June 20th, when

THE COURT: I don't want to hear the history from you either, Mr. Mendelsohn.

MR. MENDELSOHN: I am opposed --

THE COURT: The question is what is a date when we can have Ms. Sassower here with counsel and get a trial date set.

THE DEFENDANT: So, the discovery and

| -  | disqualification issue's first, including                 |
|----|---|
| 2  | disqualification of the U.S. Attorney.                    |
| 3  | THE COURT: You have not filed that motion yet,            |
| 4  | ma'am.  |
| 5  | THE DEFENDANT: It's apparent that any motion I            |
| 6  | make will be denied from the bench without a written      |
| 7  | decision by characterizations                             |
| 8  | THE COURT: Mr. Mendelsohn, what date?                     |
| 9  | MR. MENDELSOHN: Your Honor, any date after                |
| 10 | September 19th would be fine for the Government, but just |
| 11 | for the record we are, again, opposed to a further        |
| 12 | continuance for Defendant to retain counsel.              |
| 13 | THE DEFENDANT: Where is the prejudice? Where              |
| 14 | is the prejudice, Mr. Mendelsohn?                         |
| 15 | MR. MENDELSOHN: But any date that you find                |
| 16 | appropriate in late September early October would be fine |
| 17 | for the Government, other than Monday, October 6th, and   |
| 18 | Friday, September 26th.                                   |
| 19 | THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, Friday, September 26th               |
| 20 | would not be possible for me in light of the Jewish       |
| 21 | holiday.  |
| 22 | THE COURT: All right. All right.                          |
| 23 | THE DEFENDANT: And October 6th also for me is             |
| 24 | a Jewish holiday.   |
| 25 | THE COURT: Ma'am, since you are planning to be            |

|    | 1 in Washington on the 18th anyway is September 19th your |
|----|---|
|    | 2 preference?   |
|    | THE DEFENDANT: I am happy to be there on                  |
|    | 4 September 19th.   |
|    | THE COURT: All right.                                     |
| 1  | THE DEFENDANT: I offered that.                            |
|    | THE COURT: All right. September 19th it will              |
| 8  |   |
| 9  | THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.                     |
| 10 |   |
| 11 | want to be moving forward to set a trial date             |
| 12 | THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I offered                             |
| 13 | THE COURT: SO   |
| 14 | THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, there is motion                |
| 15 | practice that will need be made.                          |
| 16 | THE COURT: Ma'am, you may want to check the               |
| 17 | D.C. rules on motions.                                    |
| 18 | THE DEFENDANT: Well, this Court doesn't have              |
| 19 | an interest in going to trial when it might be resolved   |
| 20 | by motion, right? I'll put the facts                      |
| 21 | THE COURT: Well, okay, September 19th, ma'am.             |
| 22 | THE DEFENDANT: This appearance is without,                |
| 23 | without waiving, needless to say, and I reiterate my      |
| 24 | objection to this Court and, in particular, Your Honor    |
| 25 | presiding. And I will renew my motion for change of       |

venue which I think in light of the disposition today is even more compelling. And I will have counsel advise as to what kinds of standards apply where one side makes formal motions on papers, and the other side is absolved of any formal response and the Court accepts that and, with characterizations. No law denies relief.

THE COURT: Ms. Sassower, let me just explain on that point that I was doing that as a convenience to you, because the Government is present today and able to make arguments orally, and we are a Court of record. This has all been formally on the record, and if you want a copy of Mr. Mendelsohn's opposition you can order the transcript.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, no, that doesn't substitute for (indiscernible).

THE COURT: I don't want to delay this matter further when we're all in Court today and can get this resolved.

THE DEFENDANT: Now, but when --

THE COURT: Your next Court appearance, ma'am, is September 19th, at 9:30 in the morning, and I'm going to have the clerk --

THE DEFENDANT: Now --

THE COURT: -- now formally advise you of your obligation to be here on that date. Would you pay

| -  | attention now to the clerk?                               |
|----|---|
| 2  | THE DEFENDANT: Yes  |
| *3 | THE COURT: Just a minute. Pay                             |
| 4  | THE DEFENDANT: yes, Your Honor, but may I                 |
| 5  | just  |
| 6  | THE COURT: No, not yet. I want you to be                  |
| 7  | advised first.  |
| 8  | THE DEFENDANT: Yes.                                       |
| 9  | THE DEPUTY CLERK: Ma'am, you are scheduled to             |
| 10 | appear back to the Court on September the 19th, 2003, in  |
| 11 | this Courtroom, Courtroom 217, at 9:30 a.m. Failure to    |
| 12 | appear, a bench warrant can issue for your arrest. You    |
| 13 | will be subject to a fine of \$1,000, 180 days in jail or |
| 14 | both simply for your failure to appear. Do you            |
| 15 | understand the warning, ma'am?                            |
| 16 | THE DEFENDANT: I do.                                      |
| 17 | MR. MENDELSOHN: Your Honor, might I inquire as            |
| 18 | to whether we'll be setting a trial date on September     |
| 19 | 19th?   |
| 20 | THE DEFENDANT: How could they set a trial date            |
| 21 | when you may not have complied with my discovery demands  |
| 22 | by then? I'm entitled to discovery, right? Mr.            |
| 23 | Mendelsohn, did you plan to supply the demanded           |
| 24 | documents?  |
| 25 | THE COURT: Ms. Sassower, be prepared to be                |

•

able to discuss trial dates on the 19th.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I have discovery rights, right, Your Honor? You've already indicated that the Court does not involve itself --

THE COURT: Yes. Read --

THE DEFENDANT: -- unless the parties can't resolve it.

THE COURT: -- read --

THE DEFENDANT: Well, Mr., if Mr. Mendelsohn --

THE COURT: -- read rule 16.

THE DEFENDANT: -- ready to state on the record whether he is ready to resolve informally the discovery issues, or will a motion have to be made? Is he going to be complying with my discovery demands? That is a threshold issue. How can we talk about trial dates?

THE COURT: Ma'am, often trial dates are set while discovery is ongoing. If on the day of trial or on the eve of trial, you have not received discovery you feel you're entitled to, that is the time to file a formal motion that demands the discovery you think you're entitled to and, perhaps, request a continuance of the trial date if you can't proceed to trial without the discovery, but we don't wait to the conclusion of discovery to set a date for trial.

THE DEFENDANT: I want --

THE COURT: We need to get the date set even while discovery is ongoing. So --

THE DEFENDANT: Well --

THE COURT: -- be here on the 19th with counsel and we can continue whatever issues are pending at that time.

THE DEFENDANT: Hello.

THE COURT: Yes.

THE DEFENDANT: Will Mr. Mendelsohn identify whether he's planning to, whether he is planning to comply with this discovery demand?

MR. MENDELSOHN: Your Honor, for the record we are working hard to comply with Ms. Sassower's discovery request.

THE DEFENDANT: And when will it be, when might I expect production, because that was denominated my first discovery demand?

MR. MENDELSOHN: We're working hard to comply with your discovery request, and we will parse through your demands and try to get you everything that is available to us as soon as possible.

THE DEFENDANT: All right. One last thing, and that is I inadvertently cited the wrong section in the discovery demand. The, the demand is made pursuant to rule 16(a)(1)(C), so if you would be kind enough to pen

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in the change, I will send you a supergeding first page. I cited simply rule 16, and I said (b), but it appears to be 16(a)(1)(C). From the language you can see that, that subsection, because I quoted that what I was demanding were documents and tangible objects that were, quote, material to the preparation of my Defense, and that I expected to introduce as exculpatory, indeed, they are.

MR. MENDELSOHN: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Can we sign off now, Ms. Sassower?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Do we know -- I, I do want to say that this revolving door of judges, I mean if, if every time, obviously, you, I feel that you are previously disqualified, that it was error of a substantial nature for you to have had any contact with this case once I disclosed to you relevant facts that you, and all your rulings, essentially, I deem to be prejudicial, but for the scheduling of the conference on September 19th to appear with counsel. And I will, if you are going to be a judge handling any further aspects of this case, I mean I can't keep making motions addressed to the disqualification of specific judges, and then it goes to another judge who says, well, that's moot, because the prior judge is no longer on board, but, but I have, I believe that, that your dispositions and

20

21

22

23

24

25

Judge Eilperin's dispositions are reflective of, of the 1 bias in interest for which I am entitled to transfer of 2 this case. And it may be unprecedented, but you can be 3 sure that this is an unprecedented case. I do not, I do 4 not waive or accept that Your Honor has, has relieved Mr. 5 Mendelsohn, U.S., of the U.S. Attorney's office, no less 6 7 8 THE COURT: All right. 9 THE DEFENDANT: -- of the responsibility to 10 respond --11 Yeah. You're repeating yourself 12 We have other cases to call. We'll sign off now. 13 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. 14 THE COURT: Thank you for calling. 15 MR. MENDELSOHN: Thank you, Your Honor. 16 (Whereupon the hearing was concluded.) 17 18

45

## CERTIFICATE

I, Patricia E. Ives, a transcriber, do hereby certify that I transcribed the proceedings had and the testimony adduced in the case of <u>U.S. v. Elena Ruth</u>

<u>Sassower</u>, Case No. M411-03 in said Court, on the 20th day of August, 2003.

I further certify that the foregoing 45 pages constitute the official transcript of said proceedings as transcribed from audio recording to the best of my ability.

In witness whereof, I have hereto subscribed my name, this, the 9th day of September, 2003.

Transcriber

