Petitioner's October 16, 2006 letter-application to D.C. Court of Appeals Chief Judge Washington and the three-judge appellate panel (Judges Ruiz, Kramer, & Nebeker) for disqualification, disclosure, transfer, etc. *

By Express Mail

October 16, 2006

D.C. Court of Appeals
Chief Judge Eric T. Washington
Appellate Panel Judges: Vanessa Ruiz,
Noel Anketell Kramer, Frank Q. Nebeker

RE: ***Elena Ruth Sassower v. United States of America***
#04-CM-760 & #04-CO-1600
("Disruption of Congress" Case)

(1) Disqualification/Disclosure by the Appellate Panel & Transfer of these Consolidated Appeals to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit;
(2) Reconsideration of the Placement of these Consolidated Appeals on the Court's October 17, 2006 Summary Calendar;
(3) Reconsideration of Denial of Oral Argument;
(4) Submission of this Letter for the Record.

---

* **Thereafter annexed as Exhibit B to petitioner's January 2, 2007 petition for rehearing, rehearing *en banc*, motion to vacate for fraud, lack of jurisdiction, disqualification, disclosure, & transfer (A-297)**

Dear Chief Judge Washington & Appellate Panel Judges Ruiz, Kramer, and Nebeker:

This letter constitutes my request that Judge Vanessa Ruiz, Judge Noel Anketell Kramer, and Senior Judge Frank Q. Nebeker – the three judges assigned to the October 17, 2006 summary calendar – disqualify themselves from my above-numbered consolidated appeals pursuant to Canon 3E of the Code of Judicial Conduct for the District of Columbia Courts and, failing to do so, that they make disclosure pursuant to Canon 3F. Such letter-application substitutes for the oral application I would have made at the October 17, 2006 oral argument of my appeals, had the panel not denied my September 10, 2006 letter-request for oral argument (Exhibit A), which they did, *without reasons*, by a September 15, 2006 order (Exhibit B). In so doing, the panel deprived me of the opportunity to make an oral application for their disqualification and for disclosure – combined relief which this Court's judges have refused to address, let alone identify, throughout the history of this case.

In issuing their *without reasons* September 15, 2006 order, prejudicing my substantial rights, the judges of the panel did not disclose their names. Rather, the order was represented to be "on behalf of the merits division assigned to consider this matter" and signed by the Court's Clerk, Garland Pinkston, Jr. According to Chief Deputy Clerk Joy Chapper, with whom I had a lengthy telephone conversation on September 20th and who stated to me that there is a "presumptive right" to oral argument, the "merits division" is the panel assigned to the appeal.

[p. 2] Ms. Chapper's only explanation for why the September 15, 2006 order did not identify the judges' names, whereas the myriad of orders which have denied my prior motions have, was that it is not the Court's

practice to disclose the composition of appellate panels until the Thursday before the scheduled calendar date. She stated that the names of the judges assigned to my appeals would be available on Thursday, October, 12th, when they would be posted on the Court's website.

On Thursday, October 12th, upon accessing the Court's website and discovering that Judges Ruiz, Kramer, and Nebeker were assigned to my appeals (Exhibit C), I telephoned Ms. Chapper to notify her of my adamant objection to the participation of Judges Nebeker and Kramer – each of whom I stated was absolutely disqualified and should have *sua sponte* declined to sit on these appeals based on their participation in events at issue, wherein they had not only demonstrated actual bias, but acquired an interest in the outcome of the appellate issues based thereon.

Ms. Chapper confirmed that Judges Nebeker, Kramer, and Ruiz would have been the "merits division" referred-to by the September 15, 2006 order. She further acknowledged that the placement of my consolidated appeals on the summary, rather than regular, calendar – whose consequence was to enable the appellate panel to deprive me of the oral argument to which I would otherwise have been entitled – might have been made by Judge Nebeker himself, as he is a senior judge and there is no preclusion of a senior judge from sitting on the panel of an appeal he has calendared. Such acknowledgment was in the context of my questions to her based on what she had told me on September 20th when I complained that the September 15, 2006 order had neither addressed nor identified the requests for information in my September 10th letter, *to wit*, (1) as to the basis upon which my appeals had been placed on the summary, rather than regular, calendar; (2) as to whether Chief Judge Washington had recused himself from any involvement in the calendaring, based on his actual bias and interest, as particularized by my February 22, 2006 judicial misconduct complaint to the D.C. Commission on

Judicial Disabilities and Tenure; and (3) the names of such other judges as were involved in the calendaring. Ms. Chapper's response, on September 20th, was to try to provide that requested information. She represented that Chief Judge Washington's participation is limited to handling the computer-generated seating assignments of the panels, which is done monthly. She explained that senior judges then do a "quick review" of the briefs and records on appeal scheduled for that month and make the determination as to their placement on either the regular or summary calendars. According to Ms. Chapper, this system of screening is pursuant to "internal operating procedures" which are not available – and the names of the senior judges making such determinations are also not available.

In our October 12th conversation, I asked Ms. Chapper what the proper procedure was to secure the disqualification of the appellate panel and, in particular, Judges Nebeker and Kramer. She stated she was unaware of any procedure and, indeed, that she was unaware of any prior instance in which the disqualification of an appellate panel member had been sought by either a lawyer or litigant.

Under such circumstances, and consistent with the informality of the oral application I would have made for disqualification/disclosure at the October 17th oral argument, I am proceeding by letter, **[p. 3]** rather than formal motion. In any event, as evident from the September 15, 2006 order, the panel has no problem treating a letter-request as a "motion".

More to the point, I have already made a dispositive motion addressed to the disqualification of Judges Nebeker, Kramer, and Ruiz, as well as the Court's other judges, for demonstrated actual bias and interest and, if denied, for disclosure. Among the six branches of this October 14, 2005 motion, unopposed by the U.S. Attorney:

> "removal/transfer of the appeals to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit by reason of the disqualification of this Court's judges, in the interest of justice, and pursuant to the venue provision of the 'disruption of Congress' statute, D.C. Code §10-503.18"; and
>
> "such other and further relief...including requesting an advisory opinion of the Advisory Committee on Judicial Conduct as to the mandatory obligations of this Court's judges to identify and adjudicate requests for their disqualification and for disclosure – if there is any doubt as to the disciplinary, if not criminal, consequences to the judges of wilfully concealing and ignoring such request" .

As pointed out by ¶48, Judge Ruiz chairs the Advisory Committee on Judicial Conduct – a position she still holds.

The fate of my unopposed October 14, 2005 motion, which was supported by my fact-specific 29-page sworn affidavit and nearly 180 pages of substantiating exhibits, is reflected by the cover of my "conforming brief on the merits" and recounted at pages 1-2 thereof. Although I had supplied nine full copies with the original motion, it was not decided by the *en banc* Court, as I had requested in conjunction with that branch of the motion as sought reconsideration/vacatur of the Court's October 5, 2005 order (Washington, Terry, Schwelb, Farrell, Wagner, Ruiz, Reid, Glickman, Kramer) denying *en banc* initial hearing of the appeals. Rather, it was decided by Judges Reid, Glickman, and Nebeker – the very judges whose knowing disregard of mandatory disqualification/disclosure rules and falsification of *Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S. 540 (1994), pertaining to disqualification was focally detailed by my motion. Without denying or disputing the accuracy of my motion's uncontested showing that their prior unsigned orders

were all "readily-verifiable as judicial frauds" (¶32), Judges Reid, Glickman, and Nebeker issued an unsigned five-sentence October 27, 2005 order denying the motion (Exhibit D) without identifying any of the facts, law, or legal argument it had presented, all dispositive of my rights. Totally concealed by this October 27, 2005 order – as likewise by their prior unsigned orders under the docket numbers of my consolidated appeals – was my requested relief for their disqualification and for the disqualification of the Court's other judges for pervasive actual bias and interest and, if denied, for disclosure by them, including as to specified extrajudicial facts.

[p. 4] Judges Reid, Glickman, and Nebeker then blocked me from judicially-challenging this fraudulent October 27, 2005 order by directing the Court's Clerk to accept "no further filings" from me, except for my "conforming brief on the merits, due on November 7, 2005" and my "conforming reply brief, if any, due within 21 days after the filing of appellee's brief on the merits". This direction, having no basis in fact and law, was entirely *sua sponte* – and afforded me *no* notice or opportunity to be heard, in stark contrast to *Corley v. United States*, 741 A.2d 1029 (1999), the sole case the order cited, prefaced by "*See*", connoting an inferential leap between my case and *Corley*.

The facts pertaining to this fraudulent and unprecedented October 27, 2005 order are recited by my January 10, 2006 letter to Chief Judge Washington (Exhibit E), reiterating my prior urgent and imploring telephone requests for his supervisory oversight pursuant to Canons 3C and D of the Code of Judicial Conduct for the District of Columbia Courts. Chief Judge Washington did not respond, even to the limited extent of confirming, as expressly requested by my January 10, 2006 letter (at p. 3, in boldfaced type), that he personally examined the October 14, 2005 motion and the October 27, 2005 order; that he brought both to the attention of the Court's other judges for their personal review; and that neither he nor

they deemed it appropriate to recall the October 27, 2005 order and responsively adjudicate the October 14, 2005 motion.

This was recited by my February 22, 2006 complaint to the D.C. Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure (Exhibit F).[1] Such complaint was not only against Judge Washington and Judges Reid, Glickman, and Nebeker. It was also against this Court's other judges who had participated in the succession of fraudulent orders shown by my October 14, 2005 motion to have concealed ALL the facts, law, and legal argument I had raised to deny me relief to which I was entitled, *as a matter of law* – including disqualification and disclosure. Among these judges, Judges Kramer and Ruiz, each of whom – without disqualifying themselves or making disclosure – had, by inaction, participated in the October 5, 2005 order denying my petition for *en banc* initial hearing of the appeals. As to Judge Kramer, my judicial misconduct complaint specifically encompassed her violations of her mandatory administrative and disciplinary responsibilities under Canons 3C and D of the Code of Judicial Conduct for the District of Columbia Courts, when, in her former capacity as D.C. Superior Court Criminal Division Presiding Judge, she failed to respond to my urgent requests for her supervisory oversight over

---

[1] My January 10, 2006 letter and February 22, 2006 complaint were exhibits to my March 16, 2006 motion for permission to file an unopposed motion for a procedural order to extend my time to file my reply brief, due on April 5, 2006 (Exhibits G-1, G-2). Such were rejected for filing by a notice which stated that when I was ready to file my reply brief, I could "file a motion for permission to file a motion for leave, along with a lodged reply brief" (Exhibit G-3).

According to Supervisory Case Manager Thomas Abraham, who signed the notice and to whom I thereafter spoke, the rejection had been directed by Chief Judge Washington, in whole or in part, because of the annexed January 10, 2006 letter and February 22, 2006 complaint. Judge Washington's involvement and adherence to "the due process-less, unprecedented, and completely fraudulent October 27, 2005 barring order" is identified on the cover of my timely-filed reply brief.

D.C. Superior Court Judge Brian Holeman in connection with my two motions for his **[p. 5]** disqualification for pervasive actual bias.

In the interest of judicial economy, I rest this letter-application for the disqualification of Judges Nebeker, Kramer, and Ruiz on my October 14, 2005 motion particularizing their demonstrated actual bias and interest in the outcome of each of my four appellate issues (¶¶33-37), supplemented and reinforced by my January 10, 2006 letter and February 22, 2006 complaint, and by the above-recitation pertaining to the placement of my consolidated appeals on the summary calendar and the panel's denial my letter-request for oral argument. Should the judges of the panel not disqualify themselves based on this detailed showing[2], they must each address the specifics I have set forth, both as to themselves and as to their judicial brethren of which they have knowledge.

On the issue of this Court's consistent disregard and concealment of my repeated requests for disclosure of extrajudicial facts bearing upon its fairness and impartiality, I expressly call upon the panel to disclose their knowledge of the breathtaking extrajudicial fact, sufficient in and of itself to have motivated Judge Reid's lawless conduct and to have influenced their own. That fact, of which I became aware only weeks ago – and then by accident – is that Judge Reid has a twin brother, George Bundy Smith, a judge on New York's Court of

---

[2] As to Senior Judge Nebeker, see: entirety of my October 14, 2005 motion, & also, in particular, ¶6 (& fn. 4), ¶42; my "conforming brief", at pp. 36-37 (& fn. 13) [second appellate issue-venue]; my January 10, 2006 letter (Exhibit E); my February 22, 2006 complaint (Exhibit F).

As to Judge Kramer, see: my October 14, 2005 motion, at ¶¶29-30, 44-5; my "conforming brief", at pp. 36-37 (& fn. 13) [second appellate issue-venue]; my January 10, 2006 letter; my February 22, 2006 misconduct complaint, at pp. 7-8 (& fn. 8, 9, 10).

As to Judge Ruiz, see: my October 14, 2005 motion, at ¶¶29, 48; my January 10, 2006 letter; my February 22, 2006 complaint.

Appeals from 1992 until just this past month. Such close familial relationship gave Judge Reid a direct, personal interest in hurting me and prejudicing my consolidated appeals. This, because the documented corruption of Judge Richard C. Wesley as a New York Court of Appeals judge, about which I had respectfully requested to testify at the May 22, 2003 Senate Judiciary Committee confirmation hearing – and for which I was arrested, prosecuted, convicted, and incarcerated for "disruption of Congress" – was not exclusive to Judge Wesley. It also was the documented corruption of her own twin brother and his New York Court of Appeals colleagues, all of whom participated and colluded in the on-the-bench judicial misconduct which was the basis of the Center for Judicial Accountability's opposition to Judge Wesley's confirmation to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals.[3]

[p. 6] It is hard to imagine that this Court's judges were not fully aware of such close familial relationship and had not had many interactions over the years with Judge Smith at social occasions and professional events, as likewise with other New York Court judges, including Judge Wesley himself.

Yet, this Court allowed Judge Reid to participate on panels rendering a succession of fraudulent orders which addressed NONE of the facts, law and legal argument I

---

[3] Reflecting this is my March 26, 2003 written statement of opposition to Judge Wesley's confirmation, chronicling the documentary evidence of what Judge Wesley and his named Court of Appeals colleagues had done [A-1436], Judge Smith among them [A-1440, 1442].

Before I took the witness stand during the trial [A-1207-8], Judge Holeman ruled, without any objection having been made by the U.S. Attorney, that the March 26, 2003 written statement – which I had furnished to New York Home-State Senators Charles Schumer and Hillary Rodham Clinton and to the Senate Judiciary Committee, among others – was inadmissible because it was "opinion". The severe prejudice resulting from such incorrect and inconsistent ruling is highlighted, *inter alia*, at pages 79-82 of my "non-conforming" June 28, 2005 brief.

presented – all dispositive of my rights. Indeed, upon Judge Reid's first entry into this case – participating with Judge Nebeker (& Judge Steadman) in a July 7, 2004 order which, *without reasons*, denied me release from incarceration – I made a July 16/August 12, 2004 motion for reconsideration, seeking, disqualification, disclosure, and transfer among its branches of relief.[4] Among the disclosure I sought was whether her decision-making was impacted by her professional and personal relationships with judges of "the New York Court of Appeals (past or present)" (¶65, underlining added).[5] Such requested disclosure was ignored and concealed by Judge Reid when she denied the motion and kept me incarcerated by a fraudulent September 16, 2004 order (with Judges Terry & Newman) that addressed NONE of the facts, law and legal argument I had presented – all dispositive of my rights. Judge Reid then continued to obliterate any semblance of judicial process in this case: exceeding even

---

[4] A typed copy of the July 16/August 12, 2004 reconsideration motion, which I wrote, by hand, while incarcerated, is annexed as Exhibit F to my October 14, 2005 motion.

[5] Although the July 7, 2004 order was Judge Reid's first decision-making in this case, it was NOT Judge Nebeker's, whose disqualification was the third branch of relief sought by my July 16/August 12, 2004 reconsideration motion. As therein detailed (¶¶41-62), Judge Nebeker had previously rendered the fraudulent April 8, 2004 order (with Judges Farrell & Glickman) which denied my April 6, 2004 petition for a writ of mandamus and prohibition to disqualify Judge Holeman and the additional relief of certiorari and/or certification of questions of law as to my entitlement to venue of this case in the federal court pursuant to the venue provision of the "disruption of Congress" statute, without identifying any of the facts, law or legal argument I had presented, and denied my accompanying motion for a stay of trial and to disqualify the Court's judges without identifying my request for disclosure of facts bearing on their fairness and impartiality. As stated: "No judge participating in such [April 8, 2004] order can lay claim to being fair and impartial – or properly adjudicate the further proceedings it generated – all null and void by reason of Judge Holeman's violation of Rule 63-I – the subject of my mandamus petition." (at ¶62).

Judge Nebeker.[6] This includes in making a complete mockery and shambles of the course of the appellate proceedings since my filing of my June 28, 2005 motion for a procedural order – as evidenced by examination of the record underlying her July 14, 2005 order (with Judges Glickman & Pryor), her August 5, 2005 order (with Judges Glickman & Nebeker), and her October 27, 2005 order (with Judges Glickman & Nebeker). All the while, Judge Reid, with Judge Nebeker beside her, has ignored my requests for disqualification and disclosure – requests which have **[p. 7]** highlighted the disclosure that had been requested by my July 16/August 12, 2004 motion.

Judge Ruiz, as Chair of the Advisory Committee on Judicial Conduct, should be the first to address the violations of Canons 3E and F of the Code of Judicial Conduct for the District of Columbia Courts, more fully chronicled by my October 14, 2005 motion – and to state whether, in issuing with Judges Nebeker and Kramer the September 15, 2006 order, maintaining my consolidated appeals on the summary calendar and denying me oral argument, she had read my October 14, 2005 motion and was familiar with my January 10, 2006 letter and February 22, 2006 complaint based thereon. If so, it reinforces that she, no less than they, are disqualified for actual bias and interest.

Should the appellate panel not disqualify itself, as is its belated duty to do – and not transfer these appeals to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, as requested by my October 14, 2005 motion (¶¶2(d), 47) – I request reconsideration of the placement of my consolidated appeals on the summary, rather than

---

[6] No D.C. Court of Appeals judge participated in more orders in this case than Judge Reid: July 7, 2004, September 16, 2004, September 23, 2004, July 14, 2005, August 5, 2005, October 5, 2005, October 27, 2005. Judge Nebeker (who ties with Judge Glickman) follows next: April 8, 2004, July 7, 2004, October 14, 2004, August 5, 2005, October 5, 2005, October 27, 2005.

regular, calendar. Such placement on the summary calendar cannot be justified by any fair and impartial review of the briefs and record herein. Indeed, over and beyond the exceptional legal and constitutional importance of my four appellate issues, each of "first impression" and so-highlighted by my August 4, 2005 petition for *en banc* initial hearing of the appeals, the fraudulent July 14, 2005, August 5, 2005, and October 27, 2005 orders of Judges Reid and Nebeker, *et al.* make oral argument all the more critical, lest the panel be misled as to the facts and law on these consolidated appeals.[7] This, because these three orders wholly interfered with proper exposition of my appellate issues, *inter alia*, (1) by rejecting my original 119-page brief and 161-page supplemental fact statement[8], while refusing to address

---

[7] I take this opportunity to clarify the *amicus curiae* brief of Jonathan Katz, Esq. for the D.C. Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild, in the following material respect. At page 4, he states "insufficient evidence was presented at trial to show that there was disorder or disruption caused by Appellant, other than the chairperson hitting his gavel." The implication is that the chairman hit the gavel in response to some "disorder or disruption" by me – when, as recited by my analysis of the videotape [A-1574, also A-1570], from which I testified from the witness stand [A-1247], it was to signify his adjournment of the hearing that Chairman Saxby Chambliss hit the gavel. It had nothing to do with anything I did or said

The corroborating videotape – constituting "celluloid DNA" – is in this Court's possession, so-ordered by Chief Judge Washington on March 15, 2006, in response to the U.S. Attorney's bad-faith and deceitful two-page motion to release evidence – which I demolished by my six-page March 8, 2006 opposing affidavit.

[8] As recounted by my January 10, 2006 letter to Chief Judge Washington (Exhibit E, p. 5), the originals of this "non-conforming" brief and supplemental fact statement, filed on June 28, 2005 – and which were to have been preserved in the Clerk's Office files – mysteriously disappeared. In the absence of any response from the Chief Judge, including to my request that he direct an inquiry into their whereabouts, I sent duplicate copies to the Clerk's Office [See fn. 3 to my March 8, 2006 affidavit in opposition to the U.S. Attorney's motion to release evidence].

For the convenience of all, the June 28, 2005 "non-conforming" brief" and supplemental fact statement are posted on CJA's website, www.judgewatch.org, accessible *via* the sidebar panel

the question as to **[p. 8]** the particularity required to establish pervasive actual bias meeting the "impossibility of fair judgment" standard of *Liteky* and, based thereon, setting appropriate page limits for my brief ; (2) by refusing to allow the lodging of key original trial exhibits so as to enable appellate evaluation of Judge Holeman's refusal to admit them into evidence—although consented-to by the U.S. Attorney; (3) by refusing to incorporate into the record of these consolidated appeals the Court's record of my April 6, 2004 petition for a writ of mandamus, prohibition certiorari and/or certified questions of law, as well as its record of my October 6, 2004 "Emergency Appeal" for my release from incarceration to preserve appellate issues – although consented-to by the U.S. attorney; (5) by refusing a court conference pursuant to Rule 14 to resolve these and other procedural issues; (6) by restricting me to a completely generic 50-page brief; (7) by falsifying *Liteky* to pretend that judicial rulings cannot furnish grounds for disqualification; (8) by rejecting the filing of my motion to extend my 50-page brief by 20 pages – although consented-to by the U.S. Attorney; and (9) by rejecting the filing of my motion for permission to file a first-time extension to file my reply brief – although consented-to by the U.S. Attorney – the consequence of which is that my reply brief addresses only the fraudulence of the factual exposition of the U.S. Attorney's opposing brief, not his legal citations.[9]

"'Disruption of Congress' –The Appeal", where the entire subsequent appellate record is posted.

[9] As the applicable law is fact-dependent, my reply brief demonstrated that the U.S. Attorney's legal citations, as likewise his improper and materially false "Issues Presented", rested on material facts which his opposing brief had either omitted, falsified, or distorted. But for the October 27, 2005 barring order, maintained by this Court, several of whose judges – including Judge Nebeker – come out of the U.S. Attorney's office for the District of Columbia, I would have made a formal motion to strike the U.S. Attorney's opposing brief as "an outright 'fraud on the court', intended to subvert the appellate process" and for sanctions and disciplinary and criminal referrals of the U.S. Attorney and his culpable Assistant U.S. Attorneys.

Finally, should the appellate panel fail to reconsider its September 15, 2006 denial of my request for oral argument and accept submission of my consolidated appeals "for consideration and decision" on October 17, 2006, as calendared, I request this letter be substituted for the denied oral argument.

In any event, this letter is submitted for the record of these consolidated appeals.

Yours for a quality judiciary,

s/

ELENA RUTH SASSOWER
Appellant *Pro Se*

[p. 9]
Enclosures:

Ex. A: Sassower's September 10, 2006 letter to D.C. Court of Appeals

Ex. B: September 15, 2006 order ("on behalf of the merits division")

Ex. C: D.C. Court of Appeals notice of panels for October 17, 2006 & pages 1-3 of summary calendar for October 2006

Such formal motion, however is not necessary – in view of the Court's mandatory disciplinary responsibilities pursuant to Canon 3D of the Code of Judicial Conduct for the District of Columbia Courts, cited in the conclusion of my reply brief (p. 20). Indeed, as there has been no response to my April 4, 2006 letter to U.S. Attorney Kenneth Wainstein, entitled "NOTICE OF INTENT TO SEEK SANCTIONS AND DISCIPLINARY & CRIMINAL REFERRALS", annexed to my reply brief's Certificate of Service, it would not offend due process, but rather serve it, by rejecting the U.S. Attorney's opposing brief based upon the fact-specific, record-based showing of my reply brief. To assist the Court in so-doing, annexed as Exhibit H is the certified mail/return receipt for that April 4, 2006 letter, along with a further copy of the letter itself.

Ex. D: October 27, 2005 order (Judges Reid, Glickman, & Nebeker)

Ex. E: Sassower's January 10, 2006 letter to Chief Judge Washington with its two attachments

Ex. F: Sassower's February 22, 2006 judicial misconduct complaint to the D.C. Commission on Judicial Disabilities & Tenure

Ex. G-1: Sassower's March 16, 2006 motion for permission to file
G-2: Sassower's March 16, 2006 unopposed motion for a procedural order
G-3: D.C. Court of Appeals return notice, dated March 24, 2006

Ex. H: Sassower's April 4, 2006 letter to U.S. Attorney Wainstein with certified mail/return receipt

cc: U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia
ATT:
Florence Pan, Assistant U.S. Attorney
Roy W. McLeese, III,
Assistant U.S. Attorney
Professor David M. Zlotnick,
Counsel for *Amicus Curiae*
Professor Andrew Horwitz
Jonathan L. Katz, Esq., Counsel for *Amicus Curiae* D.C. National Lawyers Guild.