

GEORGE SASSOWER

16 LAKE STREET
WHITE PLAINS, N. Y. 10603

914-949-2169

September 18, 1996

Foreperson of the Grand Jury
c/o U.S. Attorney Faith S. Hochberg
U.S. Post Office & Courthouse Bldg.
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Dear Sir:

Pursuant to my constitutional First Amendment right to petition, my right to communicate with the grand jury (e.g. 18 U.S.C. §1504, §3332) and the "duty" of the grand jury to inquire into criminal activities, I respectfully request an invitation to testify and show you my extensive documented evidence of criminal activities in your judicial district.

I am mailing a copy of this letter to all those named herein and requesting that U.S. Attorney Faith S. Hochberg of the District of New Jersey to submit this letter to you, immediately after October 1, 1996, simultaneously with all responses received by and/or on behalf of those named herein by such date.

Defrauding the Federal Government.

1a. A federal judge, official, employee and serviceman can be sued in tort in his official or private capacity, as every federal judge and U.S. attorney is aware.

If he is sued in his official capacity, he is defended at federal cost and expense, by a federal attorney, provided any one of about 100 authorized officials certifies that the judge, official, employee or serviceman was "acting within the scope of his office or employment at the time of the incident out of which the claim arose" (28 U.S.C. §2679[d]), otherwise he defends himself, at his own cost and expense, and personally satisfies any judgment recovered.

Furthermore, before any official capacity suit can be entertained, at federal cost and expense, a 28 U.S.C. §2675[a] notice of claim must be filed, giving the government the opportunity of investigating the matter and amicably settling the claim, which need not be filed if it is a personal capacity action.

b. There are certain federal judges and officials from New York who are engaged in such activities as the larceny of judicial trust assets for personal benefit, bribery, extortion, diverting monies payable "to the federal court" to private pockets, and similar criminal activities.

Obviously, no authorized official, including the successive U.S. Attorneys in New Jersey, such as former U.S. Attorneys, SAMUEL A. ALITO, JR. or MICHAEL CHERTOFF, who will "scope" certify any federal judge or official engaged in such criminal activities, particularly those involved in diverting monies payable "to the federal court" to private pockets.

c. Nevertheless, although U.S. Attorneys Alito and Chertoff, and every other authorized official, refused to "scope" certify these judges and officials, these rogue judges and officials employing their "clout" of office, had U.S. Attorneys Alito and Chertoff represent them in their personal capacities, at federal cost and expense, before U.S. District Court Judge NICHOLAS H. POLITAN of New Jersey.

Exhibit "A" is a recently received letter, pursuant to a Freedom of Information Law, which reveals that there is no authorization in existence for the U.S. Attorney of New Jersey to provide such unlawful representation, at federal cost and expense.

According to one named federal official, the cost to the government, in underwriting these privately motivated rackets has been "staqqering" (New Jersey Law Journal, July 13, 1989).

d. When I moved to have recaptured in favor of the federal court/government those monies which were payable "to the federal court" but diverted to the private pockets of judges, their bagmen/cronies, it was not supported by either U.S. Attorney Alito or Chertoff, and not granted by Judge Politan, although federal entitlement to such monies were not denied.

When I moved to have the "extortion" payments being made by HYMAN RAFFE to the judicial bagmen, in order to avoid incarceration under a criminal conviction, which sums have reached "more than \$2,500,000" (Village Voice, June 6, 1989), Judge Politan threw me in jail for two (2) months, at federal cost and expense.

2. When former U.S. Attorney Alito and Judge Politan were sued, although no authorized official would "scope" certify their activities, they employed the "clout" of their office, and unlawfully obtained federal representation, at federal cost and expense.

3a. One of the prime judicial participants in this racket, who corrupted Judge Politan to pursue this illegal course of conduct is [former] Chief U.S. District Court Judge CHARLES L. BRIEANT of the Southern District of New York.

b. In the Judge Brieant world, you "pay-off" judges and/or their bagmen/cronies, and he will "fix" judges, such as Judge Politan, and their bagmen/cronies and provide them with immunity.

4. It is a fundamental proposition of American law that the prosecutor and judge must be prosecuted and judged by the same law that they prosecute and judge others.

I challenge any of those named herein to dispute the aforementioned facts, or articulate any justification for same.

5. I, and you, should inquire of U.S. Attorney Hochberg, what she is doing to recover such unlawful diverted and expended monies in favor of the federal government!

6. My documentation on the subject is massive, and I solicit your invitation to make a personal presentation. A mailed subpoena, without any fee, will be sufficient.

Most Respectfully,

GEORGE SASSOWER



U.S. Department of Justice

Office of Information and Privacy

Telephone: (202) 514-3642

Washington, D.C. 20530

JUL 25 1996

Mr. George Sassower
16 Lake Street
White Plains, NY 10603

Re: Appeal No. 96-1587
RLH:DAH:LAD

Dear Mr. Sassower:

You appealed from the action and/or inaction of the Executive Office for United States Attorneys on your requests for access to records pertaining to yourself.

You were advised by the EOUSA on May 2, 1996, that no records responsive to your request (No. 95-2976), could be located in the indices of that Office. It has been determined by my staff that its response was correct.

With regard to your request No. 95-2977, I have notified the EOUSA of your communication. Although the Act authorizes you to treat the failure of the EOUSA to act on this request within the specified time limit as a denial thereof, this Office, because it lacks the personnel resources to conduct the record reviews that are necessary to make initial determinations on requests for records, cannot act until there has been an initial determination by the component. Our function is limited to the review of those records to which access is in fact denied. You may appeal again to this Office when the component completes its action on your request No. 95-2977 if any of the material is denied. We will then open a new appeal and review the component's substantive action on your request.

If you consider my response to be a denial of your appeal, you may seek judicial review in the United States District Court for the judicial district in which you reside or have your principal place of business, or in the District of Columbia, which is also where the search was conducted for the records you seek.

Sincerely,

Richard L. Huff
Co-Director

Exhibit "A"