

1 2	BEFORE THE NEW YORK STATE SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
3	************
4	In the Matter
5	-of-
6	a Public Hearing to Consider the Nomination of Hon. Howard A. Levine as a Judge of the
7	Court of Appeals.
8	************
9	Hearing Room B
10	Legislative Office Building Empire State Plaza
11	Albany, New York
12	September 7, 1993 2:00 p.m.
13	PRESIDING:
14	SENATOR JOHN J. MARCHI, Acting Chairman, Senate Committee on Judiciary
15	PRESENT:
16	SENATOR RICHARD A. DOLLINGER
17	SENATOR HUGH T. FARLEY
18	SENATOR JOSEPH L. GALIBER
19	SENATOR EMANUEL R. GOLD
20	SENATOR FRANZ S. LEICHTER
21	SENATOR STEPHEN M. SALAND
22	SENATOR JOHN B. SHEFFER II
<i>4.</i> J	SENATOR RONALD B. STAFFORD
	kan kanangan di manangan di katalah saman di manangan di manangan di manangan di manangan di manangan di katal

1	SENATOR MICHAEL J. TULLY, JR.
2	SENATOR GUY J. VELELLA
3	SENATOR DALE M. VOLKER
4	EDWARD H. COLE, Counsel to the Committee
5	DAVID JAFFE, Counsel to Senator Marchi
6	
7	
8	
9	
0	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
0	
1	
2	
3	

I think

Thank you

1 face the very sensitive human issues which come 2 before the Court of Appeals each day. 3 I consider myself very fortunate to have had Justice Levine as a mentor during the formative years of my legal career, and I am 6 especially pleased to have been given the 7 opportunity today to enthusiastically support 8 his confirmation and, while so doing, to convey 9 my gratitude for the kindness shown a young law student almost 20 years ago. 10 11 Thank you. 12 SENATOR MARCHI: Yes. 13 it's a very fine note for you to express it here 14 today, and it certainly speaks volumes. 15 good. 16 MS. KRETSER: Thank you, Senator. 17 SENATOR MARCHI: Yes. 18 very much. 19 The next witness is Doris L. 20 Sassower, Director of the Ninth Judicial 21 Committee. 22 MS. SASSOWER: Good afternoon,

23

Senators.

1	SENATOR MARCHI: Ms. Sassower, I
2	just want to point out that the length of the
3	the meter isn't running but the length of
4	this presentation, 19 18 or 19 pages, you may
5	want to, in the interest of maintain
6	observing the ten-minute speaking time, you may
7	want to take some liberties in your narration.
8	MS. SASSOWER: I appreciate your
9	comment, Senator, but inasmuch as I am the only
10	opposition representing the public-at-large, I
11	hope, with your indulgence, that you will hear
12	what I have to say. I would also ask your in-
13	dulgence in having my daughter, Elena Ruth
14	Sassower, by my side. She is the coordinator of
15	the Ninth Judicial Committee, of which I am the
16	director.
17	SENATOR MARCHI: Perhaps if you
18	pull the mike a little closer to you.
19	MS. SASSOWER: Yes. Can you hear
20	me now? Thank you.
21	SENATOR GALIBER: Mr. Chairman.
22	SENATOR MARCHI: Yes, Senator
23	Galiber.

made a good observation on the length of this report, but you left it somewhat hanging by the person who prepared the testimony, so I'm hoping that we will hear her out. Is there still a time limit on this, or --

SENATOR FARLEY: We have to go in at 4:00, so --

SENATOR MARCHI: Well, we have -- we have required that all the speakers express themselves within the limits of ten minutes.

SENATOR GALIBER: O.K. Thank you.

And so far we

have not been -- they've all honored that requirement, but if you want an extra 60 seconds, now the meter is on you.

SENATOR MARCHI:

MS. SASSOWER: May I say, Senator, that I did speak to your -- the counsel, Ned
Cole, concerning the fact that other members of
our committee wished to come up and add to the
testimony, and it was agreed that, rather than
having them each speak for ten minutes, I -that they would yield their time to me and I

1 would present the point of view that we wish to 2 impart to the Committee. MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman. 3 4 MS. SASSOWER: (Talking over) In 5 any event, I will do my best to be through as soon as I can. 6 7 MR. COLE: If I may --SENATOR MARCHI: Yes, Counsel. 8 -- if I could take a 9 MR. COLE: couple minutes, if I may respond to that. 10 were never given any assurances. I told you I 11 did not have the authorization to extend it over 12 ten minutes but, if there were questions asked, 13 it would probably go over ten minutes, and your 14 15 other witness was going to come to talk about 16 the Ninth Judicial Committee which did not seem 17 to have -- to be pertinent to this hearing on 18 Judge Levine, so there was no such agreement, in 19 my opinion. 20 MS. SASSOWER: I differ from you, 21 but in any event --22 SENATOR MARCHI: If there are 23 questions, it's not on your time.

MS. SASSOWER: (Talking over) -may I say that I have anticipated in my remarks
some of the questions that I know you would want
to ask and, of course, I would be available at
the conclusion to answer any that you may have
in addition.

I am here today as director of the Ninth Judicial Committee, a non-partisan "grass roots" citizens' group formed in 1989 to improve the quality of the judiciary in the Ninth Judicial District, comprising the five counties of Westchester, Putnam, Dutchess, Rockland and Orange.

In September 1990, our group

spearheaded the case of Castracan against

Colavita, an historic case challenging a

political deal involving cross-endorsements of

seven judgeships, implemented at judicial

nominating conventions conducted in violation of

the election law.

Justice Howard Levine sat on the Appellate Division, Third Department panel that decided Castracan on appeal. Its May 2, 1992

decision affirming the lower court's dismissal on other grounds, and its subsequent two-sentence October 17, 1991 decision denying petitioners' motion for re-argument, renewal, recusal and, alternatively, for leave to appeal to the Court of Appeals, show convincingly that Justice Levine's elevation to this state's highest court not only disserves the public interest, but jeopardizes it.

Copies of both those decisions, as well as petitioners' reargument motion and supporting memorandum are included in the compendium of documents assembled to assist you in evaluating the substantial nature of this opposition to Justice Levine and the need for full review of the files in this case.

Before I proceed further, may I inquire as to whether you all have received copies of the compendium? I would assume.

SENATOR GOLD: We received copies, and I can say in my case I've read them all and read your remarks in advance, which may make you want to understand what Senator Marchi

CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER

was saying about condensing your remarks because we have already studied them.

MS. SASSOWER: I appreciate that, but this is intended to be a public hearing, Senator, and I would hope that the public has an equal right of access to the remarks that I have to make here today.

SENATOR GOLD: You want it public; why don't you see what I have here.

MS. SASSOWER: I don't know how you Senators make your personnel decisions, but I would suspect that you would normally want to know more about how a person performs a job and what they have done lately than how they might perform abstractly in the future or how they performed many years before in different areas.

The job of a judge is judging, and by way of overview, I would say, and based on my own direct personal knowledge and not hearsay, Justice Levine's on-the-job performance as demonstrated by his participation in <a href="Castracan">Castracan</a>, shows.

(1) disregard for ethical

conflict of interest rules applicable to judges 1 who are required to disqualify themselves where 2 3 their impartiality might reasonably be questioned; 5 (2) disregard for controlling law and the public interest which requires 6 7 adjudication of the case on the merits rather 8 than dismissal based on factually and legally 9 inappropriate procedural technicalities, applied 10 in a one-sided manner; 11 (3) indifference to the profound 12 constitutional, legal and public policy issues raised by the case, requiring at the very least 13 the granting of leave to appeal to the Court of 14 15 Appeals, which was denied; 16 (4) failure to perform his duty 17 to correct the lower court's deliberate 18 disregard for elementary legal standards and 19 willful misrepresentation of the factual record; 20 and 21 (5) disregard for ethical rules 22 requiring initiation of appropriate disciplinary

measures against lawyers and judges for

unprofessional conduct, about which this case made him aware.

No confirmation of this most important nomination should properly proceed unless and until there is a full review of the Castracan against Colavita files by the members of this Committee. Such review would support the public perception that what was done by the Appellate Division, Third Department, with Justice Levine's knowledge and consent, was a cover-up of the lower court's misconduct as well as a deliberate perpetuation of the manipulation of judgeships by the two major political parties, directly being challenged by the Castracan case.

Indeed, the question the public has a right to have answered, and which this Committee is in an unique position to explore, is whether Justice Levine would be here today for confirmation had he properly performed his adjudicative duties in Castracan against Colavita.

The 1988 report of the New York

State Commission on Government Integrity entitled, "BECOMING A JUDGE: Report on the Failings of Judicial Elections in New York State," reflects the fact that sitting judges facing reelection or looking for advancement on the bench are subject to political pressures in conflict with their judicial obligations. It is quite plain that Justice Levine, a top contender for appointment to the Court of Appeals for many years, whose elective term expires next year, would not have wished to jeopardize the support of his political patrons.

There can be no doubt that a decision in favor of the Castracan petitioners by Justice Levine would have had severe repercussions on his career. Consequently, an already cynical public might well perceive that Governor Cuomo's nomination of Justice Levine to the Court of Appeals is a payback for his having protected not the public but the political powers that control "judge-making".

Justice Levine's performance in the Castracan case gives unmistakable evidence

that he lacks the independence of mind and moral courage to chart a course consistent with applicable ethical standards, notwithstanding the comments of Presiding Justice Leonard Weiss as to his moral and ethical strength, where to do so would cause him to diverge from his colleagues. Such path might have precluded his consideration for this exalted appointment.

Before presenting further

specifics, I believe it appropriate to state my

relevant credentials. Since graduation cum

laude from New York University Law School in

1955, I have devoted most of my professional

life to the cause of legal and judicial reform.

In 1956, I worked as an assistant to Arthur T.

Vanderbilt, then chief justice of New Jersey's

highest court, credited with having led the

reform of New Jersey's archaic judicial system,

turning it into one of the most modest -- modern

justice systems in the country.

SENATOR MARCHI: Yes. I just want to point out that you still have two minutes, if you can summarize.

1	MS. SASSOWER: I
2	SENATOR MARCHI: most
3	expeditiously.
4	MS. SASSOWER: I have tried as
5	hard as I could to condense the presentation
6	into the minimum amount of time. However, with
7	all due respect, due to the extent of the
8	judicial misconduct involved on the part of
9	Justice Levine and others in the Castracan
10	against Colavita case, I could not consolidate
11	my presentation any any further than I
12	already have. I hope you will bear with me for
13	the sake of the public interest involved.
14	SENATOR MARCHI: I'm sorry, I
15	have to I have to
16	MS. SASSOWER: As president of
17	the New York Women's Bar Association
18	SENATOR MARCHI: limit you to
19	the two minutes. We have here, through your
20	prescience, a copy of your remarks and
21	MS. SASSOWER: I beg pardon?
22	SENATOR MARCHI: I said, if you
23	will go ahead and do your best

MS. SASSOWER: I'll do my best.

SENATOR MARCHI: -- to condense

your statement within the two minutes.

MS. SASSOWER: As president of the New York Women's Bar Association from 1968 to 1969 -- and that's 25 years ago, Senators -- I likewise sought to improve the quality of justice and the judiciary.

In 1971, I served on one of the first pre-nomination judicial screening panels set up to improve selection of Supreme Court judges in the First Department. My article recounting that experience, published on the front page of the New York Law Journal led to the renaming of the Judiciary Committee of the New York State Bar Association as the Judicial Selection Committee and to my appointment as the first woman ever to serve on such a committee.

In that capacity from 1972 to

1980, I interviewed and evaluated the

qualifications of every judicial candidate

during that eight-year period for the Court of

Appeals, as well as for the Appellate Division

and the Court of Claims. Indeed, my acquaintance with Archibald Murray, now president of the
New York State Bar Association and here today on
behalf of Justice Levine, goes back to the days
when he joined me as a member of the State Bar's
Judicial Selection Committee.

I, myself, was nominated as a candidate for the Court of Appeals in 1972 and also served as an elected delegate to several judicial nominating conventions.

Throughout my years in my own private practice, I had the highest rating of A V given by Martindale Hubbell's Law Directory, and in June 1989 I was honored by election to the Fellows of the American Bar Foundation, an honor reserved for less than one percent of the practicing bar in each state.

In September 1990, I became counsel to the Ninth Judicial Committee and to the petitioners in the case of Castracan vs.

Colavita. I acted as such counsel pro bono from the inception of the case in Supreme Court of Albany County through the decision on appeal to

Appellate Division, Third Department, rendered May 2, 1991.

In Castracan, Justice Levine was presented with a case of extraordinary public concern involving the sanctity of the franchise and the integrity and independence of the The petition centered on Election judiciary. Law violations occurring at the judicial nominating conventions of both major parties, so fundamental and fatal as to require that the certificates of nomination be voided. included the lack of a quorum and the lack of a roll call at the Democratic judicial nominating convention, and the fact that at the Republican judicial nominating convention Anthony Colavita, the Westchester Republican County Chairman and former state Republican Party chairman, acted in a proscribed dual capacity as both convenor of that convention and as its permanent chairman.

SENATOR MARCHI: Yes. Mrs.

Sassower, we have your statement. If there are questions.

SENATOR DOLLINGER: Mr. Chairman,

23

1

2

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1		I just have a couple questions for the witness.
2		I've read the materials that you provided, Mrs.
3		Sassower, and my question is really pretty
4		simple.
5		Other than the materials that you
6		have presented here today, have you had any
7		judicial experience with Judge Levine in his
8		capacity as a member of the Appellate Division,
9		Third Department?
10		MS. SASSOWER: Yes.
11		SENATOR DOLLINGER: Other than in
12		Castracan?
13		MS. SASSOWER: No.
14	-	SENATOR DOLLINGER: O.K.
15		MS. SASSOWER: That experience is
16		sufficient for me to base my views and opinions
17		on.
18		SENATOR DOLLINGER: All right.
19	-	O.K.
20	T. W.	MS. SASSOWER: I do submit
21		SENATOR DOLLINGER: And that is
22		based
23		MS. SASSOWER: Most

1		respectfully.
2		SENATOR DOLLINGER: And that is
3		based on your statement and the materials that
4		were submitted is the full discussion of
5		Castracan.
6		MS. SASSOWER: No, not by a long
7		shot, Senator.
8		SENATOR DOLLINGER: O.K., if you
9		could just
10		MS. SASSOWER: I have brought
11		with me the entire files
12		SENATOR DOLLINGER: O.K.
13		MS. SASSOWER: in Castracan
14		against Colavita, in fact, two separate sets of
15		those files were duplicated and sent over to
16		your office at my request.
17		SENATOR DOLLINGER: O.K. O.K.
18		So we've got your material here. My question
19		is, do you have any other personal experiences
20	·	on which you could make a judgment about Judge
21		Levine's character, his fitness for this
22		position, his past record and both as a Family
23		Court judge and Appellate Division judge, as a
	1	

1	prosecutor and his experience with families and
2	children, which are some of the issues that have
3	been discussed today; do you have any experience
4	with Judge Levine on those issues, yes or no?
5	MS. SASSOWER: Senator, my
6	testimony is set forth in the statement that you
7	have.
8	SENATOR DOLLINGER: And I don't
9	see anything
10	MS. SASSOWER: And I have
11	extensively tried to highlight the most
12	significant aspects of his performance in a case
13	that was before him
14	SENATOR DOLLINGER: I Mrs.
15	Sassower, if you'll excuse me, I don't mean to
16	interrupt.
17	MS. SASSOWER: less than two
18	years ago.
19	SENATOR DOLLINGER: but I I
20	really I'm really going to take that as a no,
21	the answer to my question of whether you have
22	further personal experience.
23	MS. SASSOWER: If you're asking,

1 I have no other personal experience with him in 2 Family Court of 30 years ago or when he was a 3 D.A. 25 years ago or any other time. giving you information which I have taken the time and effort on behalf of the Ninth Judicial 5 Committee and the public-at-large as well as the 6 7 -- the million and a half or two million residents of the Ninth Judicial District. 8 9 SENATOR DOLLINGER: O.K., but 10 just so it's clear to me as a member of this 11 Committee, you have no other personal experience 12 or no other light to shed on the character of this nominee or his judicial fitness or legal 13 fitness to be a member of the New York Court of 14 Appeals other than the material that you've 15 16 cited with respect to that one case, in which you were a litigant in that case? 17 18 MS. SASSOWER: No, I was not a 19 litigant. 20 SENATOR DOLLINGER: Excuse me, 2 1 you were representing the litigant.

MS. SASSOWER:

counsel, and I was acting as stated pro bono in

No, I was the

22

1 the public interest in order to protect the 2 rights which were violated. 3 SENATOR DOLLINGER: O.K., but you have no other personal experience. 5 MS. SASSOWER: I have the experience of this case. 7 SENATOR DOLLINGER: The answer to 8 my question then is no. 9 MS. SASSOWER: And I don't refer 10 to any other cases that Judge Levine had except that there was -- I do not quite follow your 11 12 If a person has committed a murder, the drift. fact that he has been an honorable person all 13 14 his life, or as in the case of Chief Judge Wachtler has been an honorable chief judge until 15 he committed a crime, he is then brought to 16 17 account, and we, as persons concerned with our legal and ethical responsibilities as lawyers, 18 must make known the facts that shed light on 19 20 that misconduct. 21

It seems to me you would want, as holders of the public trust, to know more about what I came to talk about, which is what was

22

1	done specifically by Justice Levine in that
2	case, not not to discuss abstractly what he
3	might do when he's if he is going to be
4	crowned confirmed today by the Senate and the
5	Court of Appeals.
6	SENATOR GOLD: Ms. Sassower.
7	SENATOR DOLLINGER: I'll yield to
8	my colleague, Senator Gold.
9	MS. SASSOWER: I'll answer those
10	questions but as a judge who was elected, as
11	long as we have elections, the public has a
12	right to ask that elected official to account
13	for what he has done in the past
14	SENATOR GOLD: Mrs. Sassower.
15	MS. SASSOWER: And that's what we
16	are asking specifically with respect to how did
17	he how did he handle his
18	SENATOR MARCHI: Senator Gold.
19	MS. SASSOWER: How did he handle
20	his judicial duties on this case?
21	SENATOR GOLD: Mrs. Sassower
22	MS. SASSOWER: He said he would
23	answer questions, according to the news report

1	that appeared in the Gannett paper on Saturday
2	today.
3	SENATOR GOLD: Mrs. Sassower.
4	MS. SASSOWER: Or at the request
5	of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and I
6	SENATOR GOLD: Mrs. Sassower
7	MS. SASSOWER: have a great
8	many questions to suggest to you.
9	SENATOR GOLD: Yeah. Mrs.
10	Sassower, I take my responsibility very
11	seriously and to tell you the truth I'm very
12	glad that, if you have a point of view, that you
13	came forward and giving us the time.
14	One thing, let me just say this
15	though, I want the record to be clear about one
16	thing: I think it's important that you came
17	forward with your information, but I think that
18	when
19	MS. SASSOWER: Thank you,
20	Senator.
21	SENATOR GOLD: I think that when
22	you say that there were some people here who
23	spoke in favor of the judge but that you're

speaking for the public, I think that's untrue. I think everybody here, Judge Casey and everyone, is doing a public service when they come forward and give their opinion, whether it agrees with you or it doesn't.

In terms of making our judgments, I think the record should indicate, since you made reference to it, that there is a document; it says Ninth Judicial Committee, Table of Contents, and it's got a number of pages all clearly marked, which you have submitted and I've read, and I will tell you that, based upon my experience with this Judiciary Committee, we have a tendency, Mrs. Sassower, to read more slowly those comments made that are negative than positive, so I can assure you that, when I cast my vote today, it will be after having very carefully considered the documents that you have submitted.

I also --

MS. SASSOWER: I think --

SENATOR GOLD: I also -- excuse

me, Ma'am. I also, and I hope that the former

witnesses will not be insulted by my saying this but while some of the more favorable comments were being made about Judge Levine, I took the liberty of taking a sneak at your comments so that I could give them a fair deliberation; so I want you to understand that whether or not you have an opportunity to read every single word you prepared, I want you to know from my point of view -- and I think this may go for others too -- we have read every word.

I'm curious about one thing though. On page 4, you say something and, of course, you know, when you get into procedures like this where people are in some degree secured from libel and slander, people make innuendos and make remarks, and it should be a freedom, I agree with that particular concept, but you suggest that a cynical public might perceive Governor Cuomo's nomination to be a payback for those who are dealing with judgemaking in a certain way.

Are you aware of the fact that Governor Cuomo has, for years, stated he wants

appointed judges and doesn't believe in elected 1 judges? Isn't it kind of wild that he would give 2 a preference to a judge who you say went out of 3 his way to vote for the status quo when one of 4 the major planks of Governor Cuomo's judicial 5 6 reform ideas is to change that process? MS. SASSOWER: Senator, if you will refer in your compendium to my letter dated 8 9 October 24, 1991 addressed to Governor Cuomo --10 SENATOR GOLD: I read it. 11 MS. SASSOWER: And that's at page 104 -- you will, if you read it carefully --12 13 SENATOR GOLD: I read the 14 letter. 15 MS. SASSOWER: -- recognize that 16 the deal that occurred in 1989 which was the 17 subject of the Castracan against Colavita 18 challenge, was a deal that was put together by the party leadership of Westchester County and 19 20 the --21 SENATOR GOLD: No, I don't think 22 -- I don't think you heard my question, all 23 right?

1 MS. SASSOWER: I heard -- I heard 2 your question. 3 SENATOR GOLD: I don't think you 4 heard my question. 5 MS. SASSOWER: Your question --6 SENATOR GOLD: I read your 7 letter. I read the references to Mr. Fredman; I read the material. What I'm saying to you, 8 9 though, is that in my opinion, in my opinion, 10 your sentence at the top of page 4 dealing with 11 Governor Cuomo is a cheap shot because the Governor -- you're implying that the Governor 12 would reward somebody who is dedicated to a 13 system which you say is outrageous without --14 15 and without making that judgment, the fact is that Governor Cuomo supports appointed judges. 16 17 He does not support a system that you say this 18 judge went out of his way to secure in an 19 illegal decision. 20 MS. SASSOWER: Senator, I would 21 be happy to discuss that subject at great 22 length, and I have the answers, but I have the 23 proof as to what I say all laid out in very

concise form, and rather than spending the time that it would take me to give you a full and complete response to that subject, it seems to me it would be more expeditious if you would hear me out on the specifics, the specifics that are documented and subject to proof, not the hearsay on which you say you relied when you say everything you have heard about Justice Levine does -- gives you reason to confirm his nomination.

Now, I will give you --

SENATOR GOLD: Madam, I don't know where you got that last comment from, but I haven't made any such statement along that line.

MS. SASSOWER: I took it down.

SENATOR GOLD: I haven't made any such statement along those lines. I was just -- I felt it's my obligation, you see in a courtroom you have litigants there, one can speak the other can speak. Right now, while Mario Cuomo does not need my help and I don't mean to suggest he does, I think it's a cheap

shot to say that the Governor --

6.

MS. SASSOWER: Well, I'm sorry you feel that way.

SENATOR GOLD: I think it's a cheap shot to say that a governor who does not agree with a certain system would give a political pay-off to someone in that system if all you said is true. It just -- there's no logic to it, and it's a cheap shot.

MS. SASSOWER: I'm sorry that you feel that way, sir. It is not an accurate analysis of the question because no one ever suggested that simply by virtue of appointing a judge, you are thereby eliminating politics from the judiciary. That is far from reality.

It is a reality, a political reality, that appointment offers control of the judiciary, just as much as elect -- as the elective process, unless it is carefully and strictly regulated. Those safeguards have to be there. Otherwise, you have appointed judges who are just as corrupt politically, just as dishonest, just as incompetent as elected

1 judges. 2 SENATOR GOLD: Mrs. Sassower, I happen to agree with that, believe it or not. 3 4 MS. SASSOWER: I'm glad you agree 5 with something. 6 SENATOR GOLD: I don't happen to agree with the Governor's philosophy. 7 8 MS. SASSOWER: I'm glad you agree 9 with something. 10 SENATOR GOLD: But we are -- now, 11 let's talk about what we have here. 12 MS. SASSOWER: Yes. I'd like 13 to. 14 SENATOR GOLD: Right now, we have a system that is not involved with county 15 leaders in politics. We have a system whereby 16 there are screening panels, et cetera, et 17 cetera, and they came forth with names, and that 18 panel of distinguished people, after making 19 20 their investigation, gave the Governor a list of names and, by the way -- and by the way, this 21 appointee today, the nominee today, has been on 22 that panel before, so this wasn't someone --

1	MS. SASSOWER: I know that.
2	SENATOR GOLD: So this wasn't
3	someone, as I understand it, who was grabbed out
4	of nowhere in order to reward that individual
5	for a 1989 case. As I understand it, the
6	individual has been on this list.
7	MS. SASSOWER: '91.
8	SENATOR GOLD: Pardon me?
9	MS. SASSOWER: The decision was
10	in '91.
11	SENATOR GOLD: '91; excuse me.
12	Better yet. Better yet. It wasn't somebody who
13	was picked out of nowhere for a '91 case but
14	someone who was thought highly of for years
15	before, and what I am suggesting to you is that
16	isn't it a fact that we have this process and
17	the process is allowing you to say negative,
18	others to say positives, and then we will vote
19	and we may or may not agree with you.
20	MS. SASSOWER: The problem is
21	SENATOR MARCHI: Mrs. Sassower.
22	MS. SASSOWER: The problem is,
23	you haven't allowed me to complete my
. 1	·

1	presentation.
2	SENATOR MARCHI: Senator Gold
3	Senator Gold has made a really deserves the
4	gratitude of the Committee because he has stated
5	very eloquently, I think, the procedures that we
6	have been following.
7	MRS. SASSOWER: Well, it's quite
8	obvious you don't want to hear the presentation.
9	SENATOR MARCHI: Now, I'm not
10	going to indulge the Committee has been very,
11	very indulgent, and so I'm excusing you from
12	further testimony. Thank you.
13	MS. SASSOWER: May I say only
14	that if the
15	SENATOR MARCHI: Unless I hear to
16	the contrary (Mrs. Sassower talking over).
17	SENATOR GALIBER: There are no
18	further questions.
19	SENATOR MARCHI: There are no
20	other questions.
21	MS. SASSOWER: You, Senator Gold,
22	on behalf of the judicial nominating panel that
23	nominated Justice Levine

1	SENATOR MARCHI: Mrs. Sassower,
2	you are excused.
3	MS. SASSOWER: knew that
4	SENATOR MARCHI: And I instruct
5	the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort you to the door.
6	. MS. SASSOWER: to testify
7	concerning the persons that made that
8	nomination.
9	MS. ELENA SASSOWER: We will
10	continue our remarks for the press and for any
11	public who wishes to hear. Obviously, the
12	Senators are not interested in you knowing the
13	facts of the case and the facts documented by
14	Castracan versus Colavita. They raise serious
15	questions.
16	SENATOR GALIBER: Mr. Chairman, we
17	don't have to take this stuff.
18	SENATOR MARCHI: We have been very
19	indulgent, Mrs. Sassower, thank you for
20	appearing but
21	MS. SASSOWER: Thank you very
22	much for your hospitality.
23	SENATOR MARCHI: we must get on

1 with our work.

opinions.

2 MS. ELENA SASSOWER: What is your work, rubber stamping or getting evidence? 3 4 have brought the file. The files are documentary proof of what went on in that case. 5 They're not platitudes; they're not euphemisms,

> SENATOR SALAND: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman.

> > SENATOR SALAND:

and they're not speculations and they're not

SENATOR MARCHI: Senator Saland.

I appreciate the fervor and passion of Mrs. Sassower and her assistant. I think you've been indulgent. Senator Gold certainly has been appropriate in his comments. I've seen here today, the kind of painting with the broadest kind of brush for a candidate of the Court of Appeals who ruled in a case as one of five. We obviously are in the midst of a quest of some kind. Your fervor again, your comments are certainly yours, but this forum has been more than indulgent; it's not here for you to attempt to make a mockery of

1 the process. 2 It's not here for you to attempt 3 to demean an individual who has served well and served admirably. This is a process which you 4 5 sought to take advantage of by way of grand-6 standing because all other avenues were shut off 7 to you. This was more than gracious to you. 8 MS. SASSOWER: This is a forum 9 for the public to know the true facts 10 behind this nomination and to make an 11 evaluation. 12 MS. ELENA SASSOWER: The record 13 speaks for itself. 14 SENATOR SALAND: The true facts 15 were heard; the true facts were heard at length. You can pursue your windmills in any 16 17 fashion you'd like. 18 SENATOR MARCHI: You are 19 excused. 20 MS. SASSOWER: May I just say on a point of personal privilege, in response to 21 22 the remarks. 23 SENATOR SALAND: I have no status

to grant you a point of personal privilege.
MS. SASSOWER: May I ask your
indulgence?
SENATOR SALAND: You may ask my
indulgence if you'd like when this hearing is
over?
SENATOR VELELLA: Are there any
other witnesses?
SENATOR MARCHI: Pardon?
SENATOR VELELLA: Are there
further witnesses?
SENATOR MARCHI: No, there are no
further witnesses.
MS. ELENA SASSOWER: Perhaps
Justice Levine would like to speak up on this
subject of the right of the people to hear the
facts in a particular case. You should have no
fear, if he thinks he has nothing to fear.
SENATOR GOLD: Mr. Chairman.
SENATOR VELELLA: I would like to
have the Sergeant-at-Arms take the name of this
witness and perhaps the Committee might consider
some action later. She hasn't been sworn in;

1 she's not a witness. We don't know who she is. She's an unidentified person and she's trying to 2 3 make a mockery of this procedure. 4 SENATOR MARCHI: Well, we won't 5 leap to any conclusions, but you are excused, and any further outbursts on your part, I'm 6 7 going to request the Sergeant-at-Arms to escort 8 you out of the chamber. 9 Are there any other witnesses? 10 SENATOR FARLEY: Mr. Chairman. 11 MS. ELENA SASSOWER: This was 12 done in the presence of the press. There is no 13 shame on the part of this body that they are 14 suppressing testimony. 15 SENATOR MARCHI: Are there any 16 other --17 MS. ELENA SASSOWER: Testimony that is documented so that you have a proper 18 understanding of this nominee for appointment to 19 20 the high court of this state. 21 MR. COLE: Mr. Chairman, there is a statement submitted to the Senate Judiciary 22 23 Committee. It is by Eli Vigliano. He asked

1 that it be submitted and put in the record and 2 if you will so permit, I will give it to the 3 reporter to put in the record. 4 SENATOR GOLD: No objection. 5 SENATOR MARCHI: No objections? 6 Very well. 7 All right. We have had -- I want to thank the --8 9 MS. SASSOWER: Why don't you read 10 it? 11 SENATOR MARCHI: -- those who 12 have testified here today. I regret the circumstances of the last appearance. 13 Nevertheless, the Committee has heard from those 14 who have been willing to place their -- their 15 objective consideration and judgment on an 16 awesome responsibility. The Court of Appeals 17 holds very envious position nationally. It has 18 been a central generator of established law in 19 this country for -- for many decades, and we 20 21 take this responsibility very seriously and believe that we should consider the nominee and 22 23 take -- take action with the committee.

1	Senator Farley.
2	SENATOR FARLEY: Thank you, Mr.
3	Chairman.
4	Let me just say that, in all the
5	years that I have known Howard Levine, I don't
6	know anybody that has a finer judicial tempera-
7	ment, that is a finer human being and father,
8	but all of this years that he has served the
9	public as an outstanding lawyer, district
10	attorney, and as a Family Court judge, it is
11	renowned throughout the United States, his
12	tenure as a Family Court judge and his concern
13	for children.
14	It is with enthusiasm that I move
15	his confirmation, Mr. Chairman.
16	SENATOR GALIBER: Second.
17	SENATOR MARCHI: Senator
18	Galiber.
19	SENATOR GALIBER: I would
20	second.
21	SENATOR MARCHI: Moved and
22	seconded.
23	SENATOR GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

1 SENATOR MARCHI: Yes, Senator 2 Gold. 3 SENATOR GOLD: Yeah. I want to 4 second also, but I wanted to just indicate the basis upon which I am going to vote. 5 6 As I said, and I'll make it 7 brief, I think that it would be a very foolish 8 concept if members of this Committee did not 9 take very seriously negative comments made as 10 regards nominees. We had at least one 11 experience this year where I think everyone, Democrat and Republican alike was very much 12 appreciative of the work of now Judge Chris Mega 13 in making sure that a particular judge had a 14 15 hearing, and I think, Senator Marchi, you are carrying out that same obligation. 16 17 I am not rubber stamping 18 anything. I think the record will indicate that I have voted no on judges, very vocally, and on 19 20 more than one occasion, and I certainly would not appreciate being called a rubber stamp. 21 22 I have already made my comments

23

about the way the Governor is handled in the

statement of Mrs. Sassower. I think unfortunately, Judge Levine was treated in similar fashion in that there is innuendo, there is a statement of conclusion that is set forth as if it was factual.

The only facts I've gotten from reading a lot of documents submitted by Mrs. Sassower is that apparently she did not agree with what happened in this case, does not agree with certain concepts which are lawful within the state of New York. I think this legislative body and the Governor have rights to change some of those concepts. On the other hand, I think that every candidate for public office has a right to live within those concepts while they are law.

I heard about Judge Levine prior to meeting him today. I have read the documents that were submitted by other people. I take as seriously as I take the testimony of Mrs.

Sassower, the testimony of Judge Casey and Mr.

Murray and Rachel Kretser, and I think that I would be doing a grave, grave injustice to the

people of this state and the people that I represent if I didn't very, very wholeheartedly support Judge Levine, and I so vote.

SENATOR MARCHI: Senator Dollinger.

SENATOR DOLLINGER: Mr. Chairman, I'll also be brief since I was one of those who questioned Mrs. Sassower.

I have read the materials. Ι guess I strongly disagree with the conclusion Mrs. Sassower draws from these facts. I, frankly, draw a very heartening conclusion from the fact the judge was willing to apply the rules of law, some procedural. Obviously the Third Department in its opinion applied procedure rules that deal with joinder of parties, which is an important aspect endorsed by this Legislature, a part of our Civil Practice Law and Rules, one of the laws that we created to govern the rights of the people of this state. Also the issues of whether proper -- parties had been properly served, whether they had been given notice and an opportunity to

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

defend themselves, another very significant part of the legislative action of this body in creating a rule that said we're not going to allow people to sue a party, affect their interest and not give them notice of that interest when the papers are served.

vitally important parts of what we have done legislatively to balance the interests of litigants and to try to obtain justice. I draw the heartening conclusion from all of this, while there may be an underlying political dispute in Westchester County over this, quote, "deal," I am pleased that the courts of our state have properly applied the law as set forth by this Legislature in the rules and procedure for governing these cases.

I draw a distinctly different conclusion from this case, one that says that the rule of law is paramount and that those who come into our courts have to abide by it.

I commend Justice Levine and others, as Senator Gold has pointed out the

issue of the involvement in politics in the judiciary is one that I think has been a subject of great discussion in this state, of whether we ought to elect or appoint judges. At this stage in our history, we have not removed politics from our judiciary completely. I doubt we ever will.

The answer is, I draw a very

The answer is, I draw a very heartening conclusion that the proper rules of law were applied, that the rules that we set in this Legislature were followed in this case. I draw no adverse inference from it. As I asked Mrs. Sassower, she has no other experience.

The overwhelming evidence in this case is that this is a man of compassion, a man of understanding, and a man who will be a very good judge in the New York Court of Appeals.

I'll be voting yes.

SENATOR MARCHI: Yes. Any further

commentary?

Senator Saland.

SENATOR SALAND: If I may,

Senator Marchi.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

1

The submissions we've received from every association that has commented on Judge Levine's nomination have been all favorable. He's been approved as a nominee; he's been rated very qualified as a nominee. We've heard testimony across a broad spectrum of the range of his experience, people who have served with him as a colleague, people who have had the opportunity to work with him, people who knew him as far back as some 30 years ago. the exception of the somewhat bombastic and I would think intemperate comments that we heard by Ms. Sassower, they were uniformly the most favorable of comments that I have heard during my service in this house and on this Committee.

I have had the opportunity in prior confirmation hearings to vote against a proposed nominee, voted against a proposed nominee for the judiciary on the floor as well. I take this job seriously; I spent several hours going over papers that were submitted to us in advance, and I must tell you that I very

1 wholeheartedly without the slightest bit of 2 equivocation, would support Judge Levine for the 3 Court of Appeals or any other judicial position that he might aspire to. The man is worthy of 4 our support and shouldn't be besmirched by the 5 6 passions of a particular cause by a particular 7 advocate. 8 SENATOR MARCHI: Well, it's very 9 obvious 10 MS. SASSOWER: Would you permit 11 us --12 SENATOR MARCHI: It's very obvious that the -- the thrust has been one of positive, 13 14 a rich array of testimony that we have received from people that we respect who have the respect 15 of people of this state, all supportive of Judge 16 17 Levine's nomination and if the past is prologue, Judge, I think it will serve us all well. 18 19 I recognize Senator Farley. 20 SENATOR FARLEY: Thank you, Mr. 21 Chairman. 22 Let me just say that I appreciate

the support and the confidence of my colleagues

1 here on behalf of Judge Levine. In all the years that I've served in this Senate, I don't 2 think that there's anybody who has come before 3 us for appointment to the Court of Appeals or for any judgeship who is more eminently 5 6 qualified than Howard Levine. 7 He's the pride of this whole He's served not only his family well, 8 area. he's served this state well. Judge Levine, the 9 10 legal background he has with all of his children and his daughter-in-law and son-in-law is all 11 legal, and, Judge Levine, we're very, very proud 12 of you, and I'm sure that when we go into 13 session which we will do very shortly, that 14 15 you're going to be unanimously confirmed by the New York State Senate. Congratulations. 16 17 JUDGE LEVINE: Thank you very, 18 very much. 19 MS. SASSOWER: Mr. Chairman, Mr. 20 Chairman, will you be --21 SENATOR GOLD: Want to take a 22 formal vote?

SENATOR FARLEY: Maybe we better

1	call the roll.
2	SENATOR MARCHI: Please call the
3	roll.
4	MS. FONTANA: Senator Marchi.
5	SENATOR MARCHI: Aye.
6	MS. FONTANA: Senator Stafford.
7	SENATOR STAFFORD: Aye.
8	MS. FONTANA: Senator Volker in
9	the affirmative.
10	Senator Farley.
11	SENATOR FARLEY: Aye.
12	MS. FONTANA: Senator Tully.
13	SENATOR TULLY: Aye.
14	MS. FONTANA: Senator Velella.
15	SENATOR VELELLA: Aye.
16	MS. FONTANA: Senator Saland.
17	SENATOR SALAND: Aye.
18	MS. FONTANA: Senator Leichter in
19	the affirmative.
20	SENATOR MARCHI: Yes, he's
21	indicated that he was in the affirmative.
22	MS. FONTANA: Senator Galiber.
23	SENATOR GALIBER: Yes.

1	MS. FONTANA: Senator Gold.
2	SENATOR GOLD: Yes.
3	MS. FONTANA: Senator Dollinger.
4	SENATOR DOLLINGER: Aye.
5	MS. FONTANA: Senator Espada in
6	the affirmative. I'm awaiting votes from
7	Senators Levy, Sheffer, Connor, Solomon.
8	SENATOR MARCHI: Well, we'll
9	adjourn to another forum.
10	(Applause)
11	(Whereupon, at 4:03 p.m., the
12	hearing was concluded.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	