UNITED STATED DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

---

CENTER FOR JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY, Inc.
and ELENA RUTH SASSOWER, individually and
as director of the Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc.,
*acting on their own behalf and on behalf of the People*
*of the State of New York & the Public Interest*,

Plaintiffs,

25-CV-8370
(Jury Trial Demanded)

Plaintiffs' June 4, 2026 Affidavit
for Disqualification/Disclosure
Pursuant to 28 USC §§144, 455

LEGISLATIVE CORRESPONDENTS ASSOCIATION, Inc.,
[and 33 other defendants]
*being representative of other New York & national media*,

Defendants.

---

STATE OF NEW YORK )
COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER ) ss:

Elena Ruth Sassower, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I am the plaintiff *pro se*, individually and as director of the Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA), suing, with the corporate plaintiff CJA, on our "*own behalf and on behalf of the People of the State of New York & the Public Interest*", 34 press defendants, who have yet to be served – and who, upon being served, will have NO defense to what is plainly an historic, summary judgment case.

2. 28 U.S.C. §144, pursuant to which this affidavit is filed, reads:

> "Whenever a party to any proceeding in a district court makes and files a timely and sufficient affidavit that the judge before whom the matter is pending has a personal bias or prejudice either against him or in favor of any adverse party, such judge shall proceed no further therein, but another judge shall be assigned to hear such proceeding.
>
> The affidavit shall state the facts and the reasons for the belief that bias or prejudice exists, and shall be filed not less than ten days before the beginning of the term at which the proceeding is to be heard, or good cause shall be shown for failure to file it within such time. A party may file only one such affidavit in any case. It shall be

> accompanied by a certificate of counsel of record stating that it is made in good faith."

3. This affidavit is both timely and sufficient. As to timeliness, this lawsuit has been at a standstill as a result of the *sua sponte* November 13, 2025 Order, issued by the Court a mere three days after being assigned to the lawsuit and before a single defendant had been served. The facts pertaining thereto – and establishing this affidavit's sufficiency – are recited by my letters to the Court, posted on the electronic docket, culminating in my May 8, 2026 letter entitled:

> "Reiterating Plaintiffs' February 23, 2026 Letter 'Awaiting the Court's ruling on plaintiffs' December 19, 2025 affidavit demonstrating subject matter jurisdiction – & extending their time to effect service on the 34 defendants', PLUS Threshold Issues of the Court's Demonstrated Actual Bias & Duty of Disclosure". (underlining and capitalization in the original).

4. The final paragraph of the May 8th letter – preceding the "Thank you" – read:

> "In keeping with the promise of Rule 1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure of a 'just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding', please advise:
>
> - whether the Court will recuse itself for the demonstrated actual bias my December 10th letter particularizes and which this letter additionally particularizes; and, if not,
> - whether the Court will disclose facts bearing upon its fairness and impartiality, as requested by my November 19th letter;
> - the date by which the Court will 'address the question of jurisdiction in short order'".

5. It is now four weeks since my May 8th letter, without response from the Court – and, as clear from the electronic docket, the Court cannot respond without conceding: (1) its duty of recusal for the demonstrated actual bias already particularized; (2) its duty of disclosure; and (3) that there is no "question of jurisdiction" needing to be "address[d]" because my December 19th affidavit blew to smithereens any such "question", mandating an IMMEDIATE one-sentence

order that "I and CJA had met our burden of demonstrating injury and standing, which was the subject matter jurisdiction inquiry raised by the Court's *sua sponte* November 13th Order… followed by a second sentence extending plaintiffs' time within which to serve defendants by 30 days".

6. Moreover, I now believe that irrespective of whether the Court was randomly assigned "by lot" to this lawsuit – and, as pointed out by my December 10th letter (at pp. 2-3, 6), the Court "makes NO affirmative statement" that it was – it knew that its duty was to decline the assignment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §455, which reads, in pertinent part:

> "(a) Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.
>
> (b) He shall also disqualify himself in the following circumstances:
>
> (1) Where he has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party, or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding;
>
> …
>
> (e) No justice, judge, or magistrate judge shall accept from the parties to the proceeding a waiver of any ground for disqualification enumerated in subsection (b). Where the ground for disqualification arises only under subsection (a), waiver may be accepted provided it is preceded by a full disclosure on the record of the basis for disqualification."

7. Surely, upon the Court's assignment to this lawsuit on November 10th, it recognized from my last name, from the content of the October 29th verified amended complaint pertaining to the destruction of constitutional, lawful New York state governance involving the state judiciary and state attorney general, enabled and accelerated by *knowingly* false, "fake news" journalism of a corruption-abetting, election-rigging press, and from the verified amended complaint's ¶95(a) – the same paragraph that the Court's *sua sponte* November 13th Order (at pp. 3-4) would materially

expurgate to remove its particulars relating to my parents so as to purport that I had not alleged injury and standing as to myself, identified by ¶21 of my December 19th affidavit – is that it had "personal knowledge" of this lawsuit's underlying material facts by virtue of its interaction, 13 years earlier, with my father, George Sassower, Esq., giving rise to my father accusing the Court of corruption, filing an affidavit for the Court's recusal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §144, and seeking access to the federal grand jury in White Plains to present the evidence with respect thereto. As to this, I knew nothing, until April 11, 2016.

8. It was then, while drafting my April 14, 2026 grand jury/public corruption complaint to New York's 62 district attorneys pertaining to the FY2026-27 state budget and 2026 elections – to which my May 8th letter refers and links – that I discovered amongst the remnants of my father's papers pertaining to his attempts, spanning decades, to testify before a grand jury about the corruption of New York's state judiciary and state attorney general and its metastases to the federal courts, his December 3, 2012 letter to the then Chief Judge of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York Loretta Preska entitled "Crime in the U.S. Courthouse at White Plains (Leave to File)", stating that the Court had:

> "concocted & contrived the existence of a valid Order which requires that I, a born American citizen & battle-star veteran of World War II, needs the permission of a judge or magistrate to have my information & evidence transmitted to the Grand Jury!" –

to which the Court was an indicated *cc* and whose appended "Leave to File" bore the Court's name in its caption:

"In the Matter of the Petition of
GEORGE SASSOWER, individually and on behalf of
THE GRAND JURY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT
OF NEW YORK, at WHITE PLAINS,

Petitioner,

For leave to file an 18 *U.S.C.* §3332(a) Grand Jury
Petition Concerning the Criminal Racketeering Activities
in the Southern District of New York, at WHITE PLAINS

-against-

[U.S. Attorney] PREET BHARARA,
[New York State Attorney General] ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN
and [U.S. District Court Judge] KENNETH M. KARAS,

Respondents."
(capitalization, italics, and brackets in the original)

Quoted therein was my father's August 1, 2012 letter to the federal grand jury foreperson and members at the White Plains address of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York – and this I also found. Both referenced, as a starting point, my father's 1987 lawsuit *Vilella v. Santagata*, 87 Civ. 1450 (GLG), filed in the White Plains U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, whose March 4, 1987 petition I had long ago scanned and posted on CJA's website as part of "The George Sassower, Esq. Legacy Project – Was he correct on the facts & on the law?"

9. Unable to find more in the remnants of my father's papers – and, as yet, unable to access his computerized records – I went to the courthouse yesterday so as to be able to include more in this affidavit. The priority was to examine the record of my father's litigation before the Court,[1] no part of which I had, and whose docket number and caption I also did not have – and to ascertain what had become of his "Leave to File" submission to then Chief Judge Preska, whose p. 4 stated:

---

[1] The legitimacy of judicial decisions can only be determined by comparison with the record. As stated in "*Legal Autopsies: Assessing the Performance of Judges and Lawyers Through the Window of Leading Contract Cases*", 73 Albany Law Review 1 (2009, Professor Gerald Caplan), "…Performance assessment cannot occur without close examination of the trial record, briefs, oral argument and the like…' (p. 53).

"On July 24, 2012, affirmant filed a timely & sufficient 28 *U.S.C.* §144 recusal application, whose allegations & conclusions, including the propriety of this application, were not denied or controverted by anyone.

Nevertheless, U.S. District Court Judge Kenneth M. Karas did not address such application, including "time[liness] & sufficiency', or obey the mandate of the statute."

10. A search of my father's name at the computer terminal in the Clerk's Office did not reveal any 2012 lawsuits – nor the 1987 *Vilella v. Santagata* lawsuit. Upon returning to the Clerk's Office today, the paper docket sheet for *Vilella v. Santagata* was located, reflecting proceedings before the Court in 2012. Not reflected, however, was my father's July 24, 2012 recusal application pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §144, referred-to by his December 3, 2012 "Leave to File" submission to then Chief Judge Preska. Upon requesting the lawsuit file, a slim manilla folder was produced containing four documents[2], totalling 6 pages, none from my father, and missing the Court's July 13, 2012 Order, listed as #51 on the docket.

11. Can the Court explain this and does it know the whereabouts of my father's docketed filings (#45, #46, #47, #49, #50, #52, #53), bearing upon its duty, from the outset, to have disqualified itself from this lawsuit, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§455(a) and (b), or, at very least, to have made disclosure, as provided for by 28 U.S.C. §455(e) – rather than, as it did, issue its *sua sponte* November 13th Order and continue with the further actually-biased conduct chronicled by my November 19th letter, December 10th letter, February 23rd letter, and May 8th letter.

---

[2] These are: (1) a June 19, 2012 notice from the *pro se* office; (2) the August 13, 2012 letter from the New York Attorney General, so-ordered by the Court on August 21, 2012; (3) the Court's September 7, 2012 Order; and (4) a September 17, 2012 notice from the Clerk's Office to the Court, with the Court's September 17, 2012 response.

12. This affidavit, made in good faith and under penalties of perjury, is additionally accompanied, as 28 U.S.C. §144 requires, by "a certificate of counsel of record stating that it is made in good faith." Annexed hereto is the certificate of Gary Zerman, Esq., counsel of record for the corporate plaintiff CJA.

Elena Ruth Sassower

Elena Ruth Sassower

Sworn to before me
this 4th day of June 2026

Jair Correa

Notary Public

JAIR E. CORREA
Notary Public - State of New York
No. 04CO6446153
Qualified in Westchester County
My Commission Expires 01/17/2027

## CERTIFICATE OF GOOD FAITH PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §144

I am counsel of record for the corporate plaintiff Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA). I have read the accompanying affidavit of the *pro se* individual plaintiff Elena Sassower, which she has written, and certify, based on my conversations with her and the documents to which her affidavit refers and links, which I have reviewed, that such affidavit is made in good faith.

Additionally, I confirm that on April 11, 2026, plaintiff Sassower alerted me to her father's December 3, 2012 letter to then U.S. Southern District of New York Chief Judge Preska and his related August 1, 2012 letter to the federal grand jury, which she had just found. We discussed how best to proceed and agreed that if the Court did not rule on her December 19, 2025 affidavit by May 8, 2026 – the 81st anniversary of V.E.-Day and her 70th birthday – she would file a letter with the Court and, absent a response, would file an affidavit pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §144 and §455 by no later than June 6, 2026 – the 82nd anniversary of D-Day. As such date is a Saturday, her affidavit is being filed today, June 4, 2026 – the 46th anniversary of the involuntary dissolution of Puccini Clothes, Ltd. by New York Supreme Court, which was the genesis of her father's massive state and federal litigations that in 2012 landed him before the Court.

Gary L. Zerman

GARY L. ZERMAN, ESQ.

June 4, 2026