

CENTER for JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY, INC.*

Post Office Box 8101
White Plains, New York 10602

Tel: 914-421-1200

E-Mail: mail@judgewatch.org
Website: www.judgewatch.org

August 4, 2022

TO: **Independent Review Committee (IRC)**

SUNY-Buffalo Law School Dean Aviva Abramovsky
CUNY-Queens College Law School Dean Sudha Setty
Albany Law School Dean Alicia Ouellette
Brooklyn Law School Dean Michael T. Cahill
Columbia University Law School Dean Gillian Lester
Cornell University Law School Dean Jens David Ohlin
Fordham University Law School Dean Matthew Diller
Hofstra University Law School Dean A. Gail Prudenti
New York Law School Dean Anthony Crowell
New York University Law School Dean Troy McKenzie
Pace University Law School Dean Horace E. Anderson, Jr.
St. John's University Law School Dean Michael A. Simons
Syracuse University Law School Dean Craig M. Boise
Touro College Law School Dean Elena B. Langan
Yeshiva University-Cardozo Law School Dean Melanie Leslie

FROM: Elena Ruth Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)

RE: **LETTER #1: Your Undisclosed Conflicts of Interest – and the Direct Interests of your Chair, New York Law School Dean Crowell, and Hofstra Law School Dean Prudenti in CJA v. JCOPE, et al., Mandating that They IMMEDIATELY Disqualify Themselves from the Independent Review Committee – or that You Disqualify Them IMMEDIATELY**

I have received no responses from you to [my June 12, 2022 letter](#) entitled: “Lawsuit to VOID the ‘ethics commission reform act of 2022’, TRO to stay the statute from taking effect on July 8th – & your ethical, professional, and civic responsibilities with respect thereto – Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc., et al. v. New York State Joint Commission on Public Ethics, et al. (Albany Co. #904235-22)”.

* **Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)** is a national, non-partisan, non-profit citizens’ organization working to ensure that mechanisms are in place to prevent judges from “throwing” cases by decisions that are judicial perjuries, obliterating and falsifying fact and law – and that processes of judicial selection and discipline are effective and meaningful.

I so-advised you, first by a [June 16, 2022 e-mail](#) and, thereafter, by [my July 2, 2022 e-mail](#) entitled “TIME IS OF THE ESSENCE – TRO/Preliminary Injunction: ‘ethics commission reform act of 2022’”, further seeking your discharge of ethical, professional, and civic responsibilities. To this, I also received no responses from you.¹

Is there an explanation for this, other than that you have not responded because of conflicts of interest, interfering with proper discharge of your duties.

And on what basis do you assert, on your [website](#):

“In the FY 2023 State budget process, the Governor worked with the Legislature to reform the State’s ethics law and processes. One measure adopted is the New York Ethics Commission Reform Act of 2022.”

The inference is that enactment of “the New York Ethics Commission Reform Act of 2022”, *via* the state budget, was constitutional and lawful and truly a “reform”, achieved by an open collaborative “process” between the Governor and “the Legislature”. This is FALSE – and so-proven by the June 6, 2022 verified petition/complaint in [CJA v. JCOPE, et al.](#), demonstrating that the “New York Ethics Commission Reform Act of 2022” was a cynical scheme to strip the public of invaluable rights, enforceable by mandamus, accomplished by behind-closed-doors deal-making by Governor Hochul and the other two persons “in the room” – Temporary Senate President Stewart-Cousins and Assembly Speaker Heastie – who inserted it into an unconstitutional and unrelated budget bill and then sprung it on legislators for passage *via* a “message of necessity” on the same day it emerged from “the room”.

Are you contesting the accuracy of the factual and legal showing made by the *CJA v. JCOPE, et al.* petition/complaint – including entitlement to the granting of its sixth cause of action (at ¶¶78-85):

“Declaring Unconstitutional, Unlawful, and Void Part QQ of Education, Labor, Housing, and Family Assistance Budget Bill #S.8006-C/A.9006-C – the ‘ethics commission reform act of 2022’ – Enacted in Violation of Mandatory Provisions of the New York State Constitution, Statutes, Legislative Rules, and Caselaw”.

If not, why have you taken no appropriate action, consistent with your ethical, professional, and civic responsibilities, as sought by my June 12th letter and July 2nd e-mail to you?

¹ To my [July 18, 2022 e-mail](#) entitled “Updating your IRC website to facilitate public comment on the selection members' nominations to CELG – and FOIL request”, I also received no responses from you. You did, however, thereupon update the IRC website in the respects I had indicated – and seemingly took remedial steps with regard to [Assembly Speaker Heastie’s July 14, 2022 announcement of his two proposed nominees](#), which had omitted any mention of, or provision for, a comment period. The Assembly Speaker issued a [press release](#) on July 21, 2022: “Public Comment Period Open for Speaker Heastie’s Nominees to the Commission on Ethics and Lobbying in Government”.

And when – and on what basis – did you elect Dean Crowell to be your chair? And did you know, prior to electing him, of the fraud he had committed as a member of the 2015 JCOPE/LEC Review Commission, if not its *de facto* chair? Did he tell you how the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission simply ignored my threshold inquiries about its conflicts of interest² so as to then conceal and perpetuate the readily-remediable corruption of JCOPE and LEC, born of JCOPE’s violations of the salutary, mandamus-enforceable provisions of Executive Law §94 to which I had alerted it. These are the same provisions that seven years later the “ethics commission reform act of 2022” would wipe out – and which *CJA v. JCOPE, et al.* seeks to enforce by its first and second causes of action (§§27-41, §§42-47).

Upon receipt of my June 12th letter, it was Dean Crowell’s absolute duty to have disqualified himself from the Independent Review Committee by reason of his direct interest in *CJA v. JCOPE, et al.*, which he would have readily recognized from the letter and certainly from its [link to the NYSCEF record](#). So, too, Dean Prudenti. Did either of them disclose that they were personally interested in all the lawsuit’s causes of action, essentially all encompassed by the first cause of action pertaining to JCOPE’s duty with respect to each of CJA’s seven complaints (§§27-41) – and that their own duty was to immediately withdraw from further participation in the Independent Review Committee and to designate, in their stead, “an associate dean of their respective law school(s)”, pursuant to Executive Law §94.2(c).

The specifics are as follows:

[New York Law School Dean Crowell](#) was a member, if not *de facto* chair, of the 2015 belatedly appointed JCOPE/LEC Review Commission, whose cover-up [November 1, 2015 report](#) did not even identify the names of its members or of its purported chair, except in appendix documents.³ It

² In 2015, Dean Crowell was a member of New York City’s five-member Conflicts of Interest Board, on which he served from April 2013 to November 2021, as reflected by its [2021 annual report](#).

In the event Dean Crowell’s service on the NYC Conflicts of Interest Board was known to you and was deemed to be a credential because you believe it to be a reputable body, properly functioning, here’s [CJA’s menu webpage for the complaints I filed last year with it and the equally corrupt NYC Department of Investigation with which it is partnered](#). As there evidenced, both wilfully ignored conflicts of interest to which I alerted them, “sitting on” [my initial May 17, 2021 complaint against NYC Public Advocate Jumaane Williams and NYC’s five district attorneys](#) AND then [my June 28, 2021 complaint against them based thereon](#), whose footnote 3 is a lengthy recital of Dean Crowell’s disqualification for interest from my complaints, arising from his participation on the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission, perpetuating JCOPE’s corruption for which I was seeking redress, and which I accompanied by a [substantiating evidentiary webpage](#).

³ As stated in [my June 18, 2015 letter to the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission members](#), *infra*, the May 1, 2015 press release that announced their appointment by the Governor, Temporary Senate President, and Assembly Speaker did not identify its chair, notwithstanding the statute expressly required that they “jointly designate a chair from among the members”. Upon [my October 19, 2015 FOIL request](#) to these three appointing authorities for records pertaining to joint designation of a chair, none were produced. However, from the Governor’s production of a single document – [an August 3, 2015 e-mail to Dean Crowell](#) pertaining to the replacement of Seymour James, Jr. by Christopher Pisciotta – I believe that Dean Crowell, who

ignored and made not a single finding with respect to the mountain of *prima facie*, open-and-shut EVIDENCE I furnished, ALL dispositive of the situation with respect to JCOPE's handling of complaints – all furnished DIRECTLY to Dean Crowell.

My first [June 18, 2015 letter addressed to the eight JCOPE/LEC Review Commission members](#) – for which my e-mail to Dean Crowell is [here](#) – was entitled “Ensuring Honest Review by the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission: (1) Your Methodology for Reviewing and Evaluating the Joint Commission on Public Ethics & Legislative Ethics Commission – Including Public Hearings; (2) Your Protocol with Respect to Conflicts of Interest”.

It is such an important contemporaneous record of the essential facts about the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission, about how it was operating, and about the goldmine evidence and appropriate methodology that it had from me, on that date, that I here reprint it in full, excluding footnotes other than footnotes 3 and 4, and its indicated enclosure:

“According to a May 1, 2015 press release posted on the Governor’s website^{fn1}, you are the ‘eight individuals’ who the Governor, Temporary Senate President, and Assembly Speaker appointed as the review commission ‘tasked with reviewing and evaluating the activities and performance of the Joint Commission on Public Ethics and the Legislative Ethics Commission’, with your report due by November 1, 2015.

The press release does not indicate who of you is chair– or identify any of the circumstances giving rise to the JCOPE/LEC review commission, namely, that the Governor, Temporary Senate President, and Assembly Speaker, having willfully violated Section 21 of Part A of Chapter 399 of the Laws of 2011, then devised, in ‘three-men-in-a-room’, behind-closed-doors fashion, to amend it as Part DD of Budget Bill S.2006-B/A.3006-B, introduced on March 31, 2015 and passed by the Legislature, hours later, *via* a ‘message of necessity’.^{fn2}

provided the Commission with its only (volunteer) staff, was the *de facto* chair. This is consistent with his interjection to correct a misstatement made by the purported chair, Dale Volker, during my testimony at its October 14, 2015 hearing. The August 3, 2015 e-mail also reflects an active role by the other law school dean on the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission: [Patricia Salkin, then dean of Touro Law School](#) – and other documents, including her June 20, 2015 email response to my June 18, 2015 letter “Thank you for your input”, reflect that as well.

Suffice to add that whereas my June 18, 2015 letter to Dean Crowell marked my first contact with him, I had had prior contact with Dean Salkin in 2000, when she was associate dean of Albany Law School and director of its Government Law Center. CJA’s webpage of that contact is [here](#), supplied because it reflects her conflicts of interest and unfitness to have served on the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission, or to have occupied any position in academia or of public trust – and because, at issue, was [CJA’s Article 78 proceeding suing the Commission on Judicial Conduct for corruption born of its statutory and rule violations](#), then beginning its appellate odyssey that would end at the New York Court of Appeals and, [in 2011, become the initial basis and constitutional grounds for CJA’s opposition to judicial pay raises before the Commission on Judicial Compensation](#).

Was a chair not jointly designated by the Governor, Temporary Senate President, and Assembly Speaker, as Part DD requires? I have been unable to locate any subsequent press releases announcing the chair – or furnishing contact information for the review commission, or identifying how you intend to go about your work.

Are there no subsequent press releases? Who among you has been designated chair and when was that designation made? Does the review commission have an office, a phone number, an e-mail, a website? Do you have staff – and who are they? What is your methodology? Will you be holding public hearings at which members of the public who have filed ethics complaints with JCOPE and LEC can testify and afford you the benefit of their direct, first-hand experience and insights? If so, when do you plan to announce those hearings?

If you are not planning public hearings, will you be privately taking testimony from members of the public who have filed ethics complaints with JCOPE and LEC? Will you be doing outreach to them – or must they reach out to you?

Please be advised that our nonpartisan, nonprofit citizens' organization, Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA), has filed conflict-of-interest ethics complaints with both JCOPE and LEC. These complaints establish, prima facie and conclusively, that JCOPE and LEC are corrupt facades, brazenly violating the statutory and rule provisions under which they are supposed to operate so as to 'protect' their appointing authorities – the Governor and Legislative Leaders – and other influential or connected persons from investigation, prosecution, and sanction.

In the likely event that the staff and members of JCOPE and LEC have not alerted you to CJA's ethics complaints and your duty, as the review commission, to 'blow the whistle' on their 'protectionism' and cover-up, the complaints are posted on CJA's website, www.judgewatch.org, accessible from the prominent homepage link: 'Exposing the Fraud of the Commission to Investigate Public Corruption'. This brings up a menu page with a link entitled 'Going Where the Commission to Investigate Public Corruption Did NOT: ...JCOPE'.

The first three items on that JCOPE webpage are our July 11, 2014 and July 18, 2014 letters culminating in our December 11, 2014 ethics complaint to JCOPE which was a complaint against JCOPE and its appointing authorities – the Governor and Legislative Leaders – for their violation of Public Officers Law §74 relating to conflict of interest with respect to Section 21 of Part A of Chapter 399 of the Laws of 2011: the essentially identical review commission that the Governor and Legislative Leaders (minority, in addition to majority) were required to appoint by June 1, 2014, but did not, and whose report was due by March 1, 2015 (fn. 2, *supra*).

In pertinent part, our December 11, 2014 ethics complaint states:

‘any legitimate review commission would have to ‘blow the whistle’ on JCOPE and expose its corrupt protectionism of the Governor and Legislative Leaders – as proven, resoundingly, by CJA’s June 27, 2013 ethics complaint against them and other public officers that JCOPE has been sitting on, now going on 18 months.’ (at p. 2, underlining in the original).

JCOPE has now been sitting on CJA’s June 27, 2013 ethics complaint for nearly 24 months – a dereliction that has cost New York taxpayers upwards of \$120 million in statutorily-violative, fraudulent, and unconstitutional judicial salary raises that the Governor, Attorney General, Comptroller, and Legislators were duty-bound to void, but did not, because judicial salary raises were the means to their own salary raises. And reinforcing the truth of what pages 4-6 of the June 27, 2013 complaint particularize as to the violations of Public Officers Law §74 by the Governor, Attorney General, Comptroller, and Legislators, born of their ‘self-interest in the judicial pay raises’ and their ‘self-interest in the ‘success’ of the statute creating the Commission on Judicial Compensation’, is that in this year’s ‘three-men-in-a-room’, behind-closed-doors, budget deal-making – to which rank-and-file Legislators gave their rubber stamp – the Governor, Temporary Senate President, and Assembly Speaker inserted into Budget Bill S.4610-A/A.6721-A a Part E, repealing the statute that had created the Commission on Judicial Compensation and putting in its place a Commission on Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Compensation, structured in materially-identical fashion.^{fn3}

That legislative rules vest coercive, autocratic powers in the Temporary Senate President and Assembly Speaker, so impinging upon the exercise of independent judgment by rank-and-file Legislators that they surrender legitimate legislative process – as with Budget Bill S.4610-A/A.6721-A, introduced and passed on the same day, March 31, 2015, with an assist by the Governor through a ‘message of necessity’ – is a further important issue presented by the June 27, 2013 complaint that JCOPE has been sitting on.

^{fn3} On its face, Part E, establishing a Commission on Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Compensation is as unconstitutional as the repealed provision of Chapter 567 of the Laws of 2010, establishing the Commission on Judicial Compensation, as it identically allows the Commission’s salary increase recommendations to have the force of law, automatically, without executive or legislative action. And because of executive and legislative self-interest, to which JCOPE’s nonfeasance has given a green light, no executive or legislative action will restrain the Commission from operating in the same statutorily-violative, fraudulent, and unconstitutional fashion as the Commission on Judicial Compensation did, with consequences catastrophic for the People of New York.”

Plainly, you have relationships and associations with the Governor, Temporary Senate President, and Assembly Speaker who appointed you to the review commission and with other persons who are the subject of CJA's two conflict-of-interest JCOPE complaints. Likewise you have relationships and associations with the multitude of persons complicit in JCOPE's corruption, as for instance, U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of New York Preet Bharara, a recipient of CJA's December 11, 2014 complaint, just as he was of CJA's underlying July 11, 2014 and July 18, 2014 letters. What is your protocol for dealing with conflicts of interest?

For example, undisclosed by the May 1, 2015 press release, with its brief bios of each of you, is that Seymour James was a member of the Commission to Investigate Public Corruption. I testified before the Commission on September 17, 2013, furnishing the June 27, 2013 ethics complaint in support of my testimony. How will Mr. James be able to discharge his duties as a member of this review commission when doing so will expose his past dereliction and that of the Commission to Investigate Public Corruption with respect to the June 27, 2013 ethics complaint – and with respect to CJA's underlying April 15, 2013 criminal complaint to U.S. Attorney Bharara on which it rests, that U.S. Attorney Bharara has been sitting on.^{fn4}

Will he – and you – have the independence to follow the evidence of JCOPE's corruption that directly leads to U.S. Attorney Bharara and brings within its wake a 'who's who' of powerful, influential persons? These include the other indicated recipients of CJA's December 11, 2014 ethics complaint, especially those addressed by our December 12, 2014 coverletter: Attorney General Eric Schneiderman, Albany County District Attorney P. David Soares, U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of New York Richard Hartunian, and the former U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, the now United States Attorney General, Loretta Lynch.

In the interest of transparency, this letter has been posted on CJA's webpage 'Going Where the Commission to Investigate Public Corruption Did NOT...JCOPE'. For your convenience, our webpage for this letter also posts our two ethics complaints that went nowhere at JCOPE, as well as ethics complaints that others filed with JCOPE, likewise against high-ranking public officers, that similarly went nowhere.

^{fn4} On October 17, 2013, I sent an e-mail directly to the members and special advisors of the Commission to Investigate Public Corruption, attaching a letter pertaining to my September 17, 2013 testimony. Identifying that I had no e-mail address for Commissioner James, among others, the transmitting e-mail requested that they forward it to him 'so that all may be held accountable to the People whose trust in New York's government and its public officials the Commission is supposed to restore.' The e-mail and its transmitted letter are enclosed herewith, as well as posted, with this letter, on CJA's website, *infra*, together with my September 17, 2013 written statement and the video of my September 17, 2013 oral testimony."

Presumably, U.S. Attorney Bharara obtained all these complaints when, in late April 2014, he reportedly served JCOPE with a subpoena for all complaints filed with it.^{fn4} (underlining and italics in the original).

The June 27, 2013 and December 11, 2014 complaints that CJA had filed with JCOPE, the latter also filed with LEC – for which any legitimate JCOPE/LEC Review Committee would have to “blow the whistle” on JCOPE and LEC – are exhibits to the *CJA v. JCOPE, et al.* petition/complaint: [CJA’s June 27, 2013 complaint is Exhibit G](#) and [CJA’s December 11, 2014 complaint is Exhibit F](#).

The JCOPE/LEC Review Commission’s wilful disregard of my June 18, 2015 letter and of the June 27, 2013 and December 11, 2014 complaints, so as to cover up the corruption of public officers and employees that JCOPE and LEC were enabling, is itself particularized by two exhibits to the *CJA v. JCOPE, et al.* petition/complaint, each highlighting the complicity therein of JCOPE and LEC. These are [CJA’s December 17, 2021 complaint against LEC and legislators to JCOPE – Exhibit B \(at pp. 14-21\)](#), where it appears under two title headings:

“V. LEC Allowed the Four Legislative Leaders to Flagrantly Violate PIRA’s Part A, §21 by Failing to Appoint the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission Mandated by June 1, 2014 – Even in the Face of CJA’s December 11, 2014 Complaint”

“VI. LEC’s 2015 Annual Report Affirmatively Concealed the Flagrant Violation of PIRA’s Part A, §21 by the Legislature’s Four Leaders – & Covered-Up the Fraud of the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission, which JCOPE & LEC had Enabled”

and [CJA’s November 2, 2021 complaint against JCOPE to the State Inspector General – Exhibit I \(eye\) \(at pp. 9-10\)](#).

These both identify CJA’s webpage for the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission entitled: “[The Delayed & Sham JCOPE/LEC Review Commission, whose website, nyethics review.org, is GONE, along with the VIDEO of its one & only hearing& its cover-up November 1, 2015 report](#)”. There you will find posted my other written communications, sent directly to Dean Crowell’s email – and the dispositive evidence I handed up at the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission’s October 14, 2015 hearing in substantiation of my explosive testimony – and the evidence I furnished thereafter, such as my four FOIL requests to JCOPE and one to LEC, simultaneously e-mailed to the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission, whose titles each began: “Assisting the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission with a methodologically-sound review...”

Before the VIDEO of the October 14, 2015 hearing vanished, indeed, immediately upon its being posted, I transcribed my testimony, which is [here](#). Presumably, it is because my testimony and the evidence I handed up were so damning that the VIDEO of the hearing VANISHED, the website of the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission VANISHED, and, also, all the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission records. Only its November 1, 2015 report is available, via [FOIL](#), which is how I obtained it.

[Hofstra Law School Dean Gail Prudenti](#) was chief administrative judge from December 1, 2011 to July 30, 2015 for Chief Judge Jonathan Lippman and actively participated in the “grand larceny of the public fisc and other corruption” that CJA’s June 27, 2013 complaint to JCOPE particularized, with her name appearing at pages 4 and 5 of its physically annexed and incorporated April 15, 2013 complaint to U.S. Attorney Preet Bharara. I had handed up the evidence of her knowledge and involvement, as likewise of Chief Judge Lippman’s, at the Legislature’s February 6, 2013 “public protection” budget hearing, at which she was the second witness to testify and I was the last. CJA’s webpage for the VIDEO of that hearing, with links to what I handed up, is [here](#).

Specifically pertaining to Chief Administrative Judge Prudenti was [my January 29, 2013 letter to her](#), which I handed up, whose final two paragraphs stated:

“As I will be testifying at the February 6, 2013 joint legislative hearing in opposition to the Judiciary’s budget request for monies for the second phase of the judicial salary increases – and will do so based on CJA’s October 27, 2011 Opposition Report to the Commission on Judicial Compensation’s August 29, 2011 ‘Final’ Report and our People’s lawsuit based thereon, *Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc., et al. v. Cuomo, et al.*, against New York State’s three government branches and highest constitutional officers to void the judicial salary increases — demand is hereby made that you produce the Judiciary’s findings of fact and conclusions of law with respect to our October 27, 2011 Opposition Report and the four causes of action of the *CJA v. Cuomo* verified complaint.^[fn]”

Needless to say, your failure to use the opportunity of your February 6, 2013 appearance before the Legislature to contest our particularized showing that the judicial salary increases are unconstitutional, statutorily-violative, and fraudulent will be deemed a further concession that New York Chief Judge Jonathan Lippman and the Unified Court Administration cannot do so.”

As reflected by my testimony, there was no response from Chief Administrative Judge Prudenti or anyone else, including Chief Judge Lippman, to whom the January 29, 2013 letter was also sent.⁵ Nor was there response to [my February 4, 2013 e-mail](#), sent to both of them, which I also handed up in substantiation of my testimony.

This correspondence, and my correspondence to the constitutional officers of the executive and legislative branches – to which Chief Administrative Judge Prudenti and Chief Judge Lippman were *cc’d* – was part of the June 27, 2013 complaint to JCOPE, just as it was, in hard copy, part of the

⁵ As to Chief Judge Lippman’s knowledge and receipt of CJA’s October 27, 2011 opposition report, addressed to him, and CJA’s declaratory judgment action based thereon, to which he and the Unified Court System were defendants, *see* my accompanying letter, at p. 6.

April 15, 2013 complaint to U.S. Attorney Bharara – and, thereafter, [handed up by me, in hard copy, to the Commission to Investigate Public Corruption](#) when [I testified before it on September 17, 2013 and furnished my succession of complaints to criminal, ethics, and oversight entities](#) – and, among them, the June 27, 2013 complaint to JCOPE – all resting on:

- [CJA’s October 27, 2011 opposition report to the Commission on Judicial Compensation’s August 29, 2011 report](#), addressed to New York’s highest constitutional officers in its three government branches; and
- [CJA’s March 30, 2012 verified complaint in a declaratory judgment action based thereon](#), suing New York’s three government branches for collusion against the People.

The opposition report and verified complaint were focal to [my testimony at the February 6, 2013 “public protection” budget hearing](#) – and, of course, I handed up full copies of each, in addition to the correspondence with Chief Administrative Judge Prudenti and Chief Judge Lippman, based thereon.

On October 14, 2015, in testifying before the Dean Crowell and the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission, I would hand up [a full copy of the opposition report and, additionally, the first three pages and four causes of action of the declaratory judgment action](#).⁶

Suffice to say that by the time the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission was belatedly appointed on May 1, 2015, Chief Administrative Judge Prudenti had reprised, in the two subsequent judiciary budgets, her front-line role in the corruption of the FY 2013-2014 judiciary budget that the June 27, 2013 complaint had documented, and not confined to the judiciary pay raises.

⁶ My penultimate statement to the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission – reflected by my [transcription from the VIDEO](#) – was:

“I am also handing this up and in addition to, in addition to the Opposition Report, which is here, which was furnished to our Legislative Leaders, and the Governor, the Attorney General, the Comptroller, I am handing up the four causes of action in the lawsuit that we brought on the judicial compensation – a lawsuit that is stalled in Supreme Court/New York County. Take a look at those four causes of action. Okay.

This is all posted, for those who are watching these proceedings so they can see what is before this panel. The website of the Center for Judicial Accountability is [www.judgewatch.org](#). There is a prominent homepage link called ‘Exposing the Fraud of the Commission to Investigate Public Corruption’ and by clicking on that link you will come to a link for JCOPE, which is where the Commission to Investigate Public Corruption did not go because they knew what they would find: a cover-up, a protectionism of New York’s most powerful public officers.” (at p. 9).

As to this, CJA's December 11, 2014 complaint to JCOPE furnished the evidence, by its footnote 7, identifying, in addition to [CJA's April 23, 2014 motion to intervene in the Legislature's declaratory judgment action against the Commission to Investigate Public Corruption, CJA's \(first\) citizen-taxpayer action](#). Commenced by a [March 28, 2014 verified complaint](#), it particularized Chief Administrative Judge Prudenti's frauds and deceits for the FY 2014-2015 judiciary budget, including by three extensive exhibits: [K-1](#), [K-2](#), and [K-3](#).⁷ Had the JCOPE/LEC Review Commission examined the citizen-taxpayer action record – stated by footnote 7 to be “a perfect paper trail of corruption for investigation and prosecution” (underlining in the original) – it would have seen that the record by then included [CJA's March 31, 2015 verified supplemental complaint](#) reflecting that Chief Administrative Judge Prudenti's prior frauds and deceits were replicated for the FY 2015-2016 judiciary budget.⁸

* * *

My accompanying separate letter demonstrates that the *CJA v. JCOPE, et al.* verified petition/complaint is indispensable to your vetting of nominees in general – and is integral to my written comments as to the unfitness of four specific proposed nominees. This further reinforces the duty of Dean Crowell and Dean Prudenti to IMMEDIATELY disqualify themselves from the Independent Review Commission based on their direct interests in *CJA v. JCOPE, et al.* and of your duty to disqualify them, IMMEDIATELY, should they fail to do so.

⁷ See ¶¶27-32, 51-68, 99-108 of March 28, 2014 verified complaint – and also:

[Exhibit K-1](#): CJA's February 21, 2014 letter Senate and Assembly fiscal committee chairs & ranking members, entitled: “Restoring Value to Your Sham and Rigged February 5, 2014 ‘Public Protection’ Budget Hearing on the Judiciary's Proposed Budget by Appropriate Questioning of Chief Administrative Judge Prudenti”, whose recitation, at pages 5-11 begins:

“Over and again at the February 5, 2014 hearing, Chief Administrative Judge Prudenti put forward deceits, to which you gave assent. Had you allowed me to testify, I would have pointed these out, as assuredly you knew in excluding me from the witness list. As illustrative;...”

[Exhibit K-2](#): “The Judiciary's Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2014-2015 – Questions for Chief Administrative Judge Prudenti” and, in particular, beginning at Question #26:

“You are familiar with the October 27, 2011 Opposition Report of the Center for Judicial Accountability, are you not? Do you deny or dispute the accuracy of its showing that the Commission's recommendations for judicial salary increases flagrantly violated Chapter 567 of the Laws of 2010, including in the following respects...”;

[Exhibit K-3](#): “Analysis of the Judiciary's Two-Part Proposed Budget & ‘Single Budget Bill’ for Fiscal Year 2014-2015”.

⁸ See ¶¶139-144, 57-162, 179-193 of March 31, 2015 verified supplemental complaint.

As your [website](#) states:

“As stewards of a profession built on the highest ethical and professional standards, the Deans’ work as members of the IRC will be conducted as transparently, independently, and objectively as possible under the law”,

your duty is to address the above presentation and my companion letter consistent therewith. To that end, and to further assist you, I here furnish you with the [link to CJA’s menu webpage for the Independent Review Committee](#), from which you can access an evidentiary webpage for this letter and its companion.

Thank you.

s/ELENA RUTH SASSOWER