

Doris L. Sassower

283 Soundview Avenue
White Plains, New York 10606-3821

Tel: (914) 997-1677
Fax: (914) 684-6554

Elena Ruth Sassower, Paralegal Assistant

BY EXPRESS MAIL
EM02560404943US

October 26, 1998

Francis Lorson, Chief Deputy Clerk
U.S. Supreme Court
1 First Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20543

RE: Petitioner's October 14, 1998 letter/application/judicial misconduct complaint
Sassower v. Mangano, et al., Supreme Court Docket #98-106

Dear Mr. Lorson:

This letter memorializes my phone conversations with you on Friday afternoon, October 23rd. You confirmed that petitioner's October 14, 1998 letter, addressed to Mr. Suter, had been distributed to the Justices as a judicial misconduct complaint against them. You also informed me that Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, as the Court's Justice for the Second Circuit, had denied petitioner's Rule 44 application, contained therein, to extend her time to file her petition for rehearing¹.

You further stated that there would be no response by Mr. Suter to the October 14, 1998 letter, notwithstanding its specific inquiries, expressly addressed to him, related to procedures of the Clerk's office and the Court. You yourself declined to provide a written response and did not deny or dispute the accuracy of the letter's factual recitations relating to you. This includes your representations, as recounted therein:

- (1) that the *sole* reason why petitioner's September 23, 1998 recusal/disclosure application, distributed to the Justices, was *not* docketed was because it was *not* acted upon by them;
- (2) that the general policy of the Clerk's Office is *not* to docket recusal applications which are *not* acted on by the Justices; and

¹ You also confirmed that the deadline for that rehearing petition is October 30, 1998, by which date it must be postmarked by the U.S. Post Office.

- (3) that you do *not* have information as to the Court's procedures for the filing and disposition of judicial misconduct complaints against the Justices and do not know who at the Court would have such information, including whether the Court took any action on the 1993 recommendation of the National Commission on Judicial Discipline and Removal pertaining to adoption of judicial misconduct complaint procedures against the Justices.

By separate letter to Mr. Suter, I will particularize the misconduct of personnel at the Clerk's office during the past week as I sought to obtain information as to when petitioner could expect Mr. Suter's response to her October 14th letter and the status of her incorporated Rule 44 extension request. You did not seem particularly concerned by that misconduct, including my notification to you that it appears that bogus names have been used by female personnel in the Clerk's office. Indeed, you confirmed that there is only one "Denise" in the Clerk's office -- and she is Denise McNerney, Mr. Suter's secretary -- and, additionally, that there are no persons named "Amy" or "Kelly".

Yours for a quality judiciary,

ELENA RUTH SASSOWER
Paralegal Assistant to Petitioner

Enclosure

cc: William K. Suter, Clerk
New York State Attorney General,
Counsel for respondents and co-respondent
Justices of the United States Supreme Court