RESPONDENT'S MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF A MOTION TO DISMISS

ELIOT SPITZER

Attorney General of the
State of New York

Attorney for Respondent, the
Commission on Judicial Conduct
of the State of New York

120 Broadway - 24th Floor
New York, New York 10271
(212) 416-8625

MICHAEL KENNEDY
CAROLYN CAIRNS OLSON
Assistant Attorneys General
of counsel

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF NEW YORK

-----X

ELENA RUTH SASSOWER, Coordinator of The Center For Judicial Accountability, Inc., Acting <u>Pro Bono Publico</u>,

Petitioner,

-against-

Index No.: 99-108551

COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,

Respondent.

RESPONDENT'S MEMORANDUM IN

SUPPORT OF A MOTION TO DISMISS

Preliminary Statement

This memorandum is respectfully submitted on behalf of respondent Commission on Judicial Conduct of the State of New York (the "Commission") in support of the Commission's motion to dismiss this Article 78 proceeding pursuant to CPLR 7804(f) and 3211(a)(3),(2),(5) and (7).

Moreover, in the so-called "Notice of Right to Seek Intervention" dated April 22, 1999, petitioner cites CPLR 1012, (continued...)

Any challenge that petitioner may raise to the authority of the Attorney General to represent the Commission in this proceeding is frivolous. The Commission is entitled to such representation and the Attorney General is statutorily authorized to defend this proceeding. Executive Law §63(1); Sassower v. Signorelli, 99 A.D.2d 358 (2d Dep't 1984).

In this CPLR Article 78 proceeding, petitioner Elena Ruth Sassower, ("petitioner") suing as the "coordinator" of the Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. ("CJA"), seeks mandamus, prohibition, and a declaratory judgment, that:

- (1) declares 22 NYCRR §§7000.3 and 7000.11, and Judiciary Law §§ 45, 41.6 and 43.1 to be unconstitutional;
- (2) vacates the Commission's December 23, 1998 dismissal of petitioner's October 6, 1998 complaint against a judicial candidate for the Court of Appeals²;

In sum, petitioner has no standing to challenge the Attorney General's determination to represent the Commission in this proceeding and any challenge to this determination should be rejected. As similarly noted by the Appellate Division in <u>Kilcoin V. Wolansky</u>, 75 A.D.2d 1 (2d Dep't 1980), <u>aff'd</u> 52 N.Y.2d 995 (1981), any motion to disqualify the Attorney General from representing the Commission in this case, suggests "something more than a concern over the Attorney General's ethical position. Rather, it bespeaks [petitioner's] continuing effort to harass and punish" the Commission for its refusal to initiate formal investigation of the Appellate Division Justices who participated in the determination to suspend her mother, Doris Sassower, from the practice of law. <u>Id</u>. 75 A.D.2d at 12, note 1.

[&]quot;intervention" by the Attorney General would be for the purpose of opposing petitioner's claims.

A copy of petitioner's October 6, 1998 letter complaint is (continued...)