Thursday, June 18, 2009

Steven Michael Cohen
Counselor and Chief of Staff
New York Attorney General
120 Broadway
New York City, NY 10271

Re: First Department Obstruction of Justice

Dear Mr. Cohen:

Steven, I contacted your offices last week with a very focused request, which was to find out who to complain to about the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee (First Dept DDC), a NY AG client and defendant in the Iviewit federal case. More particularly, I write to complain to you as counsel about the outrageous and egregious actions of your client who continues to attempt to handle complaints in mass violation of Public Office Law, Attorney Conduct Codes, Disciplinary Departmental Rules and other federal and state law while conflicted as a defendant in the Iviewit lawsuit. I am seeking your intervention to have your client cease and desist further actions in conflict and violation of public office and retract recent actions in those complaints and turn over all the complaints filed recently to the First Dept DDC to a non-conflicted third party for immediate investigation. I remind you that the First Dept DDC has once been ordered by the First Dept Justices to turn over complaints for conflict and violation of public offices, imparting the appearance of impropriety.

As I mentioned in the letter last week to you, Monica Connell of your office was to handle new complaints\(^1\) with the First Dept DDC by finding a non-conflicted venue for

the complaints to be transferred to for unbiased review. Instead, the Chief Counsel for the First Dept DDC attempted to vindicate those complained of, co-defendants in the Iviewit lawsuit. For this conflicted action, new complaints were filed against the Chief Counsel and the Chairman for their blatant violations of their own departmental rules, Attorney Conduct Codes and Law. Of note, the First Dept DDC has failed to respond to the complaints lodged against the Chief Counsel and Chairman timely and this again may be further evidence of the Whitewashing and Obstruction of Complaints as the Whistleblower Case of Anderson indicates and that the Iviewit lawsuit is “legally” related to.

Finally, I have sent written requests for the First Dept DDC to stop interfacing with a former graduate of Columbia Law School, P. Stephen Lamont of Westchester County, who despite being terminated from representing both my companies and myself continues to act on behalf of my companies, in violation of law. Lamont filed my original lawsuit whereby he is suing on behalf of companies and individuals in which he has no legal right or authorization to do so. Upon finding that representing others without their consent may be illegal, I sought to have representation of others in my lawsuit quashed by the Federal Judge Shira Scheindlin and at the US Court of Appeals, as Lamont had also named me as representing others in the lawsuit.

I have formally petitioned the courts to remove both Lamont and my representation of others without their consent from the lawsuit as indicated in the Amended Complaint. Yet, Lamont continues to assert his claims only on behalf of others whereas I always have been named in the lawsuit as a Plaintiff on behalf of myself individually and my Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 inventor rights. Lamont has not represented himself individually in the lawsuit and only acts as a quasi attorney for others who have no idea he is doing so on their behalf and have given him no authorization to do so. In fact, as his words herein reveal, he has been advised by counsel not to act in that capacity as it is illegal.

These continued actions of Lamont appear to violate several laws and rules of professional conduct. First, Lamont did not take the Bar exam, thus he is representing others, without their consent without a legal license, in a Federal Lawsuit, knowingly violating the Code of Conduct and laws that prevent non-lawyers from legally

---


representing others in court. Additionally, Lamont maintains that he is CEO of the Iviewit companies in his correspondences with the First Dept DDC when this is not true; in fact, his own words at the Iviewit website describe the legal complexities precluding that representation:

By way of introduction, I am P. Stephen Lamont, former Acting CEO of Iviewit (counsel advised all Iviewit executives to resign their posts and work along side Iviewit rather than within Iviewit, as the former Board of Directors, Counsel and Accountants, disbanded without requisite notice to Shareholders in violation of law, thereby leaving massive liability and exposure) and a significant shareholder in Iviewit. With more than a fifteen year track record as a multimedia technology and consumer electronics licensing executive and holder of a J.D. in Intellectual Property Law from Columbia University...

Repeated requests to Lamont to cease making representations on behalf of Iviewit and its Shareholders have gone ignored which may lead to more serious securities fraud charges against him in the future but it is in his misrepresentation to the First Dept DDC as an Iviewit executive, the CEO, that I write to you regarding. I have filed many complaints at the First Dept DDC that are under investigation and the centerpiece of the federal lawsuit and since the First Dept DDC is now a defendant in the lawsuit, the lunacy of them now handling complaints against co-defendants and members of their department is certifiably insane. This must stop!

Yet, Lamont and the First Dept DDC are doing just that by way of a series of letters whereby Lamont, illegally acting as Iviewit CEO, is requesting First Dept DDC actions on complaints against former Chief Counsel Cahill and others. The First Dept DDC is dealing directly with Lamont and attempting to dismiss these several year old complaints and investigations. Of course, neither party, Lamont or the First Dept DDC, should be in contact with each other as adversaries in the lawsuit where Lamont is fully aware that your offices are representing the First Dept DDC. The First Dept DDC is represented by your offices and certainly any action on the complaints against defendants by other defendants is so mired in conflict that it becomes Obstructive in nature and thus warrants criminal investigation but minimally it mandates your office to intermediate with your client to prevent further crimes from being committed by these actions.

Repeated written and verbal requests for your client the First Dept DDC to cease working on the complaints in question with Lamont have gone ignored. It has now come to my attention that the First Dept DDC is corresponding directly with Lamont and taking actions on old complaints and I request that you have the First Dept DDC rescind all
actions made recently with Lamont or face yet additional charges both criminal and ethical. This letter should also serve as notice formally for your offices to undertake investigations of the public office crimes that may be occurring as well as the securities fraud that may be transpiring through Lamont’s continued fraudulent representations.

Respectfully Yours,

[Signature]

Ellis I. Bernstein
Founder & Inventor
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