

Expose Corrupt Courts

MLK said: "Injustice Anywhere is a Threat to Justice Everywhere"

End Corruption in the Courts!

Court employee, judge or citizen - Report Corruption in any Court Today !! As of March 6, 2010, we've received over 98,750 tips...KEEP THEM COMING !! CorruptCourts@gmail.com

REFRESH - Go To Home Page

Most Read Stories

- [Wall Street Journal: When our Trusted Officials Lie](#)
- [NY Senator John Sampson Accepting Input on Chief Judge Nomination](#)
- [Massive Attorney Conflict in Madoff Scam](#)
- [FBI Probes Threats on Federal Witnesses in New York Ethics Scandal](#)
- [Coming to a Corrupt Court Near You: A New Administrative Judge](#)
- [Governor's Future Hinges on Chief Judge Pick](#)
- [Portfolio Magazine - Why was Tom Carvel's Death Certificate Forged?](#)
- [Federal Judge: "But you destroyed the faith of the people in their government."](#)
- [Attorney Gives New Meaning to Oral Argument](#)
- [Wannabe Judge Attorney Writes About Ethical Dilemmas SHE Failed to Report](#)
- [3 Judges Covered Crony's 9/11 Donation Fraud](#)
- [Former NY State Chief Court Clerk Sues Judges in Federal Court](#)
- [Concealing the Truth at the Attorney Ethics Committee](#)
- [NY Ethics Scandal Tied to International Espionage Scheme](#)
- [Westchester Surrogate's Court's Dastardly Deeds](#)

Wednesday, June 23, 2010

Iviewit Patentgate Fraud Jumps Into Anderson Appeal

09-5059-CV

United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

CHRISTINE C. ANDERSON, Plaintiff-Appellant,

--v--

THOMAS J. CAHILL, SHERRY K. COHEN, and DAVID SPOKONY, Defendants-Appellees

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF

P. STEPHEN LAMONT, PRO SE

35 LOCUST AVENUE, RYE, NEW YORK 10580

(914) 217-0038

P. Stephen Lamont, individually, and on behalf of shareholders of Iviewit Holdings, Inc. respectfully moves this Court for leave to file an Amicus

Curiae Brief in the instant appeal of Christine C. Anderson v. Thomas J. Cahill, et al. (CA2 Docket No. 09-509-cv, filed November 25, 2009).

Amicus Curiae clearly have an interest relating to the “property or transaction which is the subject of the appeal,” i.e., “retaliatory discharge on account of plaintiff’s complaints of whitewashing and corruption,” or, in the case of Amicus Curiae, the sabotage of intellectual property and the subsequent unpaid royalties resulting from whitewashing and corruption. Additionally, Amicus Curiae have both an organizational and a representative interest in this litigation of the issues that are the subject of this appeal, to wit whitewashing and corruption. From an organizational standpoint, a principle function of Amicus Curiae’s existence is to engage in business activity whereby original content creators and others would execute license agreements to benefit from the value propositions of the inventions, and pay royalties for such non-exclusive use. Accordingly, Amicus Curiae have an interest in seeing that conspiracies to whitewash attorney disciplinary complaints are adjudicated along the lines of the relief requested in instant appeal herein, especially when the United States Patent and Trademark Office has signaled that “what’s going on in your New York complaints,” or words to that effect, prior to giving Amicus Curiae the relief necessary to continue their patent applications.

Date: June 22, 2010

Attorney for Amicus Curiae

P. Stephen Lamont, Pro Se

35 Locust Avenue, Rye, N.Y. 10580

(914) 217-0038

09-5059-CV

United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

CHRISTINE C. ANDERSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

--v--

THOMAS J. CAHILL, SHERRY K. COHEN, and DAVID SPOKONY,

Defendants-Appellees

AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF

P. STEPHEN LAMONT, PRO SE

35 LOCUST AVENUE, RYE, NEW YORK 10580

(914) 217-0038

Table of Contents

IDENTIFICATION OF THE AMICUS CURIAE

INTEREST IN THE CASE

STATEMENT OF THE BASIS FOR JURISDICTION

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

ARGUMENT

A. DISTRICT COURT'S RELIANCE ON ROOKER-FELDMAN DOCTRINE

B. IMMUNITY ANALYSIS WITHIN THE ORDER

1. Eleventh Amendment Does Not Bar Suits for Declaratory or Injunctive Relief

2. Explicit §5 Override

3. The District Court's Order Cannot Claim Judicial and Qualified Immunity

CONCLUSION

Table of Authorities

Cases

Atascadero State Hospital v. Scanlon, 473 U.S. 234, 105 S.Ct. 3142, 87 L.Ed.2d 171 (1985) 9

District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 US. 462,483 n. 16 (1983) 7

Edelman v. Jordan, 415 U.S. 651 (1974) 8 -- Ex Parte Young, 209 U.S. 123, 160 (1908) 8

Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp., 544 U.S. 280 (2005) 7

Kostok v. Thomas, 105 F.3d 65, 69 (2d Cir. 1997) 9

Mitchum v. Foster, 407 U.S. 225,238-39 (1972) 9 -- U.S.C. 28 §1331 6

Constitutional Provisions

§5 of the Fourteenth Amendment 7, 8 -- Eleventh Amendment 7, 8

Statutes

28 U.S.C. § 1291 6 -- 28 U.S.C. §1254(1) 6 -- 28 U.S.C. §1331 6 -- U.S.C. 42 § 1983 9

IDENTIFICATION OF THE AMICUS CURIAE

The Amicus Curiae parties in this instant action are Plaintiffs, Plaintiff-Appellants, and Petitioners in the following cases:

Bernstein, et al v. Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee, et al. (07-cv-11196, S.D.N.Y filed December 12, 2007), Opinion and Order filed August 8, 2008 granting Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

Bernstein, et al v. Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee, et al. (08-cv-4873, CA2 NY, filed October 3, 2008), Opinion and Order filed January 5, 2010 dismissing appeal, Opinion and Order filed January 22, 2010 denying Motion for Reconsideration.

Lamont, et al v. Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee, et al. (Docket No. _____, U.S., filed April 22, 2010).

INTEREST IN THE CASE

Amicus Curiae clearly have an interest relating to the “property or transaction which is the subject of the appeal,” i.e., “retaliatory discharge on account of plaintiff’s complaints of whitewashing and corruption,” or, in the case of Amicus Curiae, the sabotage of intellectual property and the subsequent unpaid royalties resulting from whitewashing and corruption.

Additionally, Amicus Curiae, have both an organizational and a representative interest in this litigation of the issues that are the subject of this appeal, to wit, whitewashing and corruption. From an organizational standpoint, a principle function of Amicus Curiae’s existence is to engage in business activity whereby original content creators and others would execute license agreements to benefit from the value propositions of the Inventions, and pay royalties for such non-exclusive use. Accordingly, Amicus Curiae have an interest in seeing that conspiracies to whitewash attorney disciplinary complaints are adjudicated along the lines of the instant appeal, especially when the United States Patent and Trademark Office has signaled that “what’s going on in your New York complaints,” or words to that effect, prior to giving Amicus Curiae the relief necessary to continue their patent applications. Amicus Curiae’s interests may not be adequately represented by Plaintiff-Appellant Anderson. Thus, Amicus Curiae’s interests, as a practical matter, may be impaired or impeded by its inability to protect these interests without supporting the appeal, particularly given the fact that an adverse ruling by the Court could result in the continuation of the patent sabotage conspiracy, countless unpaid royalties to Amicus Curiae, and the resultant unwillingness of the United States Patent and Trademark Office to issue patents to Amicus Curiae based on the inventions. It remains at best uncertain whether the current Plaintiff-Appellant Anderson’s request for relief will encompass all possible issues related to the whitewashing and corruption in hearing attorney disciplinary complaints. It is much more likely that current Plaintiff-Appellant Anderson in this case will only develop the limited issues pertaining to her individual situation and therefore only seek the relief that would provide her individual remedy. Amicus Curiae will bring to the case a variety of fact patterns involving both conspiracies to whitewash attorney disciplinary complaints and the occurrences of civil racketeering among the same group of Defendants, in part; thus, Amicus Curiae’s support sharpens the argument on both sides and provides the Court with a more useful framework of advocacy from which to issue its decision.

STATEMENT OF THE BASIS FOR JURISDICTION

The District Court had jurisdiction under U.S.C. 28 §1331, and issued its Opinion and Order on August 8, 2008. A Motion for Reconsideration was filed on August 18, 2008, and the District Court denied the Motion on August 19, 2008. A Notice of Appeal was filed on September 4, 2008, and the Courts of Appeals for the Second Circuit has jurisdiction under U.S.C. 28 § 1291. The Court of Appeals dismissed the appeal on January 5, 2010. A Motion for Reconsideration was filed on January 12, 2010, and the Court of Appeals issued its final judgment on January 22, 2010. A Petition for a Writ of Certiorari was filed on April 22, 2010, and the United States Supreme Court has jurisdiction under U.S.C. 28 §1254(1).

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

1. Is a fundamental underpinning of Rooker-Feldman doctrine that the proper forum to appeal State court decisions is in State court (Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp., 544 U.S. 280 (2005))?
2. Does §5 of the Fourteenth Amendment grant Congress the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of that Amendment, and if so, does this Amendment abrogate the immunity provided by the Eleventh Amendment?

3. Is the purpose behind the enactment of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to secure the protection of Plaintiff-Appellant's constitutional rights against infringement by State governments and State actors who purportedly act under the authority of State law?

ARGUMENT

Amicus Curiae maintain the following:

A. District Court's Reliance on Rooker-Feldman Doctrine - In Amicus Curiae's proceedings, the District Court invoked the Rooker-Feldman doctrine as a means to support its Order in granting Amicus Curiae's Respondents' Motions to Dismiss. A recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp.*, 544 U.S. 280 (2005), makes clear that claim preclusion is a separate doctrine entirely.

Exxon stipulates the requisite elements that must be met for the Rooker-Feldman doctrine to apply (See also District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462, 483 n. 16 (1983)). None of the factors of Exxon are present in the instant appeal; the Rooker-Feldman doctrine simply does not apply.

B. Immunity Analysis within the Order Regarding Immunity, Amicus Curiae's Complaint, Amended Complaint, Opposition Memorandums, Appellant Brief, and Petition for a Writ of Certiorari pray for injunctive relief; this was clearly stated.

1. Eleventh Amendment Does Not Bar Suits for Declaratory or Injunctive Relief - The District Court's bald assertion that in Amicus Curiae's proceedings the Complaint lacked any foundation upon which the District Court can grant legal relief is clearly erroneous. The Eleventh Amendment does not preclude suit against State officers for the kind of injunctive and declaratory relief at issue here. If a State official acts in contravention of the Constitution, pursuant to an unconstitutional statute, or in a manner that violates an individual's constitutionally protected rights, suit to enjoin the offending behavior is proper and does not run afoul of a State's sovereign immunity. (See *Ex Parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123, 160 (1908), *Edelman v. Jordan*, 415 U.S. 651 (1974)). Additionally, *Ex Parte Young* and *Edelman v. Jordan* provide that the District Court could have provided retroactive monetary relief against an officer sued in his individual capacity, as bringing an action against an officer in his individual capacity does not implicate State sovereignty.

2. Explicit §5 Override - §5 of the Fourteenth Amendment grants Congress the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of that Amendment; courts have recognized that this new Amendment, again a consensus of the people, abrogates the immunity provided by the Eleventh Amendment. In *Atascadero State Hospital v. Scanlon*, 473 U.S. 234, 105 S.Ct. 3142, 87 L.Ed.2d 171 (1985), this Court said that Congress can use its Fourteenth Amendment power to override a State's Eleventh Amendment protection.

3. The District Court's Order Cannot Claim Judicial and Qualified Immunity. - Furthermore, in their proceedings, the District Court cannot allow Amicus Curiae's Respondents to use the guise of State authority as a license for violating Amicus-Curiae's constitutional rights. Indeed, the entire purpose behind the enactment of U.S.C. 42 § 1983 was to secure the protection of individuals' constitutional rights against infringement by State governments and State actors who purportedly act under the authority of State law; Section 1983 creates a private cause of action for damages (as well as injunctive relief) against those "persons" responsible for the deprivation (See *Mitchum v. Foster*, 407 U.S. 225, 238-39 (1972)). In *Kostok v. Thomas*, 105 F.3d 65, 69 (2d Cir. 1997), the court determined that declaratory and prospective injunctive relief are available, and that the Plaintiff-Appellants' claims brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 need not be dismissed.

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, Amicus Curiae respectfully supports that this Court reverse the judgment entered herein, with a finding of fact in favor of Plaintiff-Appellant; or if the Court does not feel that it would be justified by the facts in so doing that it should remand the case for a fair and impartial trial before an unprejudiced jury, on proper evidence, and under correct instructions as the law may deem just and proper.

Date: June 22, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

P. Stephen Lamont, Pro Se

Attorney for Amicus Curiae

P. Stephen Lamont, Pro Se

35 Locust Avenue, Rye, N.Y. 10580

Tel.: (914) 217-0038

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH F.R.A.P. RULE 32(a)(7)


The undersigned, P. Stephen Lamont, Pro Se, furnishes the following in compliance with F.R.A.P Rule 32(a)(7): I hereby certify that this brief conforms to the rules contained in F.R.A.P Rule 32(a)(7) for a brief produced with a proportionally spaced font. The length of this brief is 1365 words.

P. Stephen Lamont, Pro Se

Attorney for Amicus Curiae

35 Locust Avenue, Rye, N.Y. 10580

Tel.: 914) 217-0038

Posted by Corrupt Courts Administrator at 6:25 AM 

8 comments:

Anonymous said...

These criminals deserve any judicial enema available. Let's not forget about the biggest legal intestinal obstruction in Goshen New York County of Orange, Bernadette E. Lupinetti, Esq. married to a former ADA for Andrew Cuomos' Office Patrick Lupinetti, Esq. (2007) Bernadette E. Lupinetti, Esq. fixes child custody and divorce cases and engages in the trafficking of minor for sexual performance using a United States of America.

[June 23, 2010 9:46 AM](#)

Anonymous said...

Great Brief Mr.Lamont..You've done the right thing all along for the Iviewit Company...Keep up the good work!!!!

[June 23, 2010 8:25 PM](#)

will galison said...

Can the rest of us file amicus briefs as well?

[June 24, 2010 12:02 AM](#)

Anonymous said...

supporting anderson is surely a positive act but seems like some puffing and posturing in the comment here. the filing does appear to be a bit of a cut and paste of prior filings but those arguments are good arguments nonetheless. but it does appear to be a bit short on connecting the dots via Anderson and the First Dept DDC, Rubenstein et al via Iviewit. this statement is qualified however by stating that a review of any recent Anderson filings has not yet occurred which may otherwise clarify how the dots are connected and perhaps a review of such filings by Anderson does in fact connect the dots already. either way, hoping all goes well for all involved and concerned.

hudson valley region

June 24, 2010 12:26 PM

Anonymous said...

Id agree with the last comment. Someone care to spell it out?

Any news yet a response from the Governor on that Feb /2010 request to stop funding the crooks in the A-Div's & the CJC ? Lots of concerned would like to know. Also just when it the fed going to do something ? When hell freezes?

June 24, 2010 3:09 PM

Anonymous said...

What is Mr. Lamont's legal standing? Is he a certified shareholder of the Iviewit Company? Didn't see any evidence of that material fact. Anderson needs all the help she can get since it is evident that she has not been well served by some people.

June 24, 2010 3:36 PM

Anonymous said...

Mr Lamont is the CEO of Iviewit and holder of 11% of the capital shares outstanding. To fulfill his fiduciary. duties, he acts individually and on behalf of his shareholders as Iviewit has no standing in its own right without representation by an attorney.

June 24, 2010 7:06 PM

Eliot Ivan Bernstein Iviewitsaid...

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2010/06/iviewit-patentgate-fraud-jumps-into.html>

Despite the Lamont lamenting, he has no standing to act on behalf of anyone for any reason as he is NOT an ATTORNEY, as he never ever passed the State Bar exam, after allegedly completing Columbia Law School? Funny, no one joined Lamont after all his claims that everyone was on board with his filings of fraud. Mr. Lamont has been terminated, FIRED, from Iviewit and representing Eliot Bernstein in any way and further reported to criminal authorities for alleged criminal misconduct.

This filing and any others will be used as further prima fascia evidence of criminal misconduct.

Lamont has no standing in the Eliot Bernstein lawsuit, as he failed to file individually and never amended the complaint to change his interest, thus as he cannot represent others, despite his legally unqualified claims and did not sue individually he therefore has no legal basis. The arguments above are ridiculous, the argument in the case is that there is FRAUD ON THE COURT and CRIMINAL OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, not retort to fraudulent court orders, etc. Only an idiot could not see this clearly.

I, Eliot, have put the criminals on notice, I have halted my case notifying criminal authorities of the crimes identified by Anderson, the crimes of the judges and clerks, the NY AG, DA, ADA, etc. and I wait the outcome of those I notified, including NY Judiciary Committee, Glenn Fine, DOJ, House and Senate Judiciary Committees and more. Lamont trying to rush my lawsuit illegally through the courts makes no sense as the criminal allegations by Anderson must go first and then civil cases will return, ask any lawyer, just make sure they took the bar and give true legal advice. Otherwise be weary of those who give legal advice and aid without legal degrees.

Bat Out of Hell

Eliot I. Bernstein

Inventor

Iviewit Holdings, Inc. - DL

Iviewit Holdings, Inc. - DL

Iviewit Holdings, Inc. - FL

Iviewit Technologies, Inc. - DL

Uviewit Holdings, Inc. - DL

Uview.com, Inc. - DL

Iviewit.com, Inc. - FL

Iviewit.com, Inc. - DL

I.C., Inc. - FL

Iviewit.com LLC - DL

Iviewit LLC - DL

Iviewit Corporation - FL

Iviewit, Inc. - FL

Iviewit, Inc. - DL

Iviewit Corporation

2753 N.W. 34th St.
Boca Raton, Florida 33434-3459
(561) 245.8588 (o)
(561) 886.7628 (c)
(561) 245-8644 (f)
iviewit@iviewit.tv
<http://www.iviewit.tv>
<http://iviewit.tv/wordpress>
<http://iviewit.tv/wordpresseliot>
Other Websites I like:
<http://www.deniedpatent.com>
<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com>
<http://www.judgewatch.org/index.html>
<http://www.enddiscriminationnow.com>
<http://www.corruptcourts.org>
<http://www.changecourtsnow.com>
<http://www.makeourofficialsaccountable.com>
<http://www.parentadvocates.org>
<http://www.newyorkcourtcorruption.blogspot.com>
<http://cuomotarp.blogspot.com>
<http://www.disbarthefloridabar.com>
<http://www.VoteForGreg.us> Greg Fischer
<http://www.liberty-candidates.org/greg-fischer/>
<http://www.facebook.com/pages/Vote-For-Greg/111952178833067>
<http://www.killallthelawyers.ws/law> (The Shakespearean Solution)

June 30, 2010 6:10 AM

[Post a Comment](#)

Links to this post

[Create a Link](#)

[Newer
Post](#)

[Home](#)

[Older
Post](#)

Subscribe to: [Post Comments \(Atom\)](#)

See Video of Senator John L. Sampson's 1st Hearing on Court 'Ethics' Corruption

The first hearing, held in Albany on June 8, 2009 hearing is on two videos:

[CLICK HERE TO SEE Part 1](#)

[CLICK HERE TO SEE Part 2](#)

REFRESH - Go To Home Page

Video of 1st Hearing on Court 'Ethics' Corruption
The June 8, 2009 hearing is on two videos:

[CLICK HERE TO SEE Part 1](#)

[CLICK HERE TO SEE Part 2](#)

Click here to leave COMMENTS about the videos

Worthy of Review: [Click here to see 'Sex Scandal at Attorney Ethics Committee'](#)

Worthy of Review: [Click here to see 'NY Attorney pleads guilty to federal felony; Gets law license back'](#)



About Me

Corrupt Courts Administrator

[E-Mail Address](#)

[View my complete profile](#)

[Go To Home Page](#)

Westchester Keeping Feds Busy

- [Target #2 - Anthony Scarpino](#)
- [Target #1 - Francis Nicolai](#)

Search This Blog

powered by

ExposeCorruptCourts.blogspot.com



Westchester Braces for Onslaught of Federal Corruption Indictments

Informed sources have revealed that Westchester County, along with parts of Rockland, Bronx and Manhattan Counties, are about to be rocked by a series of corruption indictments. Federal Investigators have been working for nearly three years on the ever-growing and wide-spread list of charges, says the source. "The extent of public corruption in

Westchester is staggering- a panoply of crime yet uncovered in the United States. The indictments will hit many of New York's most influential in politics, finance and the legal community." **Starting October 29, 2009, we'll be highlighting some of the involved issues..... View "Westchester Keeping Feds Busy"**

September 24, 2009 NYS Senate Judiciary Hearing



More Exposure of Widespread Corruption in NY's Judiciary

VIDEO OF MANHATTAN SEPTEMBER 24, 2009 COURT CORRUPTION HEARING!

Judge John L. Phillips



Judge John L. Phillips

Corruption Targets Judge - Part II



David Grandeau, "Ethics matters."

Tom Robbins on New York Judges



Tom Robbins on NY Judges - See July 28, 2007 Post

Judicial Destruction

To See Judicial Destruction Story [CLICK HERE](#)

Judge Ramos Recusal: NO



Judge Ramos Recusal: NO

Ramos-Lippman-Weissberg Documents



[Ramos-Lippman-Weissberg Documents](#)

Was Tom Carvel Murdered for Hundreds of Millions? (CLICK ON PHOTO)



Body of Tom Carvel to be Exhumed

[CLICK HERE TO SEE VIDEO OF SEPTEMBER 24, 2009 COURT CORRUPTION HEARING](#)

[CLICK HERE TO:](#)

[Contact New York State Senator John L. Sampson TODAY !](#)

[Contact the New York State Senate Judiciary Committee TODAY!](#)

The Sampson Investigation

- [June 9, 2009- New York Law Journal: Grievances Against Lawyer, Judge Discipline Panels Aired at Capital](#)
- [May 23, 2009- Fax Press Contacts Today-Tell Them to Advertise Hearings!!](#)
- [May 22, 2009- NYS Senate Judiciary Committee Contact Information](#)
- [May 21, 2009- New York Law Journal: Judiciary Committee to Hold Hearings on Disciplinary Bodies](#)
- [May 20, 2009- Senator John Sampson Announces](#)

Public Hearings on Ethics Oversight: Monday, June 8, 2009

NY Daily News on Court Corruption



NY Daily News on Court Corruption - See May 17, 2007 Post

Ex-Judge David Gross - See Friday, September 16, 2007 Post



Ex-Judge David Gross

Judge Frank V. Ponterio



Judge Frank V. Ponterio

Horowitz Documents



Horowitz Documents

The Post Standard - OK to Sue Administrative Judge - See October 14, 2007 Post



Jim O'Hara

Former NY State Chief Court Clerk Sues Judges in Federal Court - See Monday, June 11, 2007 Post



Former Chief Court Clerk Sues Judges

Join Senator Eric Adams Tonight !!



NYS Senator Adams Virtual Town Hall Tonight !

Re: U.S. Department of Justice

April 20, 2009: We expect to have the name of a specific contact person soon, to whom information may be presented to regarding any complaint and/or information filed with any FBI agent, squad or regional office that needs re-review, reconsideration or special attention. Meanwhile, the address is: **U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Professional Responsibility, Room 3266, 950 Pennsylvania, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530** --- **Send us an email request and we will advise you directly once the contact information is made available.**

April 20, 2009: **WANTED!! - (1)** Your ignored complaints to the Commission on Judicial Conduct; and **(2)** Your ignored or whitewashed complaints to any New York State Attorney Ethics Committee. **SEND PDF FILES TO: CorruptCourts@gmail.com**

Judge to Cancer Patient: No \$\$ for Treatment - See Thursday, June 14, 2007 Post




Judge to Cancer Patient: No \$ for Treatment

Carvel Smoking Gun - See Tuesday, October 9, 2007 Post



Carvel Smoking Gun

Pirro Cost County Millions



[CLICK HERE TO SEE STORY](#)

NY Ethics Cover Up Complaint



Tammany Hall II - NY Ethics Scandal

[CLICK HERE TO SEE STORY](#)

Carvel story in The Westchester Guardian




[The Westchester Guardian](#)

Tom Carvel's Last Will (click on page)



[Tom Carvel's Last Will](#)

Carvel Criminal Complaint



Carvel Criminal Complaint

Scarpino & Streng on Internet



Scarpino & Streng on Internet

Judicial Destruction in Westchester - See April 9th & 20th Posts



Judicial Destruction

Attorney Gives New Meaning to Oral Argument



Lawyer Caught on Tape-CLICK ON IMAGE

Judicial Advertising



Judicial Advertising

Ex-Judge Lawrence Horowitz - See Saturday, July 14, 2007 Post



Ex-Judge Lawrence Horowitz

Contact Members of the NYS Judiciary Committee Today !!

[CLICK HERE](#) to get a full list of contact information for members of the New York State Senate Judiciary

Committee: names, addresses, telephone, facsimile and email.....

Judge Valcich



Judge Valcich

View: FILES WAITING TO BE SHREDDED and 2 Court Orders Against Pirro That Cost County \$350,000.00!

• <http://picasaweb.google.com/corruptcourts>

Concealing the Truth - See Saturday, October 6, 2007 Post



Sealing the Truth

Esposito Ethics Scandal Complaint



Esposito Ethics Scandal Complaint

New York Judicial Election Process is a Sham



New York Times: Real Judicial Elections

D.O.J. Widens "Patentgate" Probe - See Friday, August 24, 2007 Post



D.O.J. Widens Patentgate Probe

New York Ethics Scandal



DDC Ethics Cover-Up
Complaint

"Officers of the Court" Who Have Defied Their Oath

- December 4, 2008 - Allen H. Isaac, for attempting to get oral sex in legal representation deal, "Attorney Gives New Meaning to Oral Argument"
- December 3, 2008 - Eve Rachel Markewich, "Wannabe Judge Attorney Writes About Ethical Dilemmas SHE Failed to Report."
- December 2, 2008 - Jody B. Keltz, OCA attorney who still enjoys Scarsdale home of an old dead lady, "Westchester Surrogate's Court's Dastardly Deeds"
- December 1, 2008- Emani P. Taylor, Esq., and as highlighted in "Flesh-Eating Lawyer Must Repay \$403,000."

Wannabe Judge Attorney Markewich on Ethics Violations She Failed to Report



Markewich Ethics

[CLICK HERE TO SEE: "Wannabe Judge Attorney Markewich Writes About Ethics Violations SHE failed to Report"](#)

Silbermann - Gass v Gass



Silbermann - Gass v Gass

Scarpino Complaint to Judge Pfau



Scarpino Complaint to Judge Pfau

Judge Pfau, Bronx Bomber - See Friday, September 14, 2007 Post



Judge Pfau, Bronx Bomber



MEMO to "Concerned Citizen" with James "Whitey" Bulger Information

Dear "Concerned Citizen,"

Yes, your complete confidentiality can be assured.

Frank Brady - telephone: 347-632-9775 telephone;
email: corruptcourts@gmail.com or FrankNBrady@gmail.com

Any Posted Document below can be e-mailed to you as an attached PDF file. Send your specific request to:
CorruptCourts@gmail.com

[Go To Home Page](#)

And then there were **TEN** federal cases in the growing New York Ethics Scandal.

Summary:

1. (07cv09599) Anderson v The State of New York, et al
2. (07cv11196) Bernstein, et al v Appellate Division First Department Disciplinary Committee, et al
3. (07cv11612) Esposito v The State of New York, et al
4. (06cv05169) McNamara v The State of New York, et al
5. (08cv02391) McKeown v The State of New York, et al
6. (08cv02852) Galison v The State of New York, et al
7. (08cv03305) Carvel v The State of New York, et al
8. (08cv04053) Weisshaus v The State of New York, et al
9. (08cv04438) McCormick v The State of New York, et al
10. (08cv05455) Capogrosso v The New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct, et al

To see the latest court filings, click **DOCUMENTS** at:
www.FrankBrady.org

If you would like a pdf copy of any federal court filing emailed to you, let us know at CorruptCourts@gmail.com

In Fairness to the Courts...

It is not easy being a judge, and disgraceful that the public usually only hears about the bad judges. And while this forum attempts to expose the reprehensible acts of corrupt courts, it is important to be fair to the many under-appreciated law-abiding judges and court employees. Judges are grossly under compensated, and must rely heavily on unnamed staff who sometimes carry their own biases and improper political agendas. So let's expose and eradicate the corruption, but we are socially obligated to consider: (1) how do we get our judges adequately compensated; and (2) what specific and constructive suggestions can be made and implemented to insure the integrity of our courts. Send, too, ideas to make the courts a better system for all of us!!

Our year-long investigation has confirmed that the purported judicial "ethics" enforcer, The New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct, is itself a biased, corrupt

group that protects certain judges while destroying others who have become targets of the political thugs who control them. Something is terribly wrong when even our honest and law-abiding judges are failed by our justice system. The New York State system of justice is a corrupt process that has all but ruined the faith of the people in their government.

Judicial Reports: Fallen Guardian Angels - See Wednesday, September 19, 2007 Post



[Fallen Guardian Angels](#)

Mailed by Judge



[Mailed by Judge](#)

www.JudicialReports.com - The Color of Judge Money - See Sunday, February 17, 2008



[JudicialReports.com - The Color of Judge Money](#)

Click on Page to See FBI Bank of New York Non-Prosecution Agreement Info



[FBI Bank of New York Non-Prosecution Agreement](#)

Ethics Scandal Update: February 7, 2008



[Ethics Scandal Federal Court Transcript \(December 12, 2007\)](#)

www.WLF.org



The Washington Legal Foundation

February 21, 2008 Answer by NYS - See Tuesday, February 26, 2008 POST



New York State's Answer in Ethics Scandal

Weisshaus Fagan Lieberman



Weisshaus Fagan Lieberman

Sunday, February 10, 2008-New Jersey Ethics Counsel says NY Holocaust Attorney Should Be Disbarred



NJ Ethics Findings- Disbar Fagan

Milberg Weiss



Milberg Weiss

Senator Clinton Condemned by Center For Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)



Center For Judicial Accountability, Inc. (www.judgewatch.org)

Robert R. Reed



Robert R. Reed

Position Available: Another NY Judge needed to be a Hero For Future Generations -- We need another elected New York Judge to come forward and speak out about the systemic corruption within and about the NY court system. Must be willing to assist in plans to restore integrity and the rule of law back to our treasured courts. **Benefits:** A good nights sleep, and an opportunity to become a hero for future generations. --- **Salary:** None --- **Details:** A few private meetings with friendly Federal Agents, and one big explosive press conference. **For more details, contact:** corruptcourts@gmail.com (*Confidentiality Guaranteed- until the press conference, of course*)

Click MAY to see these stories:

- Hope in the Fight Against Corruption in Our Courts Has Arrived. Her Name is Ann T. Pfau.
- 2 Developing Stories

- Wannabe Judge Attorney Writes About Ethical Dilemmas SHE Failed to Report.
- Carvel story in The Westchester Guardian
- NY Daily News Speaks Out Against Court Corruption
- Carvel's Plea to Spitzer Sparks 2nd Request for Special I.G.

Click APRIL to see these stories:

- Tom Carvel's Kin Urgent Plea to Governor Spitzer
- Digging Up More Than Tom Carvel's Body !
- Judicial Destruction of Court Records
- Judicial Destruction...2 Sets of Books (case files) !!
- FBI Swamped with Bank of New York Violations
- Part II- Westchester Surrogate's Court's Dastardly Deeds

Carvel Letter to Governor Spitzer (click on page)



Carvel Plea to NY Governor Spitzer

MEMO to "Concerned Citizen" with James "Whitey" Bulger Information

Dear "Concerned Citizen,"
Yes. As you desire, your complete confidentiality can be assured.

Frank Brady - telephone: 347-632-9775 telephone;
email:
corrupcourts@gmail.com or FrankNBrady@gmail.com

Click on Page to See Carvel Federal Court Filing



Carvel Exhumation Lawsuit

Click here for MCQUADE COMPLAINT



MCQUADE COMPLAINT

MCQUADE COMPLAINT STATUS



MCQUADE COMPLAINT STATUS

STRENG FILING



STRENG FILING

JUNE ORDERS (2)



JUNE ORDERS (2)

NICOLAI COMPLAINT



NICOLAI COMPLAINT

LOEHR SPATZ DAHL



[LOEHR SPATZ DAHL](#)

addme

[AddMe - Search Engine Optimization](#)

[Go To Home Page](#)