



IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC.

P. Stephen Lamont
Chief Executive Officer
Direct Dial: 914-217-0038

By Federal Express

Label #: _____

August 9, 2010

Hon. Ruth Bader Ginsburg
Associate Justice
Supreme Court of the United States
1 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

RE: P. Stephen Lamont, et al. v. Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee, et al., on Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Dear Hon. Ginsburg:

By way of introduction, I am P. Stephen Lamont, Chief Executive Officer of Iviewit Holdings, Inc., and I respectfully request that my timely Petition be docketed and considered on the merits in the interest of justice and as the issues affect millions of U.S. citizens and many more abroad.

Moreover, I am a party, individually and on behalf of shareholders of Iviewit, in *Bernstein, et al v. Appellate Division First Department Disciplinary Committee, et al.* (08-cv-4873, CA2 NY, filed October 3, 2008), Opinion and Order filed January 22, 2010 denying Motion for Reconsideration on appeal from *Bernstein, et al v. Appellate Division First Department 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.

Furthermore, I filed a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari on April 22, 2010, from the decision rendered by the Second Circuit on January 22, 2010, or eighty nine (89) days

from the conclusion of the proceedings in the lower court. Thus, the fee paid Petition was timely. By letter of April 26, 2010, William K. Suter, Clerk of this Court responded by asking for formatting changes in the Petition where Petitioners' April 22 filing fell outside the Rules of this Court, and granted sixty (60) days in which to do so.

On June 24, 2010, your Petitioners resubmitted the Petition on June 24, 2010, or fifty nine (59) days from the date of Mr. Suter's letter. Thus, the repaired, booklet form Petition was timely. Still further, by letter of June 30, 2010, Mr. Suter again responded pointing to shortfalls in the repaired, booklet form Petition filed on June 24, 2010. On July 14, 2010, Rod Curry of Curry & Taylor a professional Supreme Court printing company now engaged by Petitioners, placed a telephone call to Mr. Suter's office inquiring as to his company's resubmitting of the second repaired Petition, to which Mr. Suter's office replied "No," or words to that effect.

As such, Petitioners filed a Motion for an Enlargement of Time to Repair Petition as Petitioners' particular claims are of national importance to 105 million U.S. households enjoying the delivery of DVD quality digital video and imaging and many more abroad (the inventions of which are further described in the enclosed Petition), wherein by his letter dated July 26, 2010, Mr. Suter again returned Petitioners documents stating that "...the Rules of this Court make no provision for filing an application for an extension of time to file a corrected petition for writ of certiorari." It was this instance in the Petition filing process that leads to this letter.

At this point, Hon. Ginsburg, your Petitioners while having timely filed a fee paid Petition, such application still does not sit on the Court's docket for consideration on the merits, but, factually, the pursuit of Petitioners claims are seemingly interrupted and obstructed through a step-by-step sequence of activities that have resulted in the return of your Petitioners' filings that demonstrates the unfairness of not getting our day in court over such a trivial formatting issue.

Interest of Justice

As such, Hon. Ginsburg, Petitioners respectfully request that your Honor, in your capacity as the allotted Supreme Court Justice for the Second Circuit, grant a liberal construction of the Rules of the Court for Pro se litigants and accept the timely filed and properly served June 24, 2010 Petition for a Writ of Certiorari (enclosed). However, if your Honor does not feel that it would be justified by the facts in so doing, then to grant Petitioners an enlargement of time to file a repaired Petition through Cutter & Taylor, or some other Supreme Court printing company. We look forward to a reply at your Honor's convenience.

Issues of National Importance

Lastly, of national importance, Petitioners' claims stem from the alleged patent sabotage of their video scaling and image overlay systems technologies. As it relates to the inventions, Petitioners refer not to some rudimentary software that will be rendered obsolete as newer versions emerge, but that said video scaling and image overlay systems are THE backbone, enabling technologies for the encoding of and transmission of video and images across all transmission networks and viewable on all display devices, where the inventors went back to square one to create an elegant upstream solution (towards the content creator) of reconfiguring video and image frames to unlock former bandwidth constraints, storage constraints, and provide for lower processing capabilities, effectively taking the digital video and imaging worlds to a new dimension.

Accordingly, the inventions impact commerce, business, and the ability and enjoyment of the delivery of quality digital video and imaging for 105 million U.S. households, and across multiple devices including but not limited to digital terrestrial television, digital cable television, digital satellite television, multipoint-multichannel delivery television systems, the Internet, digital video discs ("DVD's"), the hard drives of any consumer electronic devices, mobile phones, high definition DVD, digital cameras, and any other digital video capture device; factually, the Petitioners stake the claim as the inventors of digital zoom.

As such, Hon. Ginsburg, I respectfully request that you accept the Petition for filing. Thank you for considering my request.

Very truly yours,

IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC.

By: _____
Chief Executive Officer

Mail replies to:

35 Locust Avenue
Rye, N.Y. 10580