

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001**

August 12, 2010

P. Stephen Lamont  
35 Locust Avenue  
Rye, NY 10580


RE: P. Stephen Lamont, et al. v. Appellate Division First Department Disciplinary  
Committee, et al.

Dear Mr. Lamont:

The enclosed correspondence regarding the above-entitled case was received on  
August 12, 2010, and is herewith returned for the reasons stated in my letter dated June  
30, 2010.

Sincerely,  
William K. Suter, Clerk

By:

  
Gail Johnson  
(202) 479-3038

Enclosures

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001**

June 30, 2010

P. Stephen Lamont  
35 Locust Avenue  
Rye, NY 10580

RE: P. Stephen Lamont, et al. v. Appellate Division First Department Disciplinary Committee, et al.

Dear Mr. Lamont:

Returned are copies of the petition for a writ of certiorari and separate appendix in the above-entitled case originally postmarked April 22, 2010, and received again June 29, 2010, which fails to make the changes in prior correspondence from this office.

The text of the petition and appendix must be typeset in a Century family (e.g., Century Expanded, New Century Schoolbook, or Century Schoolbook) 12-point type with 2-point or more leading between lines. The typeface of footnotes must be 10-point or larger with 2-point or more leading between lines. Rule 33.1(b).

Please note that you were given 60 days from April 27, 2010, within which to file a corrected petition.

Sincerely,  
William K. Suter, Clerk  
By:

Gail Johnson  
(202) 479-3038

Enclosures



**IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC.**

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

**By Federal Express**  
**Label #:** 468698415002926

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