**Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form**

**Please accept and return signed the following Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form (COI) before continuing further with adjudication, review or investigation of the attached letter to the New York Attorney General’s Office titled,**

“**Re: Phone Call on April 14, 2011 with James Rogers on behalf of Harlan Levy referred by Steven Michael Cohen, Chief of Staff to Governor Andrew Cuomo, Regarding FILED Criminal Complaints Against the New York Attorney General’s Office, Attorney General Andrew Cuomo, Steven Michael Cohen, Chief of Secretary to Governor Andrew Cuomo and Monica Connell, of the New York State Office of the Attorney General”** and any/all materials relating to Eliot Bernstein and or the Iviewit companies.

**After 10 Days, if this form has not been signed or subsequently turned over to a NON CONFLICTED PARTY, your Failure to comply may result in criminal and civil charges FILED against you FOR AIDING AND ABETTING A RICO CRIMINAL ORGANIZATION, FEDERAL OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE and more, AS NOTED HEREIN**.

This Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form is designed to ensure that the review and any determinations from such review of the enclosed materials will not be biased by any conflicting financial interest or any other conflicting interest by those reviewers responsible for the handling of this confidential information. Whereby any conflict with any of the main alleged perpetrators of the alleged crimes referenced in these matters or any other perpetrators not know at this time must be fully disclosed and affirmed in writing and returned. Provide rationale for any conflicts that may exist that you feel will not impart fair and impartial review on your part for review by the Iviewit companies and Eliot I. Bernstein, prior to any action on your part.

Disclosure forms with "Yes" answers by any party to any of the following questions are demanded not to open the remainder of the documents or opine in any manner until reviewed and approved by the Iviewit companies and Eliot I. Bernstein. If you feel that conflict of interests exist that cannot be overcome instantly forward the matters on to the next available reviewer that is free of conflict that can sign and complete the requisite disclosure. Please identify conflicts that you have in writing upon terminating your involvement in the matters. As many of these alleged perpetrators are large law firms, members of various state and federal courts and officers of federal, state and local law enforcement agencies, careful review and disclosure of any conflict with those named herein is pertinent in your continued handling of these matters.

As these matters involve claims of, including but not limited to, conflicts of interest, violations of public offices, interference with complaints in the Supreme Court of New York, coercion, document destruction, obstructions of justice, tampering with Federal Witnesses, RICO, ATTEMPTED MURDER, the need for prescreening for conflict is essential to the administration of due process in these matters to avoid charges of OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. Federal Judge Shira A. Scheindlin has legally related these matters to a Whistleblower Lawsuit who alleges similar claims of public office corruption against Supreme Court of New York personnel and possibly others. Please take this as a formal written request for full disclosure of any conflict on your part to any related matters known or unknown, such request conforming with all applicable state and federal laws, public office rules and regulations, attorney conduct codes and judicial canons or other international law and treatises requiring disclosure of conflicts and recusal from matters where conflict precludes involvement.

Failure to comply with all applicable conflict disclosure rules, regulations and laws prior to continued action on your part **will be cause** for the filing of complaints against you for any decisions or actions you make prior to a signed Conflict Of Interest Disclosure Form with all applicable regulatory agencies. Complaints will be filed with all appropriate authorities, including but not limited to the appropriate, Federal, State, Local and International Law Enforcement Agencies, Public Integrity Officials, Judicial Conduct Officials, State and Federal Bar Associations, Disciplinary Departments and any/all other appropriate oversight agencies for failing to follow well established rules and regulations governing public office conflict, attorney conduct conflicts, judicial conduct and law.

1. Do you, your spouse, and your dependents, in the aggregate have, any direct or indirect relations (relationships), or interest in any outside entity or any direct or indirect relations (relationships) to any of the parties listed in [EXHIBIT 1](#Exhibit1) of this document to the proceeding of the matters you are reviewing:
2. Do you, your spouse, and your dependents, in the aggregate have, any direct or indirect relations (relationships), or interest in any outside entity or any direct or indirect relations (relationships) to Any other known or unknown person or known or unknown entity not named herein that will cause your review of the complaint you are charged with investigating to be biased by any conflicting past, present, or future financial interest or any other interest(s)?

**\_\_\_\_\_NO \_\_\_\_YES**

**Please describe in detail any identified conflicted parties on a separate and attached sheet. Fully disclose all information regarding the conflict. If the answer is Yes, please describe the relations, relationships and / or interests and please affirm whether such presents a conflict of interest in fairly reviewing the matters herein without undue bias or prejudice of any kind. Please indicate if you are seeking waiver of the conflict(s) or will be disqualifying from involvement in these matters.**

1. Do you, your spouse, and your dependents, in the aggregate, receive salary or other remuneration or financial considerations from any entity related to the enclosed parties to the proceeding of the matters including but not limited to campaign contributions whether direct, "in kind" or of any type at all?

**\_\_\_\_\_NO \_\_\_\_YES**

**Please describe in detail any consideration(s) on a separate and attached sheet fully disclosing all information regarding the consideration(s). If the answer is Yes, please describe the relations, relationships and / or interests and please affirm whether such presents a conflict of interest in fairly reviewing the matters herein without undue bias or prejudice of any kind.**

1. Have you, your spouse, and your dependents, in the aggregate, had any prior communication(s), including but not limited to, phone, facsimile, e-mail, mail, verbal, etc. with any person related to the proceeding of the Iviewit or related matters?

**\_\_\_\_\_NO \_\_\_\_YES**

**Please describe in detail any identified communication(s) on a separate and attached sheet fully disclosing all information regarding the communication(s). If the answer is Yes, please describe the communication(s) in detail, including but not limited to, who was present, what type of communication, the date and time, please affirm whether such communication(s) present a conflict of interest in fairly reviewing the matters herein without undue bias or prejudice of any kind.**

1. I have run a thorough and exhaustive Conflict of Interest check to conform with any and all state, federal or local laws, public office rules and regulations and any professional association rules and regulations regarding disclosure of any conflicts to verify that my spouse, my dependents, and I in the aggregate, have no conflicts with any parties to the matters referenced herein.

**\_\_\_\_\_NO \_\_\_\_YES**

1. I have notified all parties with any liabilities regarding my continued actions in these matters, including state agencies, insurance concerns or any other person with liability that may result from my actions in these matters.

**\_\_\_\_\_NO \_\_\_\_YES**

**Relevant Sections of Judicial Cannons, Attorney Conduct Codes and Law**

**Conflict of Interest Laws & Regulations**

**Conflict of interest" indicates a situation where a private interest may influence a public decision. Conflict of Interest Laws are laws and regulations designed to prevent conflicts of interest. These laws may contain provisions related to financial or asset disclosure, exploitation of one's official position and privileges, regulation of campaign practices, etc.**

**\*\*\*\*The Relevant Sections are merely a benchmark guide and other state, federal and international laws may be applicable to your particular circumstances in reviewing or acting in these matters. For a more complete list of applicable sections of law relating to these matters please visit** [**http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/oneofthesedays/index.htm#\_Toc107852933**](http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/oneofthesedays/index.htm#_Toc107852933)

**New York State Consolidated Laws Penal**   
ARTICLE 200 BRIBERY INVOLVING PUBLIC SERVANTS AND RELATED OFFENSES

S 200.03 Bribery in the second degree

S 200.04 Bribery in the first degree

S 200.05 Bribery; defense

S 200.10 Bribe receiving in the third degree

S 200.11 Bribe receiving in the second degree

S 200.12 Bribe receiving in the first degree

S 200.15 Bribe receiving; no defense

S 200.20 Rewarding official misconduct in the second degree

S 200.22 Rewarding official misconduct in the first degree S 200.25 Receiving reward for official misconduct in the second degree

S 200.27 Receiving reward for official misconduct in the first degree

S 200.30 Giving unlawful gratuities

S 200.35 Receiving unlawful gratuities

S 200.40 Bribe giving and bribe receiving for public office; definition of term

S 200.45 Bribe giving for public office

S 200.50 Bribe receiving for public office

ARTICLE 175 OFFENSES INVOLVING FALSE WRITTEN STATEMENTS

S 175.05 Falsifying business records in the second degree. S 175.10 Falsifying business records in the first degree.

S 175.15 Falsifying business records; defense

S 175.20 Tampering with public records in the second degree

S 175.25 Tampering with public records in the first degree

S 175.30 Offering a false instrument for filing in the second degree

S 175.35 Offering a false instrument for filing in the first degree

NY Constitution ARTICLE XIII Public Officers

Public Officers - Public Officers ARTICLE 1

ARTICLE 2 Appointment and Qualification of Public Officers - ARTICLE 15 ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS

S 468-b. Clients` security fund of the state of New York

S 476-a. Action for unlawful practice of the law

S 476-b. Injunction to restrain defendant from unlawful practice of the law

S 476-c. Investigation by the attorney-general

S 487. Misconduct by attorneys

S 488. Buying demands on which to bring an action.

Public Officers Law SEC 73 Restrictions on the Activities Of Current and Former State Officers and Employees

Public Officers Law SEC 74 Code of Ethics

Conflicts of Interest Law, found in Chapter 68 of the New York City Charter, the City's Financial Disclosure Law, set forth in section 12-110 of the New York City Administrative Code, and the Lobbyist Gift Law, found in sections 3-224 through 3-228 of the Administrative Code.

**TITLE 18 FEDERAL CODE & OTHER APPLICABLE FEDERAL LAW**

TITLE 18 PART I CH 11

Sec. 201. Bribery of public officials and witnesses

Sec. 225. - Continuing financial crimes enterprise

BRIBERY, GRAFT, AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Sec. 205. - Activities of officers and employees in claims against and other matters affecting the Government

Sec. 208. - Acts affecting a personal financial interest

Sec. 210. - Offer to procure appointive public office

Sec. 225. - Continuing financial crimes enterprise

TITLE 18 PART I CH 79 Sec 1623 - False declarations before grand jury or court

Sec 654 - Officer or employee of United States converting property of another

TITLE 18 PART I CH 73 Sec 1511 - Obstruction of State or local law enforcement

TITLE 18 PART I CH 96 Sec 1961 RACKETEER INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT Organizations ("RICO")

Section 1503 (relating to obstruction of justice),

Section 1510 (relating to obstruction of criminal investigations)

Section 1511 (relating to the obstruction of State or local law enforcement),

Section 1952 (relating to racketeering),

Section 1957 (relating to engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity),

TITLE 18 PART I CH 96 SEC 1962 (A) RICO

TITLE 18 PART I CH 96 SEC 1962 (B) RICO

TITLE 18 PART I CH 96 SEC 1962 (C) RICO

title 18 part i ch 19 sec 1962 (d) RICO

TITLE 18 PART I CH 19 CONSPIRACY Sec 371 CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE OR TO DEFRAUD UNITED STATES

TITLE 18 PART I CH 95 RACKETEERING SEC 1957 Engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity

TITLE 18 PART I CH 47 Sec 1031 - Major fraud against the United States

**Judicial Cannons**

**Canon 1. A Judge Should Uphold the Integrity and Independence of the Judiciary**

[1.1] Deference to the judgments and rulings of courts depends upon public confidence in the integrity and independence of judges. The integrity and independence of judges depends in turn upon their acting without fear or favor. Although judges should be independent, they must comply with the law, including the provisions of this Code. Public confidence in the impartiality of the judiciary is maintained by the adherence of each judge to this responsibility. Conversely, violation of this Code diminishes public confidence in the judiciary and thereby does injury to the system of government under law.

**Canon 2. A Judge Should Avoid Impropriety and the Appearance of Impropriety in All Activities**

(A) A judge shall respect and comply with the law and shall act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.

[2.2][2A] The prohibition against behaving with impropriety or the appearance of impropriety applies to both the professional and personal conduct of a judge. Because it is not practicable to list all prohibited acts, the proscription is necessarily cast in general terms that extend to conduct by judges that is harmful although not specifically mentioned in the Code. Actual improprieties under this standard include violations of law, court rules or other specific provisions of this Code. The test for appearance of impropriety is whether the conduct would create in reasonable minds a perception that the judge’s ability to carry out judicial responsibilities with integrity, impartiality and competence is impaired.

**Canon 3. A Judge Should Perform the Duties of the Office Impartially and Diligently**

(B) Adjudicative responsibilities.

(l) A judge shall be faithful to the law and maintain professional competence in it. A judge shall not be swayed by partisan interests, public clamor or fear of criticism.

(2) A judge shall require order and decorum in proceedings before the judge.

(D) Disciplinary responsibilities.

(1) A judge who receives information indicating a substantial likelihood that another judge has committed a substantial violation of this Part shall take appropriate action.

(2) A judge who receives information indicating a substantial likelihood that a lawyer has committed a substantial violation of the Code of Professional Responsibility shall take appropriate action.

(3) Acts of a judge in the discharge of disciplinary responsibilities are part of a judge's judicial duties.

(E) Disqualification.

(1) A judge shall disqualify himself or herself in a proceeding in which the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned

[3.11][3B(6)(e)] A judge may delegate the responsibilities of the judge under Canon 3B(6) to a member of the judge’s staff. A judge must make reasonable efforts, including the provision of appropriate supervision, to ensure that Section 3B(6) is not violated through law clerks or other personnel on the judge’s staff. This provision does not prohibit the judge or the judge’s law clerk from informing all parties individually of scheduling or administrative decisions.

[3.21][3E(1)] Under this rule, a judge is disqualified whenever the judge’s impartiality might reasonably be questioned, regardless whether any of the specific rules in Section 3E(1) apply. For example, if a judge were in the process of negotiating for employment with a law firm, the judge would be disqualified from any matters in which that firm appeared, unless the disqualification was waived by the parties after disclosure by the judge.

[3.22][3E(1)] A judge should disclose on the record information that the judge believes the parties or their lawyers might consider relevant to the question of disqualification, even if the judge believes there is no real basis for disqualification.

**Canon 4. A Judge May Engage in Extra-Judicial Activities To Improve the Law, the Legal System, and the Administration of Justice**

**Canon 5. A Judge Should Regulate Extra-Judicial Activities To Minimize the Risk of Conflict with Judicial Duties**

**Public Office Conduct Codes New York**

PUBLIC OFFICERS LAW Laws 1909, Chap. 51.

CHAPTER 47 OF THE CONSOLIDATED LAWS PUBLIC OFFICERS LAW

Sec. 17. Defense and indemnification of state officers and employees. 2 (b)

Sec. 18. Defense and indemnification of officers and employees of public entities.3 (b)

Sec. 74. Code of ethics.(2)(3)(4)

§ 73. Business or professional activities by state officers and employees and party officers.

**NY Attorney Conduct Code**

(a) "Differing interests" include every interest that will adversely affect either the judgment or the loyalty of a lawyer to a client, whether it be a conflicting, inconsistent, diverse, or other interest.

CANON 5. A Lawyer Should Exercise Independent Professional Judgment on Behalf of a Client

DR 5-101 [1200.20] Conflicts of Interest - Lawyer's Own Interests.

DR 5-102 [1200.21] Lawyers as Witnesses.

DR 5-103 [1200.22] Avoiding Acquisition of Interest in Litigation.

DR 5-104 [1200.23] Transactions Between Lawyer and Client.

DR 5-105 [1200.24] Conflict of Interest; Simultaneous Representation.

DR 5-108 [1200.27] Conflict of Interest - Former Client.

CANON 6. A Lawyer Should Represent a Client Competently

CANON 7. A Lawyer Should Represent a Client Zealously Within the Bounds of the Law

DR 7-102 [1200.33] Representing a Client Within the Bounds of the Law.

DR 7-110 [1200.41] Contact with Officials.

DR 8-101 [1200.42] Action as a Public Official.

DR 8-103 [1200.44] Lawyer Candidate for Judicial Office.

A. A lawyer who is a candidate for judicial office shall comply with section 100.5 of the Chief Administrator's Rules Governing Judicial Conduct (22 NYCRR) and Canon 5 of the Code of Judicial Conduct.

CANON 9. A Lawyer Should Avoid Even the Appearance of Professional Impropriety

DR 9-101 [1200.45] Avoiding Even the Appearance of Impropriety.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing statements in this CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE FORM are true and correct. Executed on this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_20\_\_ the foregoing statements in this CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE FORM are true. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims will subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties, including possible culpability in the RICO related crimes including the alleged attempted murder of the inventor Eliot Bernstein and his wife and children in a car-bombing attempt on their lives. I agree to accept responsibility for the unbiased review, and presentation of findings to the appropriate party(ies) who also have executed this CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE FORM. A lack of signature will serve as evidence that I have accepted this document **with** conflict in the event that I continue to represent the matters without signing such COI first and will be an admission of such conflict(s).

Organization – New York Attorney General or New York Attorney General Non Conflicted Independent Counsel or Independent Investigator of New York Attorney General Criminal Complaints.

Print Name & Title and Organization \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

If you are unable to sign this COI and are therefore unable to continue further to pursue these matters, please attach a statement of whom we may contact as your replacement. A copy can be sent to [iviewit@iviewit.tv](mailto:iviewit@iviewit.tv) and the mailing address below:

Eliot I. Bernstein

Inventor

Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – DL

Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – DL

Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – FL

Iviewit Technologies, 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](mailto:iviewit@iviewit.tv)

[www.iviewit.tv](http://www.iviewit.tv)

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:**

This message and any attachments are covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. SS 2510-2521. This message is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message or call (561) 245-8588. If you are the intended recipient but do not wish to receive communications through this medium, please so advise the sender immediately.

iviewit logo big

***“Surf with Vision”***

**Eliot I. Bernstein**

**Founder & Inventor  
Direct Dial: (561) 245-8588 (o)  
 (561) 886-7628 (c)**

Thursday, May 05, 2011

New York State Office of the Attorney General

James Rogers, Esq.

Special Counsel and Senior Advisor to

Attorney General Eric T. Schneiderman

120 Broadway

New York NY 10271

New York State Office of the Attorney General

Harlan Levy, Esq.

First Deputy Attorney General

120 Broadway

New York NY 10271

**Re:** **ADMISSION & ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST by the NEW YORK ATTORNEY GENERAL in handling CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS AGAINST ANDREW CUOMO and STEVEN M. COHEN et al. / Phone Call on April 14, 2011 with James Rogers on behalf of Harlan Levy referred by Steven Michael Cohen, Chief of Staff to Governor Andrew Cuomo, regarding FILED Criminal Complaints against the New York Attorney General’s Office, Former Attorney General Andrew Cuomo, Steven Michael Cohen, Chief of Secretary to Governor Andrew Cuomo and Monica Connell of the New York State Office of the Attorney General et al.**

Dear Mssrs. Levy and Rogers,

Please let this letter serve as formal commemoration of our April 14, 2011 phone conversation between James Rogers, Esq., Special Counsel and Senior Advisor to Attorney General Eric T. Schneiderman and myself. A witnessing party to the phone call was Patrick Hanley. James Rogers, Esq. was acting on behalf of Harlan Levy whom Steven Michael Cohen, Chief of Staff to Governor Andrew Cuomo, had referred the call to. The following summarizes the salient points of the calls and the IMMEDIATE actions now required by Law, following the revelation and admission by Rogers of existing Conflicts of Interest. The Conflicts of Interest caused Rogers to assert that the inherent Conflicts for himself, the AG’s Office and other members of the AG’s Office, now demanded that the AG’s office was required forthwith to seek Outside Non Conflicted Independent Counsel to replace them in the Iviewit Filed Criminal Complaints, the Iviewit Ongoing Federal RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit and any/all “legally related” lawsuits, all further described herein.

1. **Summary of Calls with both the Governor’s Office and the Attorney General’s Office Regarding the Criminal Complaints against the Office of the New York Attorney General, Andrew Cuomo, Eliot Spitzer, Steven Michael Cohen, Monica Connell et al.**

Calls with Governor Cuomo’s Office were made on February 08, 2011 and I spoke with Emily Cole, Assistant to Steven Michael Cohen, Secretary to Governor Cuomo, regarding CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS that had been filed against Andrew Cuomo and Steven Michael Cohen. The CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS were filed with both the Attorney General’s Office and the Governor’s Office on November 19, 2010 for RICO related crimes. On February 08, 2011, Emily Cole was informed that her work relation with Steven Michael Cohen, a named party to the Criminal Complaint posed a Conflict of Interest in her handling any complaint information. Emily Cole proceeded to assert that she would handle finding a non-conflicted party to review the complaints and get back to me in a few days.

On April 13-15th 2011 calls were made attempting to gain status of the Criminal Complaints, after several previous calls went unreturned over two months attempting to reach Emily Cole. On April 13, 2011, both Patrick Hanley[[1]](#footnote-1) and I reached Emily Cole and requested the current status of the Criminal Complaints and if she had retained any Non-Conflicted party to investigate and review the Criminal Complaints pursuant to our prior call. At this point it was learned, upon information and belief, that a one Kenneth Cole of Kenneth Cole Productions ( NYSE: KCP ) and Maria Cuomo Cole (sister to Governor Andrew Cuomo) have a daughter named Emily Cole[[2]](#footnote-2). Upon confronting Emily Cole of the Conflict of Interest a direct family relationship would create and requesting verification that she was not the Emily Cole related to the Cuomo’s, Emily Cole denied she was the daughter of Kenneth Cole and Maria Cuomo. Later in the call, further questioning Emily Cole regarding her name, Emily Cole became defensive and claimed that even if she were, it was “none of my business and would not matter” or words to that effect. I explained that if she were related to the Cuomo’s this further exacerbated the Conflict of Interests in her handling the Criminal Complaint against Andrew Cuomo and Steven Michael Cohen, in addition to the Conflict of Interest already present with her employment by Steven Michael Cohen.

Emily Cole then subsequently admitted that she had turned the prior request on February 08, 2011 for complaint information, over to Steven Michael Cohen. At this point, we advised Emily that this represented an egregious Conflict of Interest and violation of public office rules and regulations, federal and state law, as well as, attorney conduct rules by both Cohen and herself. As exhibited herein and in the attached URL exhibits, Conflicts Of Interest are the glue that binds the Title 18: 1961- 1968 RICO Conspiracy together as presented in my Amended RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit and the attached RICO Statement filed therein. The Amended Complaint can be found at

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080509%20FINAL%20AMENDED%20COMPLAINT%20AND%20RICO%20SIGNED%20COPY%20MED.pdf> ,

and the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit and Amended Complaint are hereby incorporated by reference in entirety herein. Emily Cole then became distraught and defensive when notified that her actions in conflict would be included in any ongoing and future criminal and civil complaints filed. Emily was notified that these actions promoting obvious and further conflict, aided and abetted the conspiracy through Obstruction of Justice and caused a Denial of Due Process and Procedure and that the illegal handling of the Complaints by persons with direct Conflicts of Interest, constituted further violations of law and public office rules. Emily Cole then rudely and abruptly terminated the phone call by hanging up abruptly.

Immediately, we called back the Governor’s office, now to speak with a one Benjamin Lawsky, Chief of Staff to Governor Cuomo, in efforts to find a NON-CONFLICTED party to handle the Criminal Complaints or direct the Complaints to an INDEPENDENT NON CONFLICTED INVESTIGATOR. This call was also to report the new alleged crimes committed by Emily Cole in her passing the Complaints to Steven Cohen, one of the accused and to verify that she was not a relative of the Cuomo’s. The call transferred by the receptionist to Lawsky’s office was then intercepted directly by Steven Michael Cohen. Cohen, by intercepting the call, now further acted in a continued plethora of Conflicts of Interest, Violations of Public Office Rules and Regulations and Violations of State and Federal Law, by personally handling Complaint matters against him. After noticing Cohen of his conflicts and the fact that I was attempting to “PUT HIM IN PRISON…”[[3]](#footnote-3) in my RICO & ANTITRUST Federal Lawsuit, Cohen proceeded to attempt to deflect the Complaints filed with the Governor to the New York Attorney General and a one Harlan Levy, Chief of Staff to New York Attorney General Eric T. Schneiderman. Cohen attempted this transfer of legal obligations contained in the Complaints filed with the Governor to the AG, despite notice that the AG had a separate Criminal Complaint filed with their office and that the Governor was being requested in a separate Criminal Complaint to execute his executive authorities, which could only be executed by the Governor. According to Cohen, Levy is the immediate successor to Cohen’s former position as Chief of Staff to Cuomo when Cuomo was Attorney General.

Cohen, is aware of the Criminal Complaints filed against both he and Cuomo as exhibited in all of the following URL’s, all fully incorporated by reference in entirety herein,

* + - 1. <http://www.free-press-release.com/news-iviewit-inventor-eliot-bernstein-files-criminal-charges-against-ny-ag-andrew-cuomo-chief-of-staff-steven-cohen-asst-ag-monica-connell-w-gov-david-1291165927.html>   
         November 30, 2010 Intellectual Property news in Palm Beach, Florida, United States of America, Free-Press-Release, Inc. “Iviewit Inventor Eliot Bernstein Files Criminal Charges Against NY AG Andrew Cuomo, Chief of Staff Steven Michael Cohen & Asst AG Monica Connell w/ Gov David Paterson & NY Senate Judiciary Chair John Sampson.”

Criminal Complaints were filed with Andrew Cuomo while he was Attorney General, and to my knowledge, nothing was done but to further Obstruct the Complaints. The AG’s office allegedly has obstructed numerous previous Criminal Complaints of Iviewit and Eliot Bernstein’s, dating back to those filed with Eliot Spitzer when he was Attorney General, prior to becoming Governor. The Complaints buried against State Actor/Defendants charged in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit by both denying proper Due Process and Procedure and/or through burying the Complaints entirely, has gone on for nearly a decade. The continued actions to deny Due Process and Procedure come despite the repeated demand from the start of the newly filed complaints that if conflicts existed, the Complaints were to be turned over to a Non-Conflicted Independent Party.

* + - 1. <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090613%20FINAL%20NYAG%20Steven%20Cohen%20Letter%20signed%20low.pdf>   
         June 13th 2009, letter to Steven Michael Cohen regarding “Conflicts of Interest; etc; Bernstein v. NYS First Department et al.; US Second Circuit Docket No. 08-4873-CV.”
      2. <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090618%20FINAL%20NYAG%20Steven%20Cohen%20Letter%20Re%20Lamont%20Signed.pdf>

June 18th 2009 letter to Steven Michael Cohen regarding “First Department Obstruction of Justice.” The letter deals with First Department Officials acting in blatant Conflicts of Interest in the handling of complaints against themselves and matters relating to Criminal Misconduct of P. Stephen Lamont.

In the most recent Criminal Complaints, Cohen and Cuomo have been apprised and handled the Criminal Complaints against them while they were at the AG’s office and now at the Governor’s office, and have failed to turn over the complaints to Non-Conflicted Independent Party since June 13th 2009 or provide any response. A response cannot be tendered by either Cohen, Cuomo or even the Governor’s or AG’s offices, as the Governor and now the AG and their employees are entirely conflicted with these matters, as evidenced herein and in exhibit. Therefore, they instead have elected to hide the Complaints and derail the investigations, further aiding and abetting the RICO Conspiracy by Obstructing Justice through their failure to perform their honest services, violating public office rules and regulations and state and federal laws.

Additional conflict comes from the fact that the AG’s Office and Officials of that office are named Defendants in my Federal RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit. Further, the AG’s Office is also illegally representing 39 plus State Actor/Defendants as counsel of record, representing them further illegally in both a Professional and Personal capacity, as defined further herein, which causes yet additional layers of Conflicts that further deny Due Process and Obstruct Justice.

Further, Federal Judge Shira Scheindlin has “legally related” my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit to that of an inside Whistleblower Christine C. Anderson, a veteran Senior Staff Attorney in the New York Supreme Court Disciplinary Department. Anderson has blown the Whistle on Corruption, under sworn oath, in a Federal Court and before the New York Senate Judiciary Committee in an ONGOING investigation by that Committee. Anderson exposed the corrupt and illegal patterns and practices by ATTORNEYS AT LAW, including but not limited to, Alteration and Destruction of Official Court and Prosecutorial Records, Destruction of Evidence in Federal and State matters, Extorting and Threatening a Federal Witness (a one Nicole Corrado, another Veteran New York Supreme Court Senior Staff Attorney in the New York Supreme Court Disciplinary Department who was being deposed in Anderson’s Whistleblower Lawsuit when threatened), Whitewashing Attorney Disciplinary Complaints, Obstructions of Justice and more. These illegal actions exposed to the Judiciary Committee and Federal Judge Shira Scheindlin infect the entire legal community, including but not limited to, Court Officials, Disciplinary Officials, Regulators and State and Federal Prosecutors. Anderson further stated in open Court during trial that a “CLEANER” exists inside the Ethics Department of the New York Supreme Court, named Naomi Goldstein. Goldstein, with the aid of other senior ranking New York Court Officials, District Attorneys, US Attorneys and Favored Law Firms and Lawyers, WHITEWASHED Complaints, Altered and Destroyed Official Court Records and Evidence and more, on behalf of US ATTORNEYS, DA’s, ADA’s and FAVORED LAW FIRMS and LAWYERS. OUTRAGEOUS!

Anderson further complains in Motion to the Federal Court that Cuomo is ILLEGALLY REPRESENTING STATE DEFENDANTS in both the US District Court for the Southern District of New York and the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. Anderson filed to remove the AG from her Whistleblower Lawsuit for egregious Conflicts of Interest and other violations of Law, illustrating a further Pattern and Practice of Corruption. These allegations are almost identical to those claimed in my RICO and ANTITRUST Lawsuit but now exposed from the perspective of an inside Whistleblower, alleging Violations of Public Office Rules and Regulations, Violations of Attorney Conduct Codes and State and Federal Law, as further defined herein.

A tad of the crimes alleged by Anderson and contained in the Iviewit Criminal Complaints that were filed and contained in the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, committed by Senior Public Officials, include but are far from limited to, all those crimes listed in [Exhibit 2](#Exhibit2) of this document.

Anderson’s Motion to Remove the AG can be found at the following URL’s and Anderson’s arguments for removing the AG in that Motion and her Lawsuit are hereby fully incorporated by reference as my own in this letter, where they are applicable to our “legally related” lawsuits.

<http://iviewit.tv/wordpress/?p=391>

“Wednesday, September 15, 2010 “Anderson Moves to Disqualify NY Attorney General”

For Anderson’s Motion to remove the AG see link @

<http://www.frankbrady.org/TammanyHall/Documents_files/CCA%20091410%20Filing.pdf> .

After Anderson’s trial and hearing the shocking STATE AND FEDERAL FELONY CRIMINAL VIOLATIONS OF PUBLIC OFFICE, VIOLATIONS of ATTORNEY CONDUCT CODES and VIOLATIONS OF STATE AND FEDERAL LAW committed by Government Attorneys, notice was sent to Federal Judge Shira Scheindlin on October 27th 2009, by eyewitnesses of Anderson’s CRIMINAL allegations made under oath at trial, Eliot Bernstein and Terrence Finnan. The letter to Scheindlin demanded that Scheindlin follow her Judicial Cannons and Law in reporting the CRIMINAL allegations to the proper authorities. Those authorities included notifying the New York Attorney General’s Office to begin criminal investigations, where Cohen was officially copied the letter to Scheindlin. Notice of these CRIMINAL allegations levied by Anderson against Senior Public Officials, via copy of the Scheindlin letter, include all of the following State, Federal & International Authorities currently investigating the Iviewit complaint matters;

* The Honorable Barack Hussein Obama II  
  President United States of America
* The Honorable Glenn A. Fine  
  Inspector General United States Department of Justice
* The Honorable John Conyers Jr.  
  Chairman House Judiciary Committee
* The Honorable United States Senator Dianne Feinstein  
  Senate Judiciary Committee
* Hon. Eric H. Holder, Jr.  
  United States Attorney General US Department of Justice
* The Honorable Elena Kagan  
  Solicitor General US Department of Justice
* Robert S. Mueller, III.  
  Director Federal Bureau of Investigation
* Candice M. Will  
  Assistant Director, Office of Professional Responsibility Federal Bureau of Investigation
* The Honorable Harry I. Moatz  
  Director, Office of Enrollment & Discipline United States Patent & Trademark Office
* Todd J. Zinser  
  Inspector General United States Department of Commerce
* David Kappos  
  Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office United States Patent & Trademark Office
* John J. Doll  
  Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office
* David L. Gouvaia  
  Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration
* Mary L. Schapiro  
  Chairperson United States Securities and Exchange Commission
* Peter L. McClintock  
  Acting Inspector General Small Business Administration
* Chris P. Mercer  
  President Institute of Professional Representatives before the European Patent Office (epi)
* Steven Michael Cohen  
  Counselor and Chief of Staff for Andrew Cuomo New York Office of the Attorney General
* Joseph M. Demarest, Jr.  
  FBI Assistant Director in Charge of the New York Division
* David A. Paterson  
  Governor New York State
* New York Senate Judiciary Committee Members:

sampson@senate.state.ny.us, onorato@senate.state.ny.us, schneiderman@schneiderman.org, schneiderman@senate.state.ny.us, hassellt@senate.state.ny.us, diaz@senate.state.ny.us, jdklein@senate.state.ny.us, eadams@senate.state.ny.us, espada@senate.state.ny.us, breslin@senate.state.ny.us, dilan@senate.state.ny.us, savino@senate.state.ny.us, perkins@senate.state.ny.us, maziarz@senate.state.ny.us, jdefranc@senate.state.ny.us, volker@senate.state.ny.us, saland@senate.state.ny.us, lavalle@senate.state.ny.us, bonacic@senate.state.ny.us, winner@senate.state.ny.us, nozzolio@senate.state.ny.us, lanza@senate.state.ny.us, ranz@senate.state.ny.us, spotts@senate.state.ny.us.

* Hon. Andrew Cuomo  
  Attorney General Office of the Attorney General
* Monica Connell, Esq.  
  Assistant Attorney General - Division of State Counsel Litigation Bureau, State of New York Office of the Attorney General
* Thomas P. DiNapoli  
  Comptroller State of New York
* Robert Morris Morgenthau  
  District Attorney of New York County
* Lovett & Bellatoni

The Notice to Shira Scheindlin and others of the Criminal Whistleblowing Felony Allegations levied by Christine Anderson can be found at,

<http://iviewit.tv/wordpress/?p=205>

“Re: CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS in Christine C. Anderson v. New York State et al. (07cv09599); Code of Conduct for US Judges Canon 3B(5), Protecting the People”.

The New York Attorney General’s Office and Andrew Cuomo as AG, were fully and intimately cognizant of Anderson’s FELONY CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS in OPEN FEDERAL COURT before Judge Scheindlin. FELONY CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS against **ATTORNEYS** from the offices of the US ATTORNEY, the DA, the ADA, the New York Supreme Court, Favored Law Firms and Lawyers and others, as the New York Attorney General was COUNSEL to Anderson’s Defendants that were State Public Officials and therefore were factually in the Court at the time of the Allegations.

Once cognizant of the alleged crimes, the AG’s Office acting as Counsel of Record for the Anderson Defendants, including but not limited to, Assistant Attorney Generals’ Lee Alan Adlerstein (present in the Courtroom), Wesley Eugene Bauman, Esq, Monica Wagener and Monica Connell, could have no plausible deniability of the CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS levied under oath in federal court. Therefore, in their OFFICIAL CAPACITIES they are required by LAW and ATTORNEY CONDUCT CODES to report and/or investigate any reliable CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS as mandated by the New York Lawyer's Code of Professional Responsibility and Laws, including but not limited to:

* **DR 1-103 [1200.4] Disclosure of Information to Authorities.**A lawyer possessing knowledge, (1) not protected as a confidence or secret, or (2) not gained in the lawyer's capacity as a member of a bona fide lawyer assistance or similar program or committee, of a violation of DR 1-102 [1200.3] that raises a substantial question as to another lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer shall report such knowledge to a tribunal or other authority empowered to investigate or act upon such violation.
* Attorneys are officers of the court, Clark v. United States, 289 U.S. 1, 12, 53 S.Ct. 465, 468, 77 L.Ed. 993 (1933), and are obligated to adhere to all applicable disciplinary rules, and to report incidents of which they have unprivileged knowledge involving violations of a disciplinary rule. ABA Code of Professional Responsibility, DR 1-102(A), 1-103(A); see In re Walker, 87 A.D.2d 555, 560,448 N.Y.S.2d 474, 479 (1st Dep't 1982) (as officers of the court, attorneys are required to notify parties and the court of errors including conflicts of interest).
* **TITLE 18 PART I CHAPTER 1 § 4 Misprision of felony**

Whoever, having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cognizable by a court of the United States, conceals and does not as soon as possible make known the same to some judge or other person in civil or military authority under the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

The revised Code of Conduct[[4]](#footnote-4) for Judges also binds Scheindlin to report these allegations to the proper authorities under,

* **CANON 3 A JUDGE SHOULD PERFORM THE DUTIES OF THE OFFICE IMPARTIALLY AND DILIGENTLY**   
   B. Administrative Responsibilities.

(3) A judge should initiate appropriate action when the judge becomes aware of reliable evidence indicating the likelihood of unprofessional conduct by a judge or lawyer.

COMMENTARY

Canon 3B(3). Appropriate action may include direct communication with the judge or lawyer who has committed the violation, other direct action if available, and reporting the violation to the appropriate authorities.

There might also be further criminal financial abuses by Public Officials, necessitating immediate investigation of those Officials, who were represented illegally, in their individual capacities, by the New York Attorney General. Legal fees for Personal legal defenses are being paid for by the AG’s office and presumably then gifted by the AG’s office to these Public Officials personally and if not, the legal fees for personal representations are ultimately being paid for by the New York Taxpayers. Doubtfully, these gifted personal legal fees, which in these cases may range in the tens of millions of dollars for personal counsel, reflect as gifts and income on the State Actors/Defendants personal income tax returns (both state and federal). Further, the New York Attorney General would have to file such gifts properly in annual state and federal tax returns and fully disclose them to state auditors, separating out the legal billings for professional representation (which the state can pay) and for individual representation (which the state cannot pay).

As Anderson’s Motion to Disqualify the AG Office shows, there are Conflicts of Interest inherent in the ILLEGAL representation of the Public Officers both personally and professionally by the New York AG’s office. Such conflicted representation is in Violation of Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Office Rules and Regulations, State and Federal Law and must instantly cease and desist. All State Actors/Defendants illegally represented currently by the AG, now must be replaced with Non-Conflicted Independent Counsel, for both their Professional and Personal legal defenses. The newly retained attorneys must be separate and distinct counsel for their Professional and Personal defenses. In particular, Anderson claims,

**Ongoing Conflict of Interest**

Representation by the New York Attorney General's office in the pending appeal continues the improper prejudice against plaintiff. Furthermore, not only did the Attorney General's representation of the defendants unduly prejudice the plaintiff, but it also raised serious conflict of interest issues with respect to the defendants themselves. To protect their own rights, each of the defendants had to have their own attorneys in order to permit them to cross claim or make admissions, including their own right to protect their own individual rights in this appeal. Under New York State and federal conflict of interest rules, each of the defendants must be free to undertake these independent actions. To do so, they must have their own counsel. (See NYS Code of Professional Conduct Cannon 5 Conflict of Interest Rules.[[5]](#footnote-5)) The Attorney General as a state attorney is bound by these rules as well.[[6]](#footnote-6)

This constitutes New York State law, and the attorney who violates these safeguards must be immediately removed from the case. Further, should the defendants seek to waive the conflicts they would have to submit an affidavit to that effect to the court.

Notwithstanding a defendant's attempt to waive his right to independent counsel, the court can deny the waiver, based on a finding that ultimately this conflict cannot properly be waived.

The trail [sic trial] court improperly ignored the obligation to address the inherent conflict up to and including the trial. This court, however, must now disqualify the Attorney General from any representation of the defendants.

As a result of these conflict of interest issues, the Attorney General cannot properly represent the defendants, either as a group or individually, in these appellate proceedings. Each defendant must have the right to advance his or her own position on appeal, to cross claim against the others, and to bring a counterclaim against the State.

These actions most certainly could not be undertaken in a case where the Attorney General represents all the named defendants. All defendants clearly are in conflict with each other, especially in their individual capacities. Without question, the Attorney General violated its ethical rules and the public trust in undertaking to represent all of the defendants. The Attorney General continues to violate its ethical rules by appearing before this appellate body.

This would be the case, even were it established that the defendants had sought to consent to such representation…

The conflict here is particularly acute given the nature of the claims brought by plaintiff Anderson. Plaintiff's charges warranted an independent investigation by the New York State Attorney General’s office to review the basic claims given that Anderson was formerly a Departmental Disciplinary Committee staff attorney with considerable experience and over the years received excellent evaluations. The fact is that these are not allegations from a lay person.

While at the DDC, Plaintiff Anderson was charged with investigating cases involving possible criminal and civil misconduct by attorneys. She carried out her duties as a duly authorized officer of the Court. The New York State Attorney General's Office was therefore obligated to protect her and to investigate her claims of serious misconduct against the named parties. To the Contrary, the New York State Attorney General's Office failed to do so.

The Attorney General is a publicly funded arm of the State. It was conflicted from the outset of this case because it could not possibly defend any of the defendants, while simultaneously investigating plaintiff's claims of serious ongoing misconduct by the defendants. Indeed, no explanation has ever been provided as to why the Attorney General did not represent plaintiff Anderson against any of the original defendants. This was itself a misappropriation of public funds by a state investigative agency with prosecution powers.

Federal law mandates that a special prosecutor be substituted into the case, and this was not done.

Similar to Anderson, in my RICO & ANTITRUST lawsuit, the AG not only represents 39 plus State Actors/Defendants ILLEGALLY, both personally and professionally, but also acts as in further conflict as Counsel for their own offices and former employees, in both the US District Court and Second Circuit Court of Appeals. Evidence of such representations can be found in the AG’s response to the Amended Complaint in US District Court, which was GRANTED & DOCKETED by Judge Scheindlin in the following order, included by reference in entirety herein,

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080414%20Order%20Granting%20Filing%20of%20Amended%20Complaint.pdf>

The Amended Complaint was responded ILLEGALLY to by the AG’s Office, whom was wearing a number of hats, acting as both a State Actor/Defendant and Defense Counsel to other State Actor/Defendants, all represented ILLEGALLY both Professionally and in their Individual capacities. Once again, a further bizarre and illegal myriad of Conflicts of Interest, Violations of Public Offices and Violations of State and Federal Law, combined to Block Due Process & Procedure, thereby Obstructing Justice to both the Criminal Complaints and RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit.

A further Conflict arises in that both the Cuomo Administration and the Spitzer Administration dismissed Iviewit Complaints after review, with no formal investigation, **EVEN AFTER HAVING ALLEGATIONS FROM A NEW YORK SUPREME COURT ATTORNEY WHISTLEBLOWER,** yet then turned around to represent many of the same State Actor/Defendants. Clearly, this conflict of interest is insurmountable for the AG, after having reviewed the Criminal Complaint information and acting upon it and then turning around and representing against Iviewit in the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit involving the same corpus of information and State Actor/Defendants. This further poses additional massive Conflicts of Interest, Violations of Public Office Rules & Regulations, Violations of Attorney Conduct Codes and State and Federal Law.

The Cuomo Administration, upon the termination of Spitzer as Attorney General for admitted Violations of the Federal Mann Act in Transporting Prostitutes across State Lines and other crimes, then as a first act as the new AG, paid Defendant in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, Proskauer Rose (the central conspirator of the RICO) for Spitzer’s Legal Defense. Again, it is almost too bizarre that Proskauer represented Spitzer and the Conflicts of Interest of the AG representing Proskauer were not rectified earlier. Proskauer again being the main initial Defendant in the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit and where Proskauer is also illegally in Conflict of Interest representing themselves in the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit. Further, almost as if realizing that the mass of Conflicts was being exposed, Proskauer in responding to the Amended Complaint, even had their counsel then begin representing themselves PRO SE, while also acting as Counsel for their firm?

The cost for Spitzer’s PERSONAL defense to Proskauer Rose was approximately US $500,000.00 dollars, paid out of New York States coffers. Since the crimes had nothing to do with Public Office Duties, Spitzer should have paid the legal fees directly out of his personal funds and again the Great State of New York was fleeced to pay personal defense funds for Public Officers committing felony crimes personally and outside of their scope of their office duties. Further, several key Spitzer Officials, after Spitzer’s forced resignation, then landed Partnerships with Proskauer further advancing the Conflicts in the Conflict Swamp of the New York Courts and Prosecutorial Offices. Again, this may represent illegal use of State Funds for personal legal defense fees, of course, a review of Defendant in my RICO, Eliot Spitzer’s tax returns and the NY AG’s, both state and federal, would reveal how these personal defense monies to Proskauer Rose were reported to the IRS or if they ever were. If they were not this represents a clear misuse of Public Funds and Tax Evasion and immediate cause for investigation of all those involved.

On April 15, 2011, calls were made to Harlan Levy, which were intercepted, or transferred, to a one, James Rogers, Esq. ~ Special Counsel and Senior Advisor to Attorney General Eric Schneiderman. Mr. Rogers was advised that,

* 1. the AG’s Office had previously received Criminal Complaints against Andrew Cuomo and Steven M. Cohen and failed to act to find Non Conflicted Independent Counsel thus far to handle the complaints, while simultaneously representing as Counsel of Record their offices and 39 plus State Actors/Defendants in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit,
  2. the AG’s Office and two former AG’s are Defendants in the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, acting as central players in the Public Office Cover Up alleged therein,
  3. the AG is representing the AG’s Office and two former AG’s while having multiple Conflicts of Interest in the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit and violating their Public Office duty to investigate the CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS against Public Officials or in the event they are Conflicted, for example when representing State Actors/Defendants as Counsel of Record in a RICO, the AG must call in a Special Prosecutor in order to Investigate the AG and the AG’s client Defendants which the AG has failed to do thus far,
  4. the former Attorney Generals Spitzer and Cuomo, the AG’s Office, the Governors Offices of Spitzer and Cuomo are also the accused actors in the Criminal Complaints filed with both Offices and thus **CANNOT INVESTIGATE THEMSELVES** and **MUST TURN OVER THE COMPLAINTS TO A SPECIAL PROSECUTOR IMMEDIATELY.** The failure to turn the CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS over to a NON CONFLICTED INDEPENDENT PROSECUTOR acts further to Obstruct Justice with Scienter, by shielding the AG’s and their co-conspirators from investigations, through direct involvement in derailing the Criminal Complaints against themselves and others, thereby aiding and abetting the Criminal RICO Organization defined in the Amended Complaint.

After being advised of the material facts, especially as they relate to the AG’s Conflicts of Interest in handling the matters directly, Rogers then declared a Conflict of Interest existed with him and the AG Office. This Admission and Acknowledgement of ongoing conflicts now requires the AG’s office to seek Independent Counsel in these matters to review the Criminal Complaints and determine whom the Complaints and Investigations should be turned over to.

Due to the number of Conflicts, it appears impossible for either the AG or Governor’s Office now to review the FILED CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS against Cohen, Cuomo et al. and Mr. Rogers did the first step in the right direction by admitting and affirming existing Conflicts Of Interest and the need for INDEPENDENT NON CONFLICTED Counsel going forward. Immediately after declaring Conflicts of Interest existed, Mr. Rogers refused to discuss the CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS or anything further until retaining NON CONFLICTED OUTSIDE COUNSEL, as the Conflicts acknowledged were impossible to overcome.

First, I must applaud Mr. Rogers, for he is one of the very few people in over a decade that has handled the Complaints appropriately and navigated the existing WEB OF CONFLICTS in the CONFLICT SWAMP, ethically. Bravo Mr. Rogers!

Now that Conflicts of Interest are affirmed and acknowledged by the AG’s Office, a mass of actions must be taken to IMMEDIATELY REMOVE the CONFLICTS from ALL Iviewit matters, including but not limited to, existing court and prosecutorial cases. Further, the AG must notify all Relevant Parties IMMEDIATELY of the existence of Conflicts. For a partial list of Relevant Parties to be notified, see the following URL, hereby incorporated in entirety by reference herein,

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/INVESTIGATIONS%20MASTER.htm>

All Relevant Parties must be notified immediately of the Conflicts identified, as actions of the New York Attorney General have prejudiced and continue to prejudice ongoing proceedings and any/all closed proceedings that must be re-examined in light of the new evidence of conflicts.

1. **ACTIONS TO REMOVE CONFLICTS FROM ALL PROCEEDINGS**

First the AG must not only DISQUALIFY/RECUSE their offices from investigating the CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS filed at the AG and Governor’s Offices, they must also now WITHDRAW from REPRESENTATION in all COURT CASES of IVIEWIT, Eliot I. Bernstein and ALL LEGALLY RELATED CASES to Iviewit, Eliot I. Bernstein and the legally related WHISTLEBLOWER Christine C. Anderson’s Lawsuit as listed below.

**Legally Related Cases to Whistleblower Christine C. Anderson by Federal Judge Shira A. Scheindlin @ New York Second Circuit**

* 1. Anderson v The State of New York, et al. - WHISTLEBLOWER LAWSUIT which other cases have been marked legally “related” to by Fed. Judge Shira A. Scheindlin
  2. 08-4873-cv United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Docket - Bernstein, et al. v Appellate Division First Department Disciplinary Committee, et al. – 12 COUNT 12 TRILLION DOLLAR FEDERAL RICO & ANTITRUST LAWSUIT
  3. Capogrosso v New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct, et al.
  4. Esposito v The State of New York, et al.
  5. McKeown v The State of New York, et al.

**Legally Related Cases to Whistleblower Christine C. Anderson by Federal Judge Shira A. Scheindlin @ US District Court - Southern District NY**

* 1. 07cv09599 Anderson v The State of New York, et al. - WHISTLEBLOWER LAWSUIT which other cases have been marked legally “related” to by Fed. Judge Shira A. Scheindlin
  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. 08cv00526 Capogrosso v New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct, 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 Gizella Weisshaus v The State of New York, et al.,
  9. 08cv04438 Suzanne McCormick v The State of New York, et al.,
  10. 08cv06368 John L. Petrec-Tolino v. The State of New York,
  11. 06cv05169 McNamara v The State of New York, et al.

Acknowledging that the AG’s Office and current and former Officers, are Professionally and Individually sued and thereby further conflicted, now forces the AG IMMEDIATELY to remove all prior court filings and complaint matters prejudiced by the Conflicts, Violations of Public Office Rules and Regulations and Law. All previous representations were filed in Conflict, as has been complained of in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit since the very start, and have prejudiced the Lawsuit and all investigations. Therefore, the AG must notify the Court and all other relevant parties investigating or hearing these matters, including all state, federal and international investigators listed herein, of their Conflicts and their Withdrawal from all proceedings forthwith**. Further, all of these Criminal and Civil matters, per Mr. Roger’s admission, now need to be represented by the AG’s NON-CONFLICTED Independent Counsel and Investigated by NON-CONFLICTED Independent Special Prosecutors, all brought in to the replace the AG’s multiple conflicted and illegal roles.**

Once all the withdrawals and notices are given by the AG to all relevant parties, the Acknowledged and Admitted Conflicts of Interest then cause all Prior Criminal/Civil Complaints filed with the New York Attorney General’s Office and the New York Governor’s Office, dating back to the original complaints filed with the Spitzer, Cuomo and Schneiderman Administrations, to IMMEDIATELY transfer to an INDEPENDENT NON CONFLICTED THIRD PARTY SPECIAL PROSECUTOR. Transferred for new investigations and hearings with fair and impartial NON-CONFLICTED Due Process free from further Obstruction, especially, in those matters, which have been dismissed illegally, prior to formal investigation by the conflicted parties.

**The Acknowledged and Admitted Conflicts of Interest by the Attorney General, now cause ALL current ILLEGAL** representation of New York State Defendants by the New York Attorney General’s Office in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, to cease and desist. This forces the State Actors/Defendants to seek new and INDEPENDENT NON CONFLICTED COUNSEL. The Attorney General must WITHDRAW IMMEDIATELY AS COUNSEL to all State Actors in the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit both Professionally and Personally. The AG should notify the Courts instantly of their Withdrawal as Counsel to all State Actors/Defendants.

The State Actor/Defendants must also now seek new NON-CONFLICTED representation in the RICO & ANTITRUST LAWSUIT and that counsel must be separate and distinct counsel for their Personal and Professional Representations. Going forward it would appear that while the State of New York may pay for their Professional defenses, their Personal defenses should be billed directly to them as a personal expense and further paid personally, precluding further misuse of Public Funds.

The New York AG must also seek independent counsel for the New York Attorney General’s Office and for the former AG Officials directly named as Actors/Defendants, again separate counsel for their Personal and Professional representations. In addition, notice has been given to both Cuomo and Cohen that in addition to the Criminal Complaints previously filed against them, they will both be forthcoming Defendants both Professionally and Personally in all Iviewit/Eliot I. Bernstein worldwide Lawsuits, both current and future, and where the Patents are concerned litigation may continue for 20 or more years.

1. **RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit and Related Cases UPDATE**

The new Investigators and new INDEPENDENT COUNSEL handling these matters, are apprised of the salient updates in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, Anderson’s Related Whistleblower Lawsuit and the “legally related” lawsuits defined already herein. These updates may not be readily apparent due to many of the Ongoing Conflicts of Interest, Violations of Public Office Rules & Regulations and Law that PLAGUE these lawsuits in the courts and within the prosecutorial offices.

Anderson’s filing in Federal Court to remove the AG, already incorporated by reference herein, indicates that former Chief Counsel of the New York State Supreme Court Disciplinary Department, Thomas Cahill, Chief Counsel, a Defendant in both the Anderson Lawsuit and the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, perjured court testimony and other violations of Law, further Obstructing Justice in a Federal Whistleblower Lawsuit. In particular, Anderson claims,

**Newly Discovered Evidence**

The court gave the Jury above-referenced instructions and its members adjourned to the Jury room to deliberate at approximately 1:25 pm on Thursday, October 29. After the Jury left the courtroom, Judge Scheindlin first announced that she had denied the defendants' pending motion for a directed verdict. She next stated words to the effect that she found that, "...Cahill was aware of the whitewashing allegations[[7]](#footnote-7)… The judge read this statement related to defendant Cahill's conduct into the record as part of her order denying defendant's directed verdict. **This fact alone requires a new trial.**

In addition, Courts have an obligation to report and order Investigation into official and at times criminal misconduct. This is a duty of the Court. There is no record to date as to any action having been undertaken by the Court regarding this central question. (See also recent decisions on spoliation of evidence which are state and federal crimes. Acorn v. Nassau County- cv052301 (2009 USDistLEXIS 19459) and Gutman v. Klein, 03cv1570. 2008 WL 5084182,2008 WL 4682208. **The Court's finding of culpability on the part of Defendant Cahill constitutes newly discovered evidence, which directly supports the fundamental allegations of Plaintiff.**

Here, the new evidence establishes that in the view of the Court, Defendant Cahill, the head officer of the DDC and the supervisor of Cohen, had full knowledge of the practice of whitewashing as alleged by Plaintiff, leading to the parallel conclusion that whitewashing was accepted as a common practice by the defendants, and presumably other staff members of the DDC. Had such facts been confirmed during the trial stage, the jury would have come to know and understand the illegal activities that were accepted as everyday practice by the DDC staff, a finding totally consistent with a main element of Plaintiff's case. The Court's statement after the close of trial accepting the establishing the whitewashing activities by Defendant Cahill must be found to constitute grounds for granting the instant motion.

Another reason for demanding immediate investigations by State and Federal Authorities is further revealed in Anderson’s Motion and involves threats on a Federal Witnesses in Anderson’s Whistleblowing Lawsuit. In particular, Anderson states,

**Witness Tampering - Threat on Witness In a Federal Proceeding**

Based on information heretofore submitted in this proceeding, the court is aware that one of Plaintiff's witnesses, DDC staff attorney Nicole Corrado, was confronted by her DDC supervisor on the street just prior to her deposition in this proceeding. As this court is also aware, plaintiff's former counsel, John Beranbaum, advised the court of this incident in a letter to the court dated October 24, 2008. (See exhibit "C") In the Beranbaum Submission, it was made clear to the court that Ms. Corrado was given a '"warning' about the testimony she was to gave at the deposition[,]" and further advised that "Ms. Corrado is very upset about the entire experience."

Mr. Beranbaum again raised the issue on the record four days later on October 30, 2008. (See Exhibit, "D" - Transcript of October 30, 2009 hearing, Page 26 (Lines 17-26) and page 27 (lines 1-8)). The court, in responding to the letter advising of the threat on plaintiffs witness, commented, "You [Mr. Beranbaum] seem to want to tell me something or report it to me. Okay. You report it to me." It is plaintiffs belief that the court had an obligation to report the matter to federal agents and, further, to interview Ms. Corrado concerning the incident. Plaintiff believes she has been severely prejudiced by the threat upon witness Corrado. and, as the court Is aware. Ms. Corrado did not appear at a witness in this proceeding. While plaintiff is aware that counsel within the Office of the New York Attorney General's office offered to "fully" compensate Mr. Beranbaum for ALL of his legal fees, expenses, etc., if plaintiff settled her case, I am unaware of the exact timing of when the compensation offer, believed to be between $120,000.00 and $150,000.00, was actually made.

**Conclusion**

For the reasons set forth in detail herein, Movant respectfully requests that this Court in the interest of justice grant a new trial. As noted, the participation of the Attorney General in failing to investigate the charges submitted by plaintiff against the defendants, and subsequently representing these same persons in the instant court proceedings, denied plaintiff's constitutionally protected right to a fair and impartial trial.

Note that Count 1 of Anderson’s Lawsuit, her claim to Violation of Free Speech (her Whistleblower Testimony) was won in the Jury Verdict, which is the fundamental piece of her Lawsuit for the “legally related” Lawsuits listed herein, including the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit. From Anderson’s Verdict,

**RETALIATION** **Deprivation of a Federal Right: Plaintiff's Acts of Speech**:

**Jury Question “**Has plaintiff proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that she made statements that the DDC failed to diligently prosecute complaints of misconduct made by the public against attorneys?

**Jury Verdict = YES**

After learning of the Criminal Allegations levied by Anderson against US Attorneys, the DA’s, the ADA’s, New York Supreme Court Officials and “Favored Lawyers and Law Firms”, a Motion was filed with the Second Circuit by Iviewit/Eliot Bernstein titled, “**EMERGENCY Motion to Compel / HALT PROCEEDING PENDING CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND OVERSIGHT. REMOVE THE APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY IN THIS COURT THROUGH CESSATION OF VIOLATIONS OF JUDICIAL CANNONS, ATTORNEY CONDUCT CODES, PUBLIC OFFICE RULES AND REGULATIONS AND LAW. RESTORE ORDER TO THIS COURT!**” The Motion to Compel charges that any actions by the Courts prior to fully resolving the Conflicts of Interest, Illegal Representations, Violations of Public Office Rules & Regulations, Violations of Attorney Conduct Codes, Violations of Judicial Cannons and Law and now the Violations of Law, including Obstruction and more by Anderson, would be used against them in a court of law and submitted as Prima Facie evidence of further Criminal activity in the courts. The motion states specifically,

In summation, this Writ of Motion to Compel, Compelling this Court and all those involved with Professional Legal Titles to “Freeze, put your hands up in the air and surrender”. [sic] Surrender until all applicable Law Enforcement and oversight Authorities summoned can evaluate your further right to continued involvement in these matters and can determine the degree of Your culpability of which You may become a Defendant in these matters. Freeze, as this is a Citizen’s Arrest [120][[8]](#footnote-8) and take no further action that Violates JC [Judicial Cannons], ACC [Attorney Conduct Codes], PORR [Public Office Rules & Regulations] and Law as required by JC, ACC, PORR and Law, for a period necessary for Authorities summoned to examine the alleged Violations of JC, ACC, PORR and Law.

“You [all Justices, Court Personnel, Law Firms, Lawyers and Public Office Officials involved in the Legal Disposition of this Lawsuit] have the right to remain silent. Anything You say [or put in Order or Motion or Pleading, etc. in this Lawsuit] can and will be used against You in a court of law [a conflict free court]…Do You understand these rights?” This reading of Miranda is not a joke but more a Citizen’s Arrest notification that action on Your part forward without the summoned oversight Authorities and Law Enforcement approval of Your actions thus far and continuation going forward will be met with further CRIMINAL AND CIVIL charges against You. ANY ACTION taken prior to such time will incur filing of criminal charges against You with all appropriate authorities. Charges will include US Code Title 18 Obstruction charges, RICO charges and more, as defined herein and in the Amended Complaint and it would be best if YOU TURN YOURSELF IN TO AUTHORITIES versus forcing further rights under a Citizen’s Arrest to Force You into custody.

I remind this Court, which acts outside its own Rules, as if Above the Law, of the all too recent “Judges’ Trial[121][[9]](#footnote-9)” of the infamous Nuremberg Trials. Proving that no one is Above the Law, not Justices, not Lawyers, nor Presidents or Deciders and that while power may corrupt and perverse those that control law at times, when the Long Arm of the Law regains its reach, the Guilty will be Tried despite their Titles and perceived Entitlement. Changing laws in order to commit crimes by those entrusted to uphold the sanctity of Law is not a defense that holds up well in a fair and impartial courtroom. Once Law and Order was re-established, the NAZI Party crushed and their delusional grandeur deflated, the Judges Trial tried the NAZI justices and lawyers who changed Law to allow Torture, Death Camps and Theft of Personal Properties, all eventually convicted in US Courts acting in Germany for the War Crimes, including for the Abuse and Misuse of Law. Above the Law while deluded in grandeur from sick Abuse of Power, yet in the end sentenced to life imprisonment for their crimes and forever stamped into history as Nazi war criminals. Eventually Justice will return to This Court and those guilty of misusing Law for personal gain to the disadvantage of citizens tried and convicted too.

In her August 08, 2008 Dismissal[[10]](#footnote-10), Scheindlin referred all the “legally related” cases she had dismissed, prior to full resolution of the Anderson case, for investigations to the Attorney General’s Office, US Attorney and to the US Supreme Court. Scheindlin’s referrals indicate that these Lawsuits and Criminal Complaints are far from over in both the courts and prosecutorial offices summoned. Scheindlin states,

As discussed below, the United States Constitution does not permit this Court to supervise the departmental disciplinary committees or review the decisions of the courts of New York State. Regardless of the possibility of corruption in the courts of the State of New York, the only federal court that may review their decisions is the United States Supreme Court[5]. Plaintiffs must direct their complaints to the state court system, the Attorney General for the State of New York, or the appropriate United States Attorney. Because the Court lacks jurisdiction to review the decisions of the departmental disciplinary committees, and for the other reasons stated below, these actions are dismissed.

Therefore, the Iviewit Appeal is on hold after the Motion to Compel was filed, pending investigations of the Criminal Complaints filed against;

1. Appeal Court Officials continuing to handle the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit for allowing the Conflicts to persist and failing to allow investigations to proceed prior to Dismissal, and,
2. Prosecutorial Offices named by Whistleblower Anderson, including but not limited to,
   1. the NY AG,
   2. the NY DA,
   3. the NY ADA,
   4. the US Attorney offices, and,
   5. Yet unknown “Favored Law Firms & Lawyers”.

As the New York Courts, Regulatory Offices and Prosecutorial Offices are all center stage in the Whistleblower allegations and the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, finding Non-Conflicted Officials in New York to represent these matters seems impossible. Any Special Prosecutors or Court Officials now coming into the fray must be thoroughly screened with thousands of Iviewit defendants in the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, the Whistleblower Lawsuit and the “Legally Related” Lawsuits, including but not limited to, all of the parties listed at the URL <http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/Appendix%20A/index.htm#NDALIST> and those already defined herein.

1. Ponzi Schemes Involving Current Defendants in the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit that Prior NY AG Complaints ignored but now need IMMEDIATE new investigations to preclude further fraud on victims due to prior lack of Investigation by the New York Attorney General. New Evidence and Important Information for Ongoing Investigations of; **Allen Stanford, Bernard L. Madoff, Proskauer Rose, Marc S. Dreier, Galleon, Enron Broadband, Enron Corporation, Arthur Andersen** and their direct RELEVANCY to this Complaint

Information regarding these FRAUDS & SWINDLES as they directly relate to the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit can be found in the Iviewit/Eliot Bernstein SEC Complaint and demands concurrent investigations by New York Authorities where the bulk of these Ponzis/Law Firm Money Laundering Schemes occurred @

<http://iviewit.tv/wordpress/?p=288>

fully incorporated by reference herein and

<http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20100206%20FINAL%20SEC%20FBI%20and%20more%20COMPLAINT%20Against%20Warner%20Bros%20Time%20Warner%20AOL176238nscolorlow.pdf>

fully incorporated by reference herein.

Anderson’s allegations expose a gang of corrupted “FAVORED LAW FIRMS AND LAWYERS,” including but not limited to, Court Officials, Prosecutors and Regulators, Violating masses of Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Office Rules & Regulations and State & Federal Law. Further, the gang violates their public office laws they are sworn to uphold to facilitate the crimes with scienter, infiltrating the highest ranks of the offices of the US Attorney, the DA, the ADA, the New York Supreme Court and all of their corresponding Regulatory Agencies. Effectuating a Coup D’état on parts of New York and the US Governments necessary to operate their Criminal RICO Enterprise free of prosecution. Infiltration necessary to cover-up the crimes and hold off investigations while creating a fraudulent façade of Justice and Due Process to victims. Further, these corrupted “FAVORED LAW FIRMS AND LAWYERS” have conspired in a diabolical scheme to commit complex legal crimes and then evade prosecution for those crimes by controlling the prosecutorial and regulatory offices and the courts. The scheme is simple to see, after learning of Anderson’s inside Whistleblower claims, which involves a gang of corrupted “Favored Law Firms & Lawyers,” committing sophisticated **illegal legal crimes** through misusing their intimate knowledge of the law. Then, creating a revolving door of lawyers conspiring to aid and abet the cover-ups planted inside the government to erase any complaints by Threatening Federal Witnesses, Destroying Whistleblowers, Altering Official Records, Destroying Official Records, Committing Fraud Upon the Courts, Whitewashing Attorney Disciplinary Complaints and Prosecutorial Complaints, with the aid of “The Cleaner,” and well, you get the picture.

The reality of the situation is overwhelming, as it presents a clear picture of how even Wall Street/Greed Street has melted down through CRIMINAL ACTS using fraudulent legal instruments[[11]](#footnote-11), WITHOUT a SINGLE ARREST. Anderson’s depiction further paints a picture where all those fingered by Anderson, including the New York Attorney General’s Office, whom are all responsible for regulating and prosecuting misconduct and financial FRAUD on Wall Street, are instead in bed together scratching and watching each other’s backs. Note here that behind all of these Wall Street/Greed Street Frauds are CORRUPTED LAW FIRMS and LAWYERS creating the documentation for every single one of these financial frauds occurring. Again, behind every unprosecuted fraud, including but not limited to, the mortgage/housing frauds, the banking frauds, the stock frauds, the derivative frauds, the tax shelter frauds and the TARP fraud, etc., lay prevaricatory lawyers. Again, these Law Firms and Lawyers have not only failed to fulfill their legal obligations to the PEOPLE but have actively participated and further aided and abetted the CRIMINAL RICO ORGANIZATION at every step, from commission of the crimes through illegal fraudulent ‘legal’ documents to the Obstruction of Investigations and Lawsuits within the Government and Courts.

Further, supporting evidence of this CRIMINAL ENTERPRISE committing these FRAUDS can be found in the April 13, 2011 report by the United States Senate / PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS / Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Chaired by Hon. Carl Levin and Tom Coburn, Ranking Minority Member, titled **WALL STREET AND THE FINANCIAL CRISIS: Anatomy of a Financial Collapse**, which can be found at the following URL, hereby fully incorporated by reference herein, @

<http://hsgac.senate.gov/public/_files/Financial_Crisis/FinancialCrisisReport.pdf>

This detailed stinging report alleges fraud over 200 times in 650 pages and still no arrests while most of this Criminal Activity is taking place in New York, and continues too. One must ask where the New York Attorney General is and the Governor of New York, the “sheriffs” of Wall Street, whom instead look more like criminal accomplices disguised as sheriffs. Further, reports[[12]](#footnote-12) show overwhelmingly that regulators “failed” to regulate appearing asleep at the wheel but look deeper and you will find the regulators, mostly attorneys, were both complicit and essential to actual commissioning of the crimes/financial frauds benefiting the RICO Criminal Enterprise. The regulators feigning regulatory “failures” while Lawmakers and Law Firms began to remove regulations with the intent of opening the door for their crimes, now these criminal acts are referred to as “deregulation[[13]](#footnote-13)” in efforts to evade prosecution. Therefore, not one Regulator/Lawyer has been prosecuted for any of their massive “failures” as the prosecutors appear holding the door open as the loot is carted off. In fact, after their government disservices they appear then to enter the never-ending revolving door to the Corrupt Law Firms, leaving their government posts and landing PARTNERSHIPS with, you guessed it, Law Firms where many came from in the first place. In many instances, as evidenced herein, leaving to Law Firms that economically benefited by their “failures” and “deregulation” while securing instant lucrative Partnerships in most instances, as if their cut of loot was waiting in their Partnership interests, a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. One must question why in many instances the lawyers are leaving multimillion-dollar law firm Partnerships to take low income government jobs, certainly not from benevolence, a characteristic long since gone with ethics in law, only then to be found directly involved in these schemes that benefit the Criminal RICO Enterprise Law Firms and their clientele.

Anderson has exposed the revolving door of corruption between the RICO Criminal Enterprise composed mainly of Law Firms and Lawyers, Government Officials and a select group of their clients/corporations[[14]](#footnote-14) and yet Prosecutors fail to investigate, the courts attempt to derail her lawsuit prior to full formal investigations and all because they cannot investigate themselves or order investigations of themselves. One must question why Anderson was forced to bring her Whistleblower Lawsuit in a Federal Civil Court when almost all of the accusations are CRIMINAL but where else could she turn when the WALL OF CORRUPTION that she fingered is composed of ALL those responsible for CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS? Calls to Prosecutors and the Courts have been made by Anderson and many of the related cases for a FEDERAL MONITOR to intervene, one free of Conflicts of Interest but again the calls have landed on deaf ears. Therefore, this letter requests whomever the New York Attorney General replaces themselves with in these matters going forward, to avoid conflict, would have to be an attorney/prosecutor that lives and works outside of the Conflict Swamp in New York and is NOT a LAWYER. Certainly not a lawyer who works for any of the “Favored Law Firms” or any of the accused parties in any of the lawsuits related to Anderson and one who will sign the attached Conflict of Interest disclosure prior to ANY actions.

Finally, the following Crime Chart illustrates how just one law firm, Proskauer Rose, has been found in a multiplicity of criminal frauds under investigation and the revolving door their Law Firm had with Government Agents and the Court Officials involved in these Criminal Acts that were intentionally misinterpreted as “Regulatory Failures” while actually part of the Cover-Up.

Proskauer is one of several Law Firms where a pattern emerges exposing the REVOLVING DOOR of the CRIMINAL RICO ENTERPRISE operating through Law Firms and the Government to commit financial crimes and cover-ups.

Iviewit’s Proskauer Patent Attorney Raymond Joao, caught stealing patents and put 90+ patents in his own name, once busted transfers to a Marc Dreier Law Firm with stolen patents. No wonder Marc was living like a king.

Iviewit Defendants in Galleon Insider Trading:  
IBM  
INTEL  
ROPES & GRAY Law Firm (Holds Patents)

SEC blamed for “REGULATORY FAILURES” by SEC Inspector General in Ponzis and Wall Street Meltdown. Were these “FAILURES” or Organized Market Riggings and Money Laundering Schemes where the SEC Employees where Aiding and Abetting the Criminal Acts by intentional FAILURE?

NY AG represents against

Whistleblower Anderson & Iviewit, acting as Counsel to State

Defendants both Professionally & Personally illegally. AG fails to bring in Special

Prosecutor to investigate

where AG office cannot b/c of Conflict.

The failure Obstructs

Investigations while using

state funds to illegally

represent State Actors

Personally accused of crimes.

Documentation for all of these financial FRAUDS were created by Lawyers and Law Firms and yet no law firm has been held accountable or ARRESTED, even in the Mortgage Frauds where wholly FRAUDULENT DOCUMENTATION WAS PROCURED BY LAWYERS. The Lawyers and Law Firms protected instead as depicted by Anderson.

Several Spitzer AG team exodus to Proskauer. Cuomo pays Proskauer 500,000 legal fees for Spitzer personal defenses.

Proskauer Represents NY Attorney General.

Proskauer Partner Sjoblom in Miami airport hanger teaching Stanford Employees to lie to SEC and FBI investigators. Proskauer sued in Global Class Action for entire 8Billion Stanford Loss. Sjoblom sued by Laura Pendergast Holt (arrested in Stanford affair) for illegal representations.

Cahill ordered for Investigation with Proskauer for Conflicts of Interest, Appearance of Impropriety and more. Anderson sues Cahill and after trial, Judge Scheindlin, AFTER THE VERDICT, read into record that new evidence showed Cahill had committed Perjury and thus Obstructed Justice.

Steven C. Krane, Deceased, Proskauer Partner. Head of NY Supreme Court Disciplinary, ordered for Investigation for Conflict of Interest & Appearance of Impropriety by unanimous consent of Five NY Supreme Court Justices.  
Judith Kaye, Former Chief Judge of New York, married to Deceased Proskauer Partner Stephen Kaye.

**EXHIBIT 1 – PARTIAL LIST OF KNOWN CONFLICTED PARTIES**

* Proskauer Rose, LLP; Alan S. Jaffe - Chairman Of The Board - ("Jaffe"); Kenneth Rubenstein - ("Rubenstein"); Robert Kafin - Managing Partner - ("Kafin"); Christopher C. Wheeler - ("Wheeler"); Steven C. Krane - ("Krane"); Stephen R. Kaye - ("S. Kaye") and in his estate with New York Supreme Court Chief Judge Judith Kaye (“J. Kaye”); Matthew Triggs - ("Triggs"); Christopher Pruzaski - ("Pruzaski"); Mara Lerner Robbins - ("Robbins"); Donald Thompson - ("Thompson"); Gayle Coleman; David George; George A. Pincus; Gregg Reed; Leon Gold - ("Gold"); Albert Gortz - ("Gortz"); Marcy Hahn-Saperstein; Kevin J. Healy - ("Healy"); Stuart Kapp; Ronald F. Storette; Chris Wolf; Jill Zammas; FULL LIST OF 601 liable Proskauer Partners; any other John Doe ("John Doe") Proskauer partner, affiliate, company, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Proskauer ROSE LLP; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Proskauer related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* MELTZER, LIPPE, GOLDSTEIN, WOLF & SCHLISSEL, P.C.; Lewis Melzter - ("Meltzer"); Raymond Joao - ("Joao"); Frank Martinez - ("Martinez"); Kenneth Rubenstein - ("Rubenstein"); FULL LIST OF 34 Meltzer, Lippe, Goldstein, Wolf & Schlissel, P.C. liable Partners; any other John Doe ("John Doe") Meltzer, Lippe, Goldstein, Wolf & Schlissel, P.C. partner, affiliate, company, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Meltzer, Lippe, Goldstein, Wolf & Schlissel, P.C.; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Meltzer, Lippe, Goldstein, Wolf & Schlissel, P.C. related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* FOLEY & LARDNER LLP; Ralf Boer ("Boer"); Michael Grebe (“Grebe”); Christopher Kise (“Kise”); William J. Dick - ("Dick"); Steven C. Becker - ("Becker"); Douglas Boehm - ("Boehm"); Barry Grossman - ("Grossman"); Jim Clark - ("Clark"); any other John Doe ("John Doe") Foley & Lardner partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Foley & Lardner; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Foley & Lardner related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* Schiffrin & Barroway, LLP; Richard Schiffrin - ("Schiffrin"); Andrew Barroway - ("Barroway"); Krishna Narine - ("Narine"); any other John Doe ("John Doe") Schiffrin & Barroway, LLP partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Schiffrin & Barroway, LLP; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Schiffrin & Barroway, LLP related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP; Norman Zafman - ("Zafman"); Thomas Coester - ("Coester"); Farzad Ahmini - ("Ahmini"); George Hoover - ("Hoover"); any other John Doe ("John Doe") Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon LLP; Martyn W. Molyneaux - ("Molyneaux"); Michael Dockterman - ("Dockterman"); FULL LIST OF 198 Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon LLP liable Partners; any other John Doe ("John Doe") Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon LLP partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon LLP; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon LLP related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.; Alan M. Weisberg - ("Weisberg"); any other John Doe ("John Doe") Christopher & Weisberg, P.A. partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Christopher & Weisberg, P.A. related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* YAMAKAWA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE; Masaki Yamakawa - ("Yamakawa"); any other John Doe ("John Doe") Yamakawa International Patent Office partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Yamakawa International Patent Office; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Yamakawa International Patent Office related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* GOLDSTEIN LEWIN & CO.; Donald J. Goldstein - ("Goldstein"); Gerald R. Lewin - ("Lewin"); Erika Lewin - ("E. Lewin"); Mark R. Gold; Paul Feuerberg; Salvatore Bochicchio; Marc H. List; David A. Katzman; Robert H. Garick; Robert C. Zeigen; Marc H. List; Lawrence A. Rosenblum; David A. Katzman; Brad N. Mciver; Robert Cini; any other John Doe ("John Doe") Goldstein & Lewin Co. partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Goldstein & Lewin Co.; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Goldstein & Lewin Co. related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* INTEL Corporation;
* Silicon Graphics Inc.;
* Lockheed Martin Corporation;
* Real 3D, Inc. (SILICON GRAPHICS, INC., LOCKHEED MARTIN & INTEL) & RYJO; Gerald Stanley - ("Stanley"); Ryan Huisman - ("Huisman"); RYJO - ("RYJO"); Tim Connolly - ("Connolly"); Steve Cochran; David Bolton; Rosalie Bibona - ("Bibona"); Connie Martin; Richard Gentner; Steven A. Behrens; Matt Johannsen; any other John Doe ("John Doe") Intel, Real 3D, Inc. (Silicon Graphics, Inc., Lockheed Martin & Intel) & RYJO partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Intel, Real 3D, Inc. (Silicon Graphics, Inc., Lockheed Martin & Intel) & RYJO; Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Intel, Real 3D, Inc. (Silicon Graphics, Inc., Lockheed Martin & Intel) & RYJO related or affiliated entities, and any successor companies both individually and professionally;
* Tiedemann Investment Group; Bruce T. Prolow ("Prolow"); Carl Tiedemann ("C. Tiedemann"); Andrew Philip Chesler; Craig L. Smith; any other John Doe ("John Doe") Tiedemann Investment Group partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Tiedemann Investment Group and any other Tiedemann Investment Group related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* Crossbow Ventures / Alpine Partners; Stephen J. Warner - ("Warner"); Rene P. Eichenberger - ("Eichenberger"); H. Hickman Hank Powell - ("Powell"); Maurice Buchsbaum - ("Buchsbaum"); Eric Chen - ("Chen"); Avi Hersh; Matthew Shaw - ("Shaw"); Bruce W. Shewmaker - ("Shewmaker"); Ravi M. Ugale - ("Ugale"); any other John Doe ("John Doe") Crossbow Ventures / Alpine Partners partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Crossbow Ventures / Alpine Partners and any other Crossbow Ventures / Alpine Partners related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* BROAD & CASSEL; James J. Wheeler - ("J. Wheeler"); Kelly Overstreet Johnson - ("Johnson"); any other John Doe ("John Doe") Broad & Cassell partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Broad & Cassell and any other Broad & Cassell related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* FORMER IVIEWIT MANAGEMENT & BOARD; Brian G. Utley/Proskauer Referred Management - ("Utley"); Raymond Hersh - ("Hersh")/; Michael Reale - ("Reale")/Proskauer Referred Management; Rubenstein/Proskauer Rose Shareholder in Iviewit - Advisory Board; Wheeler/Proskauer Rose Shareholder in Iviewit - Advisory Board; Dick/Foley & Lardner - Advisory Board, Boehm/Foley & Lardner - Advisory Board; Becker/Foley & Lardner; Advisory Board; Joao/Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolfe & Schlissel - Advisory Board; Kane/Goldman Sachs - Board Director; Lewin/Goldstein Lewin - Board Director; Ross Miller, Esq. (“Miller”), Prolow/Tiedemann Prolow II - Board Director; Powell/Crossbow Ventures/Proskauer Referred Investor - Board Director; Maurice Buchsbaum - Board Director; Stephen Warner - Board Director; Simon L. Bernstein – Board Director (“S. Bernstein”); any other John Doe ("John Doe") Former Iviewit Management & Board partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Former Iviewit Management & Board and any other Former Iviewit Management & Board related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT - WEST PALM BEACH FLORIDA; Judge Jorge LABARGA - ("Labarga"); any other John Doe ("John Doe") FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT - WEST PALM BEACH FLORIDA staff, known or not known to have been involved at the time. Hereinafter, collectively referred to as ("15C");
* THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK APPELLATE DIVISION: FIRST JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT, DEPARTMENTAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE; Thomas Cahill - ("Cahill"); Joseph Wigley - ("Wigley"); Steven Krane, any other John Doe ("John Doe") of THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK APPELLATE DIVISION: FIRST JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT, DEPARTMENTAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE staff, known or not known to have been involved at the time;
* THE FLORIDA BAR; Lorraine Christine Hoffman - ("Hoffman"); Eric Turner - ("Turner"); Kenneth Marvin - ("Marvin"); Anthony Boggs - ("Boggs"); Joy A. Bartmon - ("Bartmon"); Kelly Overstreet Johnson - ("Johnson"); Jerald Beer - ("Beer"); Matthew Triggs; Christopher or James Wheeler; any other John Doe ("John Doe") The Florida Bar staff, known or not known to have been involved at the time;
* MPEGLA, LLC. – Kenneth Rubenstein, Patent Evaluator; Licensors and Licensees, please visit [www.mpegla.com](http://www.mpegla.com/) for a complete list; Columbia University; Fujitsu Limited; General Instrument Corp; Lucent Technologies Inc.; Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.; Mitsubishi Electric Corp.; Philips Electronics N.V. (Philips); Scientific Atlanta, Inc.; Sony Corp. (Sony); EXTENDED LIST OF MPEGLA LICENSEES AND LICENSORS; any other John Doe MPEGLA, LLC. Partner, Associate, Engineer, Of Counsel or Employee; any other John Doe ("John Doe") MPEGLA, LLC partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to MPEGLA, LLC and any other MPEGLA, LLC related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* DVD6C LICENSING GROUP - Licensors and Licensees, please visit [www.mpegla.com](http://www.mpegla.com/) for a complete list; Toshiba Corporation; Hitachi, Ltd.; Matsushita Electric Industrial Co. Ltd.; Mitsubishi Electric Corporation; Time Warner Inc.; Victor Company Of Japan, Ltd.; EXTENDED DVD6C DEFENDANTS; any other John Doe DVD6C LICENSING GROUP Partner, Associate, Engineer, Of Counsel or Employee; any other John Doe ("John Doe") DVD6C LICENSING GROUP partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to DVD6C LICENSING GROUP and any other DVD6C LICENSING GROUP related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* Harrison Goodard Foote incorporating Brewer & Son; Martyn Molyneaux, Esq. (“Molyneaux”); Any other John Doe ("John Doe") Harrison Goodard Foote (incorporating Brewer & Son) partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Harrison Goodard Goote incorporating Brewer & Son and any other related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* Lawrence DiGiovanna, Chairman of the Grievance Committee of the Second Judicial Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee;
* James E. Peltzer, Clerk of the Court of the Appellate Division, Supreme Court of the State of New York, Second Judicial Department; Diana Kearse, Chief Counsel to the Grievance Committee of the Second Judicial Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee;
* Houston & Shahady, P.A., any other John Doe ("John Doe") Houston & Shahady, P.A., affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Houston & Shahady, P.A. related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* Furr & Cohen, P.A. any other John Doe ("John Doe") Furr & Cohen, P.A., affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Furr & Cohen, P.A. related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* Moskowitz, Mandell, Salim & Simowitz, P.A., any other John Doe ("John Doe") Moskowitz, Mandell, Salim & Simowitz, P.A., affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Moskowitz, Mandell, Salim & Simowitz, P.A. related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. Jeffrey Friedstein (“Friedstein”); Sheldon Friedstein (S. Friedstein”), Donald G. Kane (“Kane”); any other John Doe ("John Doe") The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. and any other related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* David B. Simon, Esq. (“D. Simon”);
* Sachs Saxs & Klein, PA any other John Doe ("John Doe") Sachs Saxs & Klein, PA, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Sachs Saxs & Klein, PA related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* Huizenga Holdings Incorporated any other John Doe ("John Doe") Huizenga Holdings Incorporated affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Huizenga Holdings Incorporated related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
* Davis Polk & Wardell;
* Ropes & Gray LLP;
* Sullivan & Cromwell LLP;
* Eliot I. Bernstein, (“Bernstein”) a resident of the State of California, and former President (Acting) of Iviewit Holdings, Inc. and its affiliates and subsidiaries and the founder of Iviewit and principal inventor of its technology;
* P. Stephen Lamont, (“Lamont”) a resident of the State of New York, and former Chief Executive Officer (Acting) of Iviewit Holdings, Inc. and all of its affiliates and subsidiaries;
* SKULL AND BONES; The Russell Trust Co.; Yale Law School;
* Council on Foreign Relations;
* The Bilderberg Group;
* The Federalist Society;
* The Bradley Foundation;

Please include in the COI check the defendants and any other parties in the legally related cases in New York District Court Southern District of New York to Docket No 07cv09599 Anderson v The State of New York, et al. - WHISTLEBLOWER LAWSUIT, including but not limited to;

* + 1. United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit 08-4873-cv
    2. (07cv11196) Bernstein et al. v Appellate Division First Department Disciplinary Committee, et al. - TRILLION DOLLAR LAWSUIT Defendants, in addition to those already listed herein, include but are not limited to;
       - STATE OF NEW YORK;
       - THE OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNIFIED COURT SYSTEM;
       - STEVEN C. KRANE in his official and individual Capacities for the New York State Bar Association and the Appellate Division First Department Departmental disciplinary Committee, and, his professional and individual capacities as a Proskauer partner;
       - ESTATE OF STEPHEN KAYE, in his professional and individual capacities;
       - MATTHEW M. TRIGGS in his official and individual capacity for The Florida Bar and his professional and individual capacities as a partner of Proskauer;
       - JON A. BAUMGARTEN, in his professional and individual capacities;
       - SCOTT P. COOPER, in his professional and individual capacities;
       - BRENDAN J. O'ROURKE, in his professional and individual capacities;
       - LAWRENCE I. WEINSTEIN, in his professional and individual capacities;
       - WILLIAM M. HART, in his professional and individual capacities;
       - DARYN A. GROSSMAN, in his professional and individual capacities;
       - JOSEPH A. CAPRARO JR., in his professional and individual capacities;
       - JAMES H. SHALEK; in his professional and individual capacities;
       - GREGORY MASHBERG, in his professional and individual capacities;
       - JOANNA SMITH, in her professional and individual capacities;
       - TODD C. NORBITZ, in his professional and individual capacities;
       - ANNE SEKEL, in his professional and individual capacities;
       - JIM CLARK, in his professional and individual capacities;
       - STATE OF FLORIDA, OFFICE OF THE STATE COURTS ADMINISTRATOR, FLORIDA;
       - FLORIDA SUPREME COURT;
       - HON. CHARLES T. WELLS, in his official and individual capacities;
       - HON. HARRY LEE ANSTEAD, in his official and individual capacities;
       - HON. R. FRED LEWIS, in his official and individual capacities;
       - HON. PEGGY A. QUINCE, in his official and individual capacities;
       - HON. KENNETH B. BELL, in his official and individual capacities;
       - THOMAS HALL, in his official and individual capacities;
       - DEBORAH YARBOROUGH in her official and individual capacities;
       - DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL REGULATION – FLORIDA;
       - CITY OF BOCA RATON, FLA.;
       - ROBERT FLECHAUS in his official and individual capacities;
       - ANDREW SCOTT in his official and individual capacities;
       - PAUL CURRAN in his official and individual capacities;
       - MARTIN R. GOLD in his official and individual capacities;
       - SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK APPELLATE DIVISION FIRST DEPARTMENT;
       - CATHERINE O’HAGEN WOLFE in her official and individual capacities;
       - HON. ANGELA M. MAZZARELLI in her official and individual capacities;
       - HON. RICHARD T. ANDRIAS in his official and individual capacities;
       - HON. DAVID B. SAXE in his official and individual capacities;
       - HON. DAVID FRIEDMAN in his official and individual capacities;
       - HON. LUIZ A. GONZALES in his official and individual capacities;
       - SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK APPELLATE DIVISION SECOND JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT;
       - SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK APPELLATE DIVISION SECOND DEPARTMENT DEPARTMENTAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE;
       - HON. A. GAIL PRUDENTI in her official and individual capacities;
       - HON. JUDITH S. KAYE in her official and individual capacities;
       - STATE OF NEW YORK COMMISSION OF INVESTIGATION;
       - ANTHONY CARTUSCIELLO in his official and individual capacities;
       - LAWYERS FUND FOR CLIENT PROTECTION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK;
       - OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK;
       - ELIOT SPITZER in his official and individual capacities, as both former Attorney General for the State of New York, and, as former Governor of the State of New York;
       - ANDREW CUOMO in his official and individual capacities, as both former Attorney General for the State of New York, and, as current Governor of the State of New York;
       - Steven M. Cohen in his official and individual capacities, as both former Chief of Staff fo Attorney General Andrew Cuomo for the State of New York, and, as current Secretary to the Governor of the State of New York;
       - Emily Cole, in her official and individual capacities, as an employee of Steven M. Cohen for the Governor Cuomo of the State of New York;
       - COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA;
       - VIRGINIA STATE BAR;
       - ANDREW H. GOODMAN in his official and individual capacities;
       - NOEL SENGEL in her official and individual capacities;
       - MARY W. MARTELINO in her official and individual capacities;
       - LIZBETH L. MILLER, in her official and individual capacities;
       - MPEGLA LLC; LAWRENCE HORN, in his professional and individual capacities;
       - INTEL CORP.; LARRY PALLEY, in his professional and individual capacities;
       - SILICON GRAPHICS, INC.;
       - LOCKHEED MARTIN Corp;
       - EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE;
       - ALAIN POMPIDOU in his official and individual capacities;
       - WIM VAN DER EIJK in his official and individual capacities;
       - LISE DYBDAHL in her official and personal capacities;
       - DIGITAL INTERACTIVE STREAMS, INC.;
       - ROYAL O’BRIEN, in his professional and individual capacities;
       - HUIZENGA HOLDINGS INCORPORATED, WAYNE HUIZENGA, in his professional and individual capacities;
       - WAYNE HUIZENGA, JR., in his professional and individual capacities;
       - BART A. HOUSTON, ESQ. in his professional and individual capacities;
       - BRADLEY S. SCHRAIBERG, ESQ. in his professional and individual capacities;
       - WILLIAM G. SALIM, ESQ. in his professional and individual capacities;
       - BEN ZUCKERMAN, ESQ. in his professional and individual capacities;
       - SPENCER M. SAX, in his professional and individual capacities;
       - ALBERTO GONZALES in his official and individual capacities;
       - JOHNNIE E. FRAZIER in his official and individual capacities;
       - IVIEWIT, INC., a Florida corporation;
       - IVIEWIT, INC., a Delaware corporation;
       - IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC., a Delaware corporation (f.k.a. Uview.com, Inc.);
       - UVIEW.COM, INC., a Delaware corporation;
       - IVIEWIT TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a Delaware corporation (f.k.a. Iviewit Holdings, Inc.);
       - IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC., a Florida corporation;
       - IVIEWIT.COM, INC., a Florida corporation;
       - I.C., INC., a Florida corporation;
       - IVIEWIT.COM, INC., a Delaware corporation;
       - IVIEWIT.COM LLC, a Delaware limited liability company;
       - IVIEWIT LLC, a Delaware limited liability company;
       - IVIEWIT CORPORATION, a Florida corporation;
       - IBM CORPORATION;

**To be added New Defendants in the RICO and Antitrust Lawsuit through amendment or in any anticipated future litigations and criminal filings:**

* + - * **Andrew Cuomo, in his official and individual capacities,**
      * **Steven M. Cohen, in his official and individual capacities,**
      * **Emily Cole, in her official and individual capacities,**
      * **Justice Richard C. Wesley in his official and individual capacities,**
      * **Justice Peter W. Hall in his official and individual capacities,**
      * **Justice Debra Ann Livingston in her official and individual capacities,**
      * **Justice Ralph K. Winter in his official and individual capacities,**
      * **P. Stephen Lamont, (Questions about Lamont’s filings on behalf of others and more filed with criminal authorities and this Court notified of the alleged fraudulent activities of Lamont)**
      * **Alan Friedberg, in his official and individual capacities,**
      * **Roy Reardon, in his official and individual capacities,**
      * **Martin Glenn, in his official and individual capacities,**
      * **Warner Bros. Entertainment, (Already named in the lawsuit since the amended complaint filed)**
      * **Time Warner Communications, (Already named in the lawsuit since the amended complaint filed)**
      * **AOL Inc., (Already named in the lawsuit since the amended complaint filed)**
      * **Ropes & Gray,**
      * **Stanford Financial Group,**
      * **Bernard L. Madoff et al.**
      * **Marc S. Dreier, (Already named in the lawsuit since the amended complaint filed)**
      * **Sony Corporation, (Already named in the lawsuit since the amended complaint filed)**
      * **Ernst & Young, (Already named in the lawsuit since the amended complaint filed)**
      * **Arthur Andersen, (Already named in the lawsuit since the amended complaint filed)**
      * **Enron, (Already named in the lawsuit since the amended complaint filed)**
    1. Other Cases @ US District Court - Southern District NY
* 07cv09599 Anderson v The State of New York, et al. - WHISTLEBLOWER LAWSUIT;
* 07cv11196 Bernstein, et al. v Appellate Division First Department Disciplinary Committee, et al.;
* 07cv11612 Esposito v The State of New York, et al.;
* 08cv00526 Capogrosso v New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct, et al.;
* 08cv02391 McKeown v The State of New York, et al.;
* 08cv02852 Galison v The State of New York, et al.;
* 08cv03305 Carvel v The State of New York, et al.;
* 08cv04053 Gizella Weisshaus v The State of New York, et al.;
* 08cv04438 Suzanne McCormick v The State of New York, et al.;
* 08cv06368 John L. Petrec-Tolino v. The State of New York

EXHIBIT 2 – PARTIAL LIST OF RICO & ANTITRUST LAWSUIT PREDICATE CRIMES

§20.00 Criminal liability for conduct of another;

§105.05 Conspiracy in the fifth degree, and

§105.10 Conspiracy in the fourth degree;

§115.00 Criminal facilitation in the fourth degree;

§195.00 Official misconduct,

§195.05 Obstructing governmental administration in the second degree,

§175.20 Tampering with public records in the second degree,

§175.25 Tampering with public records in the first degree. (class D felony).

NY Executive Law: § 63

General duties. The attorney-general shall: Prosecute and defend all actions and proceedings in which the state is interested…to protect the interest of the state…

and

Public Officers Rule 17 (2)(b)

New York State Consolidated Laws Penal

ARTICLE 200 BRIBERY INVOLVING PUBLIC SERVANTS AND RELATED OFFENSES

S 200.03 Bribery in the second degree

S 200.04 Bribery in the first degree

S 200.05 Bribery; defense

S 200.10 Bribe receiving in the third degree

S 200.11 Bribe receiving in the second degree

S 200.12 Bribe receiving in the first degree

S 200.15 Bribe receiving; no defense

S 200.20 Rewarding official misconduct in the second degree

S 200.22 Rewarding official misconduct in the first degree S 200.25 Receiving reward for official misconduct in the second degree

S 200.27 Receiving reward for official misconduct in the first degree

S 200.30 Giving unlawful gratuities

S 200.35 Receiving unlawful gratuities

S 200.40 Bribe giving and bribe receiving for public office; definition of term

S 200.45 Bribe giving for public office

S 200.50 Bribe receiving for public office

ARTICLE 175 OFFENSES INVOLVING FALSE WRITTEN STATEMENTS

S 175.20 Tampering with public records in the second degree

S 175.25 Tampering with public records in the first degree

S 175.30 Offering a false instrument for filing in the second degree

S 175.35 Offering a false instrument for filing in the first degree

NY Constitution ARTICLE XIII Public Officers

Public Officers - Public Officers ARTICLE 1

ARTICLE 2 Appointment and Qualification of Public Officers - ARTICLE 15 ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS

S 476-b. Injunction to restrain defendant from unlawful practice of the law

S 476-c. Investigation by the attorney-general

S 487. Misconduct by attorneys

S 488. Buying demands on which to bring an action.

Public Officers Law SEC 73 Restrictions on the Activities Of Current and Former State Officers and Employees

Public Officers Law SEC 74 Code of Ethics

Conflicts of Interest Law, found in Chapter 68 of the New York City Charter, the City's Financial Disclosure Law, set forth in section 12-110 of the New York City Administrative Code, and the Lobbyist Gift Law, found in sections 3-224 through 3-228 of the Administrative Code.

TITLE 18 FEDERAL CODE & OTHER APPLICABLE FEDERAL LAW OF THE RICO & ANTITRUST LAWSUIT

Sec. 201. Bribery of public officials and witnesses

Sec. 225. - Continuing financial crimes enterprise

BRIBERY, GRAFT, AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Sec. 205. - Activities of officers and employees in claims against and other matters affecting the Government

Sec. 208. - Acts affecting a personal financial interest

Sec. 210. - Offer to procure appointive public office

Sec. 225. - Continuing financial crimes enterprise

TITLE 18 PART I CH 79 Sec 1623 - False declarations before grand jury or court

Sec 654 - Officer or employee of United States converting property of another

TITLE 18 PART I CH 73 Sec 1511 - Obstruction of State or local law enforcement

TITLE 18 PART I CH 96 Sec 1961 RACKETEER INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT Organizations ("RICO")

Section 1503 (relating to obstruction of justice),

Section 1510 (relating to obstruction of criminal investigations)

Section 1511 (relating to the obstruction of State or local law enforcement),

Section 1952 (relating to racketeering),

Section 1957 (relating to engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity),

TITLE 18 PART I CH 96 SEC 1962 (A) RICO

TITLE 18 PART I CH 96 SEC 1962 (B) RICO

TITLE 18 PART I CH 96 SEC 1962 (C) RICO

TITLE 18 PART I CH 19 SEC 1962 (D) RICO

TITLE 18 PART I CH 19 CONSPIRACY Sec 371 CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE OR TO DEFRAUD UNITED STATES

TITLE 18 PART I CH 95 RACKETEERING SEC 1957 Engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity

TITLE 18 PART I CH 47 Sec 1031 - Major fraud against the United States

Judicial Cannons

Canon 1. A Judge Should Uphold the Integrity and Independence of the Judiciary

[1.1] Deference to the judgments and rulings of courts depends upon public confidence in the integrity and independence of judges. The integrity and independence of judges depends in turn upon their acting without fear or favor. Although judges should be independent, they must comply with the law, including the provisions of this Code. Public confidence in the impartiality of the judiciary is maintained by the adherence of each judge to this responsibility. Conversely, violation of this Code diminishes public confidence in the judiciary and thereby does injury to the system of government under law.

Canon 2. A Judge Should Avoid Impropriety and the Appearance of Impropriety in All Activities

(A) A judge shall respect and comply with the law and shall act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.

[2.2][2A] The prohibition against behaving with impropriety or the appearance of impropriety applies to both the professional and personal conduct of a judge. Because it is not practicable to list all prohibited acts, the proscription is necessarily cast in general terms that extend to conduct by judges that is harmful although not specifically mentioned in the Code. Actual improprieties under this standard include violations of law, court rules or other specific provisions of this Code. The test for appearance of impropriety is whether the conduct would create in reasonable minds a perception that the judge’s ability to carry out judicial responsibilities with integrity, impartiality and competence is impaired.

Canon 3. A Judge Should Perform the Duties of the Office Impartially and Diligently

(B) Adjudicative responsibilities.

(l) A judge shall be faithful to the law and maintain professional competence in it. A judge shall not be swayed by partisan interests, public clamor or fear of criticism.

(2) A judge shall require order and decorum in proceedings before the judge.

(D) Disciplinary responsibilities.

(1) A judge who receives information indicating a substantial likelihood that another judge has committed a substantial violation of this Part shall take appropriate action.

**(2) A judge who receives information indicating a substantial likelihood that a lawyer has committed a substantial violation of the Code of Professional Responsibility shall take appropriate action.**

(3) Acts of a judge in the discharge of disciplinary responsibilities are part of a judge's judicial duties.

Public Office Conduct Codes New York

PUBLIC OFFICERS LAW Laws 1909, Chap. 51.

CHAPTER 47 OF THE CONSOLIDATED LAWS PUBLIC OFFICERS LAW

Sec. 17. Defense and indemnification of state officers and employees.

2 (b)

Sec. 18. Defense and indemnification of officers and employees of public entities.

3 (b)

Sec. 74. Code of ethics.

§ 73. Business or professional activities by state officers and employees and party officers.

NY Attorney Conduct Code

(a) "Differing interests" include every interest that will adversely affect either the judgment or the loyalty of a lawyer to a client, whether it be a conflicting, inconsistent, diverse, or other interest.

CANON 5. A Lawyer Should Exercise Independent Professional Judgment on Behalf of a Client

DR 5-101 [1200.20] Conflicts of Interest - Lawyer's Own Interests.

DR 5-102 [1200.21] Lawyers as Witnesses.

DR 5-103 [1200.22] Avoiding Acquisition of Interest in Litigation.

DR 5-104 [1200.23] Transactions Between Lawyer and Client.

DR 5-105 [1200.24] Conflict of Interest; Simultaneous Representation.

DR 5-108 [1200.27] Conflict of Interest - Former Client.

CANON 6. A Lawyer Should Represent a Client Competently

CANON 7. A Lawyer Should Represent a Client Zealously Within the Bounds of the Law

DR 7-102 [1200.33] Representing a Client Within the Bounds of the Law.

DR 7-110 [1200.41] Contact with Officials.

DR 8-101 [1200.42] Action as a Public Official.

DR 8-103 [1200.44] Lawyer Candidate for Judicial Office.

A. A lawyer who is a candidate for judicial office shall comply with section 100.5 of the Chief Administrator's Rules Governing Judicial Conduct (22 NYCRR) and Canon 5 of the Code of Judicial Conduct.

CANON 9. A Lawyer Should Avoid Even the Appearance of Professional Impropriety

DR 9-101 [1200.45] Avoiding Even the Appearance of Impropriety.

The underlying crimes which the New York Attorney General Office, Andrew Cuomo, Assistant Attorney General Monica Connell and Chief of Staff Steven M. Cohen conspired with and facilitated were the Iviewit Crimes described in Iviewit’s Trillion Dollar FEDERAL RICO & ANTITRUST LAWSUIT.

The allegations in the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, include but are not limited to,

§ 125.25 Murder in the second degree.

§ 125.20 Manslaughter in the first degree.

§ 135.60 Coercion in the second degree

§ 155.42 Grand larceny in the first degree.

§ 170.15 Forgery in the first degree.

§ 170.30 Criminal possession of a forged instrument in the first degree.

§ 175.25 Tampering with public records in the first degree.

§ 175.35 Offering a false instrument for filing in the first degree.

§ 195.05 Obstructing governmental administration in the second degree.

§ 210.15 Perjury in the first degree.

federal code

The Economic Espionage Act

ANTITRUST CIVIL PROCESS

THE SHERMAN & CLAYTON ACTS

TITLE 18 PART I CH 96 Sec 1965 RICO VENUE AND PROCESS

TITLE 18 PART I CH 96 Sec 1961 ("RICO")

TITLE 18 PART I CH 96 Sec 1962 (a) - RICO

TITLE 18 PART I CH 96 SEC 1962 (B) RICO

TITLE 18 PART I CH 96 SEC 1962 (C) RICO

TITLE 18 PART I CH 19 CONSPIRACY Sec 371 CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE OR TO DEFRAUD UNITED STATES

TITLE 18 PART I CH 95 RACKETEERING Sec 1951 - INTERFERENCE WITH COMMERCE BY THREATS OR VIOLENCE

TITLE 18 PART I CH 95 RACKETEERING SEC 1952 Interstate and foreign travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises

TITLE 18 PART I CH 95 RACKETEERING SEC 1956 Laundering of monetary instruments

TITLE 18 PART I CH 95 RACKETEERING SEC 1957 Engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity

TITLE 18 PART I CHAPTER 103 SEC. 2112 - Personal property of United States

TITLE 15 CHAPTER 1 RELATING TO MONOPOLIES AND COMBINATIONS IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE Sec. 1 - Trusts, etc., in restraint of trade illegal; penalty

TITLE 15 CHAPTER 1 Sec. - Monopolizing trade a felony; penalty

TITLE 15 CHAPTER 1 Sec. 6 - Forfeiture of property in transit

TITLE 15 CHAPTER 1 Sec 6a - Conduct involving trade or commerce with foreign nations

TITLE 15 CHAPTER 1 Sec. 14 - Sale, etc., on agreement not to use goods of competitor

TITLE 15 CHAPTER 1 Sec. 18 - Acquisition by one corporation of stock of another

TITLE 15 CH 1 Sec 19 Interlocking directorates and officers

TITLE 15 CH 1 Sec 26 INJUNCTIVE RELIEF FOR PRIVATE PARTIES; EXCEPTION; COSTS

TITLE 15 CH 2 SUBCH I Sec 45 Unfair methods of competition unlawful; prevention by Commission

TITLE 15 CH 2 SUBCH I Sec 57b Civil actions for violations of rules and cease and desist orders respecting unfair or deceptive acts or practices

TITLE 15 CH 2 SUBCH II SEC 62 - Export trade and antitrust legislation

TITLE 15 CH 2 SUBCH II SEC 64 - Unfair methods of competition in export trade

TITLE 17 CH 5 Sec 501 Infringement of copyright.

TITLE 17 CH 5 Sec 502 Remedies for infringement: Injunctions

TITLE 17 CH 5 SEC 503 Remedies for infringement: Impounding and disposition of infringing articles

TITLE 17 CH 5 Sec 504 Remedies for infringement: Damages and profits

TITLE 17 CH 5 Sec 505 Remedies for infringement: Costs and attorney's fees

TITLE 17 CH 5 Sec 506 Criminal offenses

TITLE 17 CH 5 Sec 507 Limitations on actions

TITLE 17 CH 5 Sec 508 Notification of filing and determination of actions

TITLE 17 CH 5 Sec 509 Seizure and forfeiture

TITLE 17 CH 5 Sec 510 REMEDIES FOR ALTERATION OF PROGRAMMING BY CABLE SYSTEMS

TITLE 17 CH 5 Sec 511 Liability of States, instrumentalities of States, and State officials for infringement of copyright

TITLE 17 CH 5 Sec 512 Limitations on liability relating to material online

TITLE 17 CH 5 Sec 513 Determination of reasonable license fees for individual proprietors

TITLE 17 CHAPTER 13 Sec 1312 - Oaths and acknowledgments

TITLE 17 CH 13 Sec 1326 Penalty for false marking

TITLE 17 CHAPTER 13 Sec 1327 - Penalty for false Representation

TITLE 17 cH 13 Sec 1329 Relation to design patent law

TITLE 17 CH 13 Sec 1330 Common law and other rights unaffected

TITLE 35 PART I CH 2 Sec 25 Declaration in lieu of oath

TITLE 35 PART II CH 11 Sec 115 Oath of applicant

TITLE 35 PART II CH 11 Sec 116 Inventors

TITLE 35 PART III CH 261 Ownership; assignment

TITLE 35 PART IV PATENT COOPERATION TREATY CH 35 Sec 351

TITLE 35 PART IV CH 37 Sec 373 Improper applicant

SEC1.56 Duty to disclose information material to patentability

SEC 1.63 regarding Oaths and declarations

CONSOLIDATED PATENT RULES SEC 1.63

SEC 1.64 regarding person making false oaths and Declarations

SEC 1.71 regarding detailed description and specification of the invention.

SEC 1.137 for Revival of abandoned application, terminated reexamination proceeding, or lapsed patent

LAWS NOT IN TITLE 35, UNITED STATES CODE 18 U.S.C. 1001

LAWS NOT IN TITLE 35, UNITED STATES CODE 18 U.S.C. 2071

Title 37 - Code of Federal Regulations Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights - MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE PATENT RULES Part 10 - PRACTICE BEFORE THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE PART 10 - REPRESENTATION OF OTHERS BEFORE THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK

SEC10.18 Signature and certificate for correspondence filed in the Patent and Trademark Office

SEC 10.20 Canons and Disciplinary Rules

SEC 10.21 Canon 1

SEC 10.23 Misconduct

SEC 10.25 - 10.29 [Reserved] SEC 10.30 Canon 2

SEC 10.31 Communications concerning a practitioner's services

SEC 10.33 Direct contact with prospective clients

SEC 10.40 Withdrawal from employment

SEC 10.50 - 10.55 [Reserved] SEC 10.56 Canon 4

SEC 10.57 Preservation of confidences and secrets of a client

SEC 10.58 - 10.60 [Reserved] SEC 10.61 Canon 5

SEC 10.64 Avoiding acquisition of interest in litigation or proceeding before the Office

SEC 10.65 Limiting business relations with a client

SEC10.66 Refusing to accept or continue employment if the interests of another client may impair the independent professional judgment of the practitioner

SEC 10.68 Avoiding influence by others than the client

SEC 10.69 - 10.75 [Reserved] SEC 10.76 Canon 6

SEC 10.77 Failing to act competently

SEC 10.78 Limiting liability to client

SEC 10.79 - 10.82 [Reserved] SEC 10.83 Canon 7

SEC 10.84 Representing a client zealously

SEC 10.85 Representing a client within the bounds of the law

SEC 10.94 - 10.99 [Reserved] SEC 10.100 Canon 8

SEC 10.104 - 10.109 [Reserved] SEC 10.110 Canon 9

SEC 10.112 Preserving identity of funds and property of client

PATENT RULES PART 10 INDEX - PART 15

TITLE 18 PART I CH 90 Sec 1831 Economic espionage

TITLE 18 PART I CH 90 Sec 1832 Theft of trade secrets

TITLE 18 PART I CH 90 Sec 1834 Criminal forfeiture

TITLE 18 PART I CH 90 Sec 1835 ORDERS TO PRESERVE CONFIDENTIALITY

TITLE 18 PART I CH 90 Sec 1837 Applicability to conduct outside the United States

TITLE 15 CH 22 TRADEMARKS Sec 1116 Injunctive relief

TITLE 15 CH 22 SUBCH III Sec 1117 - Recovery for violation of rights

TITLE 15 CH 22 SUBCH III Sec 1120 CIVIL LIABILITY FOR FALSE OR FRAUDULENT REGISTRATION

TITLE 15 CH 22 SUBCH III Sec 1125 FALSE DESIGNATIONS OF ORIGIN, FALSE DESCRIPTIONS, AND DILUTION FORBIDDEN

TITLE 15 CH 22 SUBCH III Sec 1126 False designations of origin, false descriptions, and dilution forbidden

TITLE 17 - COPYRIGHTS

TITLE 18 PART I CHAPTER 9 BANKRUPTCY Sec. 152 CONCEALMENT OF ASSETS; FALSE OATHS AND CLAIMS; BRIBERY

TITLE 18 PART I CHAPTER 9 Sec 156 - Knowing disregard of bankruptcy law or rule

TITLE 18 PART I CHAPTER 9 Sec 157 - Bankruptcy fraud

TITLE 11 CHAPTER 1 Sec 110 - Penalty for persons who negligently or fraudulently prepare bankruptcy petitions

TITLE 18 PART I CH 47 FRAUD AND FALSE STATEMENTS Sec 1001

TITLE 18 PART I CH 47 Sec 1031 - Major fraud against the United States

TITLE 18 PART I CH 65 Sec 1361 - Government property or contracts

TITLE 18 PART I CH 103 Sec 2112 - Personal property of United States

TITLE 18 PART I CH 103 Sec 2114 - Mail, money, or other property of United States

TITLE 18 PART I CH 113 STOLEN PROPERTY Sec 2311

TITLE 18 PART I CH 113 Sec 2314 - Transportation of stolen goods, securities, moneys, fraudulent State tax stamps, or articles used in counterfeiting

TITLE 18 PART I CH 113 Sec 2315 - Sale or receipt of stolen goods, securities, moneys, or fraudulent State tax stamps

TITLE 18 PART I CH 113 Sec 2318 - Trafficking in counterfeit labels for phonorecords, copies of computer programs or computer program documentation or packaging, and copies of motion pictures or other audio visual works, and trafficking in counterfeit computer program documentation or packaging

TITLE 18 PART I CH 113 Sec 2319 - Criminal infringement of a copyright

TITLE 18 PART I CH 113 Sec 2320 - Trafficking in counterfeit goods or services

TITLE 18 PART I CH 79 Sec 1621 - Perjury generally

TITLE 18 PART I CH 79 Sec 1622

TITLE 18 PART I CH 79 Sec 1623 - False declarations before grand jury or court

TITLE 18 PART I CH 63 Sec 1341 - Frauds and swindles

TITLE 18 PART I CH 63 Sec 1342 Fictitious name or address

TITLE 18 PART I CH 63 Sec 1343 - Fraud by wire, radio, or television

TITLE 18 PART I CH 63 Sec 1344 - Bank fraud

TITLE 18 PART I CH 63 Sec 1346 - Definition of ''scheme or artifice to defraud''

TITLE 18 PART I CH 63 Sec 1345 - Injunctions against fraud

TITLE 18 PART I CH 83 Sec 1701 - Obstruction of mails generally

TITLE 18 PART I CH 83 Sec 1702 - Obstruction of correspondence

TITLE 26 INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

TITLE 18 PART I CH 31 Sec 641 - Public money, property or records

Sec 654 - Officer or employee of United States converting property of another

TITLE 15 CH 22 SUBCH IV SUBCHAPTER IV - THE MADRID PROTOCOL

TITLE 18 PART I CH 73 Sec 1511 - Obstruction of State or local law enforcement

Respectfully Yours,



\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  
Eliot I. Bernstein  
Founder & Inventor  
  
Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – DL  
Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – DL  
Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – FL  
Iviewit Technologies, 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

cc/ec:

UNITED STATES OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, The Honorable President of the United States Barack Obama @ Facsimile +1 (202) 456-2461

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Glenn Fine or his Replacement [glenn.a.fine@usdoj.gov](mailto:glenn.a.fine@usdoj.gov) & [oig.hotline@usdoj.gov](mailto:oig.hotline@usdoj.gov)

HOUSE AND SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEES

The Honorable John Conyers Jr., Chairman ~ House Judiciary Committee [john.conyers@mail.house.gov](mailto:john.conyers@mail.house.gov)

The Honorable United States Senator Dianne Feinstein, Senate Judiciary Committee

NEW YORK SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE @ members’ individual email addresses,

[sampson@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:sampson@senate.state.ny.us) [onorato@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:onorato@senate.state.ny.us) [schneiderman@schneiderman.org](mailto:schneiderman@schneiderman.org) [schneiderman@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:schneiderman@senate.state.ny.us) [hassellt@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:hassellt@senate.state.ny.us) [diaz@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:diaz@senate.state.ny.us) [jdklein@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:jdklein@senate.state.ny.us) [eadams@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:eadams@senate.state.ny.us) [espada@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:espada@senate.state.ny.us) [breslin@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:breslin@senate.state.ny.us) [dilan@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:dilan@senate.state.ny.us) [savino@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:savino@senate.state.ny.us) [perkins@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:perkins@senate.state.ny.us) [maziarz@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:maziarz@senate.state.ny.us) [jdefranc@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:jdefranc@senate.state.ny.us) [volker@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:volker@senate.state.ny.us) [saland@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:saland@senate.state.ny.us) [lavalle@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:lavalle@senate.state.ny.us) [bonacic@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:bonacic@senate.state.ny.us) [winner@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:winner@senate.state.ny.us) [nozzolio@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:nozzolio@senate.state.ny.us) [lanza@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:lanza@senate.state.ny.us) [ranz@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:ranz@senate.state.ny.us) [spotts@senate.state.ny.us](mailto:spotts@senate.state.ny.us)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL, Eric Holder, Jr.,

[inspector.general@usdoj.gov](mailto:inspector.general@usdoj.gov) & [AskDOJ@usdoj.gov](mailto:AskDOJ@usdoj.gov)

SEC, Chairperson Mary Shapiro [CHAIRMANOFFICE@sec.gov](mailto:CHAIRMANOFFICE@sec.gov) and [enforcement@sec.gov](mailto:enforcement@sec.gov)

SEC INSPECTOR GENERAL, H. David Kotz [oig@sec.gov](mailto:oig@sec.gov)

Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, David Gouvaia [Complaints@tigta.treas.gov](mailto:Complaints@tigta.treas.gov) and [david.gouvaia@tigta.treas.gov](mailto:david.gouvaia@tigta.treas.gov)

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION INSPECTOR GENERAL, Peggy E. Gustafson & Daniel J. O’Rourke daniel.o’rourke@sba.gov & <http://web.sba.gov/oigcss/client/dsp_welcome.cfm> Complaint Form

US DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE INSPECTOR GENERAL, Todd J. Zinser [hotline@oig.doc.gov](mailto:hotline@oig.doc.gov)

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the US Patent Office, David Kappos [david.kappos@USPTO.gov](mailto:david.kappos@USPTO.gov)

Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Deputy Director of the USPTO, Sharon Barner [Sharon.Barner@USPTO.gov](mailto:Sharon.Barner@USPTO.gov)

US PATENT OFFICE - OFFICE OF ENROLLMENT AND DISCIPLINE DIRECTOR, Harry I. Moatz [Harry.Moatz@USPTO.GOV](mailto:Harry.Moatz@USPTO.GOV)

The Hon. Preet Bharara, United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York United States Department of Justice

Hon. William M. Welch II, Chief, Public Integrity Unit at the United States Department of Justice

The Hon. John L. Sampson, Chairman, New York State Senate Judiciary Committee

The Hon. Boyd M. Johnson III, Deputy United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York ~ Public Corruption Unit - United States Department of Justice

The Hon. Loretta A. Preska, Chief U.S. District Judge ~ United States Courthouse Southern District of New York

Andrew M. Cuomo, New York State Governor

The Hon. Luis A. Gonzalez, Presiding Justice, New York State Appellate Division, 1st Department

The Hon. Joseph M. Demarest, Jr., Assistant Director in Charge, New York Division

The Honorable Elena Kagan, Solicitor General, US Department of Justice

Robert S. Mueller, III., Director ~ Federal Bureau of Investigation

Candice M. Will, Assistant Director, Office of Professional Responsibility ~ Federal Bureau of Investigation

The Honorable Shira A. Scheindlin, United States District Court ~ Southern District of New York

Peter L. McClintock, Acting Inspector General ~ Small Business Administration

Chris P. Mercer, President ~ Institute of Professional Representatives before the European Patent Office (epi)

New York Office of the Attorney General, Joseph M. Demarest, Jr. ~ FBI Assistant Director in Charge of the New York Division, 26 Federal Plaza, 23rd Floor New York, NY 10278-0004

Lovett & Bellatoni

Select Press

Select Iviewit Shareholders and Patent Interest Holders

Enclosure(s)/Attachment(s)/URL’s

Uniform Resource Locator(s), all Uniform Resource Locators ( URL’s ) and the contents of those URL’s Websites are incorporated in entirety by reference herein, include these sites and documents as part of this correspondence and as evidentiary material to be included with this document. Due to allegations alleged by New York State Supreme Court Whistleblowers regarding Document Destruction and Tampering with Official Complaints and Records printing all referenced materials and attaching them to your copy is necessary to ensure proper review.

cmb/eib

1. Patrick Hanley is a Personal Assistant to Suzanne McCormick. McCormick filed a Federal Lawsuit against the NY Supreme Court Disciplinary Dept et al., that was “Legally Related” by Judge Shira Scheindlin, SDNY, to a Federal Lawsuit of a New York Supreme Court Disciplinary Department Attorney Whistleblower, Christine C. Anderson. The Iviewit and Eliot I Bernstein, Federal RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, is also “Legally Related” by Judge Scheindlin to Whistleblower Anderson’s Lawsuit. McCormick and Bernstein filed several prior disciplinary complaints that involve the same nexus of State Actors as identified by Whistleblower Anderson and now all of whom are Defendants in the lawsuits. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://www.zimbio.com/photos/Maria+Cuomo+Cole/Emily+Cole/Cannes+Film+Festival/J5qqur_otEh> “Maria Cuomo Cole and Emily Cole Photostream - Browse all photos of Maria Cuomo Cole and Emily Cole together in this socially oriented mega-slideshow”. URL fully incorporated by reference in entirety herein. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Cohen ironically responded to the fact that I was attempting to “Put him in Prison” by retorting that “Some would say I already am in Prison” at which point I responded that “I agree”. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Note that this language cited comes from a revised Code of Conduct on July 01, 2009. As the Iviewit matters involve allegations of CORRUPTION against Senior Ranking Court Officials dating back to 1997, including those involved directly in Disciplinary Departments and creating code, both State and Federal, it is suggested that only Disciplinary Rules from 1997 or prior be reviewed prior to the watering down of the code that has taken place over the years. Evidence has been submitted to the courts and investigators, of previous attempts by named Defendants in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit to change Disciplinary Codes to fit their crimes using falsified un-codified codes in forming dismissal letters. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <http://www.law.cornell.edu/ethics/ny/code/NY_CODE.HTM> ; Conflict of Interest Disciplinary Rule 5 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. As head of the Department of Law, the Attorney General is both the "People's Lawyer" and the State's chief legal officer. As the "People's Lawyer," the Attorney General serves as the guardian of the legal rights of the citizens of New York, its organizations and its natural resources. In his role as the State's chief legal counsel, the Attorney General not only advises the Executive Branch of Slate government, but also defends actions and proceedings on behalf of the State. <http://www.ag.ny.gov/our_office.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. As of the submission of this Motion, neither the written decision or the transcript of the proceedings have been made available via the PACER reporting system. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. [120] New York State Consolidated Laws hold that: Any person may arrest another person (a) for a felony when the latter has in fact committed such felony, and (b) for any offense when the latter has in fact committed such offense in his presence. (N.Y.C.L. 140.30). [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. [121] The Judges’ Trial (or the Justice Trial, or, officially, The United States of America vs. Josef Altstötter, et al.) was the third of the twelve trials for war crimes the U.S. authorities held in their occupation zone in Germany in Nuremberg after the end of World War II. These twelve trials were all held before U.S. military courts, not before the International Military Tribunal, but took place in the same rooms at the Palace of Justice. The twelve U.S. trials are collectively known as the “Subsequent Nuremberg Trials” or, more formally, as the “Trials of War Criminals before the Nuremberg Military Tribunals” (NMT)… [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. August 08, 2008 USDC Dismissal Order <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080808%20Scheindlin%20Dismissal%20of%20Complaint.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. “Deutsche Bank lied, U.S. says Lender ‘lied’ to get into federal home-loan insurance program: suit” By Alistair Barr, MarketWatch May 3, 2011

    <http://www.marketwatch.com/story/deutsche-bank-sued-by-us-government-2011-05-03> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Additional reports citing “regulatory failures:”

    U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission Office of Investigations

    “Investigation of Failure of the SEC to Uncover Bernard Madoff’s Ponzi Scheme” August 31, 2009 Report No. OIG-509 477 Pages

    <http://www.sec.gov/news/studies/2009/oig-509.pdf>

    \*\*\*\*\*\* Jacqueline Wood who transferred from the SEC to a PROSKAUER ROSE PARTNERSHIP, is mentioned, 102 times in fact, as the central “failure” of the regulatory process!!!

    JACQUELINE WOOD PERRELL; aka Jacqueline Wood, Jacqueline Murray Wood, Former OCIE Attorney Advisor, aka Witness Number 7, Witness 7, Witness No. 7, Witness #7 UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION In the Matter of File No. GIG-509 GIG-509 WITNESS: Number Bc

    “Lawmakers Sink Teeth Into the SEC - Agency Mocked for Not Catching Madoff” by Frank Ahrens

    Washington Post Staff Writer Thursday, February 5, 2009

    <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/02/04/AR2009020403399.html>

    REPORT OF INVESTIGATION - UNITED STATES SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

    OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL Case No. OIG-526

    “Investigation of the SEC’s Response to Concerns Regarding Robert Allen Stanford’s Alleged Ponzi Scheme” March 31, 2010

    <http://www.sec.gov/news/studies/2010/oig-526.pdf>

    “Report Finds Catastrophic Failure By SEC In Stanford Ponzi Case” by Justin Elliott | April 19, 2010, TPM Media LLC.

    <http://tpmmuckraker.talkingpointsmemo.com/2010/04/report_sec_failed_massively_in_stanford_alleged_po.php>

    “Why Isn't Wall Street in Jail? Financial crooks brought down the world's economy — but the feds are doing more to protect them than to prosecute them” Illustration by Victor Juhasz By Matt Taibbi

    February 16, 2011 Rolling Stone / Wenner Media

    <http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/why-isnt-wall-street-in-jail-20110216>

    <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=woXzgoja7Ao> Michael Moore on Rachel Maddow MSNBC Video Clip. “This is what's coming for you. [Holds up a pair of HANDCUFFS] You've taken our money, we want the money back. You've taken our jobs overseas, we want those jobs back. ... We're mad as hell and we're not going to take it anymore!” -- Michael Moore

    “Leaked report brands NYSE regulatory failure” by Simon English Telegraph Media Group Limited 04 Nov 2003 @

    <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/markets/2867903/Leaked-report-brands-NYSE-regulatory-failure.html>

    “S.E.C. Concedes Oversight Flaws Fueled Collapse” by STEPHEN LABATON New York Times Published: September 26, 2008

    <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/09/27/business/27sec.html>

    “Lax Oversight Caused Crisis, Bernanke Says” by CATHERINE RAMPELL New York Times

    Published: January 3, 2010

    <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/04/business/economy/04fed.html>

    “SEC Rebuked for Regulatory Failure With Lehman Brothers” by Marian Wang ProPublica, April 20, 2010 @

    <http://www.propublica.org/blog/item/sec-rebuked-for-regulatory-failure-with-lehman-brothers> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Removal of the Glass–Steagall Act of 1932 and other regulatory barrier/protections by Lawmakers (again, note mostly lawyers) and Law Firms, an intentional portal for committing the very crimes the legislations were intended to Prohibit opened, leading to the wild west lawlessness that has consumed Wall Street/Greed Street since, while destroying Main Street, wiping out the middle class and leaving the nation bankrupt. “The repeal of provisions of the Glass-Steagall Act of 1933 by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act effectively removed the separation that previously existed between Wall Street investment banks and depository banks. This repeal directly contributed to the severity of the Financial crisis of 2007–2010.[4][5][6][7][8]”… The repeal enabled commercial lenders such as Citigroup, which was in 1999 the largest U.S. bank by assets, to underwrite and trade instruments such as mortgage-backed securities and collateralized debt obligations and establish so-called structured investment vehicles, or SIVs, that bought those securities.[21] Elizabeth Warren,[22] author and one of the five outside experts who constitute the Congressional Oversight Panel of the Troubled Asset Relief Program, has said that the repeal of this act contributed to the Global financial crisis of 2008–2009.[23][24]…The year before the repeal, sub-prime loans were just five percent of all mortgage lending.[citation needed] By the time the credit crisis peaked in 2008, they were approaching 30 percent.[citation needed] This correlation is not necessarily an indication of causation however, as there are several other significant events that have impacted the sub-prime market during that time. These include the adoption of mark-to-market accounting, implementation of the Basel Accords and the rise of adjustable rate mortgages.[30]”

    <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Glass%E2%80%93Steagall_Act> [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. List of known Corporations involved in the Financial Crimes described herein: [↑](#footnote-ref-14)