**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,

**“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, Secretary to Governor Andrew Cuomo and Monica Connell of the New York State Office of the Attorney General et al.,”**

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**.

The Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form designed to ensure that the review and any determinations from such review of the enclosed materials should 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 known at this time must be fully disclosed and affirmed in writing and returned by to any review.

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 interest exists that cannot be eliminated through conflict resolution with the Iviewit Companies or Eliot Bernstein, instantly forward the matters 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 to the address listed at the end of this disclosure form. 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 objectively.

These matters already involve claims of, including but not limited to, Conflicts of Interest, Violations of Public Offices, Whitewashing of Official Complaints in the Supreme Courts of New York, Florida, Virginia and elsewhere, Threatening a Federal Witness in a Federal Whistleblower Lawsuit, Document Destruction and Alteration, Obstructions of Justice, RICO and ATTEMPTED MURDER. The need for prescreening for conflict is essential to the administration of due process in these matters and necessary to avoid charges of OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE and more, against you. Federal District Court Judge Shira A. Scheindlin SDNY legally related these same matters to a New York Supreme Court Attorney Whistleblower Lawsuit who alleges similar claims of public office corruption against Supreme Court of New York Officials, US Attorneys, NY District Attorneys and Assistant District Attorneys. This is a formal request for full disclosure of any conflict on your part, 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 Withdrawal from matters where conflict precludes involvement.

Failure to comply with all applicable conflict disclosure rules, public office rules and regulations and laws, prior to continued action on your part, **shall constitute cause** for the filing of criminal and civil complaints against you for any decisions or actions you make prior to a signed Conflict Of Interest Disclosure Form, with all applicable regulatory and prosecutorial 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.

1. Do you, your spouse, and your dependents, in the aggregate have, any direct or indirect relations (relationships), or interest in any entity or any direct or indirect relations (relationships) to any of the parties listed in [EXHIBIT 1](#Exhibit1) of this document and any of the named Defendants in these matters contained at the URL <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/Appendix%20A/index.htm#proskauer> , URL hereby incorporated by reference in entirety herein? Please review the online index in entirety.

**\_\_\_\_\_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. 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, defined in I, 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 as defined in I?

**\_\_\_\_\_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 designed to prevent conflicts of interest that deny fair and impartial due process and procedure thereby Obstructing Justice in State/Federal Proceedings. These Laws may contain provisions related to financial or asset disclosure, exploitation of one's official position and privileges, improper relationships, regulation of campaign practices, etc. The Relevant Sections of Attorney Conduct Codes, Judicial Cannons, Public Office Rules & Regulations and State & Federal Law listed herein 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 the URL,**

[**http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/oneofthesedays/index.htm#\_Toc107852933**](http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/oneofthesedays/index.htm#_Toc107852933) **, fully incorporated by reference in entirety herein.**

**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

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 in writing within 10 business days to preclude legal actions against you. A copy can be sent to iviewit@iviewit.tv and original to 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

[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.



***“Surf with Vision”***

**Eliot I. Bernstein**

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

Tuesday, May 10, 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, 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 on the phone call was Patrick Hanley. The following summarizes the salient points of the calls with James Rogers, Esq., acting on behalf of Harlan Levy who was referred by Steven Michael Cohen, Chief of Staff to Governor Andrew Cuomo. Notably, Rogers acknowledged and admitted that he was precluded from handling the matters related to Iviewit’s Criminal Complaints and RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, as the Attorney General was Conflicted in the matters, as further defined herein. Admissions by Rogers of existing Conflicts of Interest now require IMMEDIATE corrective actions in ongoing State, Federal and International Criminal and Civil Proceedings going forward. The multiple Conflicts of Interest identified, further caused Rogers to assert that the inherent Conflicts for himself, the Attorney General’s Office and other members of the Attorney General’s Office, now demanded that the Attorney General’s office was required forthwith, to seek Outside Non Conflicted Independent Counsel. Independent Counsel to replace the Attorney General in the review and investigation of the Iviewit Filed Criminal Complaints and act as counsel for them regarding the Iviewit Ongoing Federal RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit and any/all “legally related” lawsuits and proceedings, all further described herein.

1. **Summary of Telephone 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, Esq., Eliot Spitzer, Esq., Steven Michael Cohen, Esq., Monica Connell, Esq., et al.**

William Wagener and I made calls to Governor Cuomo’s Office on February 08, 2011 and spoke with Emily Cole, Assistant to Steven Michael Cohen, Secretary to Governor Cuomo, regarding CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS filed against Andrew Cuomo and Steven Michael Cohen. The CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS previously filed with both the Attorney General’s Office and the Governor’s Office on November 19, 2010 for RICO Crimes, Violations of Public Offices and more, the following URL contains a copy of the Criminal Complaint, hereby incorporated by reference in entirety herein,

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20101120%20FINAL%20Andrew%20Cuomo%20Criminal%20Complaint%20New%20York%20Attorney%20General%20Cuomo%20Public%20Integrity%20Cover%20Letter%20Color.pdf>.

On February 08, 2011, I informed Emily Cole 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 and asked to be transferred to a non-conflicted party. Despite the obvious Conflict created by her employment by Cohen, 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 and that she understood the conflicts with Cohen and Cuomo and would be careful to avoid further conflicts.

On April 13-14th 2011[[1]](#footnote-1), seven calls were placed to Governor Cuomo’s office and Attorney General Scheinderman’s office, in order to ascertain the status of the filed Criminal Complaints. Several previous calls went unreturned over two months attempting to reach Emily Cole since the February 08, 2011 call, where she promised to get back to us in a few days. On April 13, 2011, Patrick Hanley[[2]](#footnote-2) and I finally made contact with Emily Cole and requested the current status of the Criminal Complaints to determine if she had found and retained a 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 identically named to Steven Cohen’s assistant Emily Cole[[3]](#footnote-3). Upon confronting Emily Cole of the Conflict of Interest that a direct family relationship would create and requesting verification she was not the Emily Cole related to the Cuomo family, Ms. Cole denied she was the daughter of Kenneth Cole and Maria Cuomo Cole. Later in the call, further questioning Ms. Cole regarding her name, she became defensive and claimed that even if she were their daughter, 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 family 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 admitted she had turned the prior request on February 08, 2011 for complaint information, directly over to Steven Michael Cohen, the accused! At this point, I advised Ms. Cole that this represented further egregious illegal Conflicts of Interest, Violations of Attorney Conduct Codes, Violations of Public Office Rules & Regulations and Federal & State Law committed by Cohen and herself. As exhibited herein and in the attached URL exhibits, an incestuous and illegal web of Conflicts of Interest exists wherein lawyers acting in various Government Offices, including but not limited to, Court Officials, Prosecutors, Regulators, Oversight Authorities and Disciplinary Committees, create the glue that binds the Title 18: 1961- 1968 RICO Conspiracy together. The RICO Criminal Organization is defined in detail in my Amended Federal RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit and the attached RICO Statement filed therein. The RICO Organization described is composed mainly of Lawyers and Law Firms acting in conspiracy to commit crimes, including the theft of Iviewit’s Trillion Dollar Patents that changed the digital world, and another set of Lawyers and Law Firms acting inside the Government to cover-up their crimes and deny Due Process to their victims. Cover-ups made possible by a “Revolving Door” that swings between the RICO Criminal Organization Law Firms and Government Agencies, including the Courts. The RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit is hereby incorporated by reference in entirety herein and is located at the URL,

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

1. **THE CONFLICT SWAMP THICKENS**

Emily Cole then became distraught and defensive when notified that her actions were in Conflict and Violations of Law and would be included in any/all ongoing and future Criminal and Civil Lawsuits/Complaints filed, as further acts of Obstruction and more and reported to proper authorities. We then notified Ms. Cole that these actions constituted obvious Conflicts and Aiding and Abetting the Criminal Conspiracy through further Obstruction of Justice, causing further Denial of Due Process and Procedure. Ms. Cole then rudely and abruptly terminated the phone call without further direction.

We immediately called back the Governor’s office, now attempting to reach Benjamin Lawsky, Chief of Staff to Governor Cuomo, in efforts to find a NON-CONFLICTED party to handle the Criminal Complaints filed with the Governor or have the complaints directed to an INDEPENDENT NON CONFLICTED INVESTIGATOR. Moreover, our call was essential to report the newly discovered alleged crimes committed by Emily Cole and Steven M. Cohen, as Ms. Cole admitted to turning over the Complaints to Steven Cohen, her boss, and one of the central Defendants accused in the Criminal Complaints. Further, we sought to have in writing, verification that Emily Cole was not a family/relative of the Cuomo family. The call transferred by the receptionist to Lawsky’s office was intercepted instead directly by Steven Michael Cohen.

Cohen, by intercepting the call, now further acted in a continued plethora of Conflicts of Interest, again Violating Public Office Rules & Regulations, Attorney Conduct Codes and State & Federal Law, by personally handling Criminal Complaint matters against him. After noticing Cohen of his conflicts and the fact that I was attempting to “PUT HIM IN PRISON…”[[4]](#footnote-4) 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 the Governor’s legal obligations to the Attorney General despite notice that the Attorney General had a separate Criminal Complaint filed with their office and that the Governor was being requested to execute his executive authorities in the Criminal matters, 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. At this point it appeared that the Governor of New York Cuomo was unwilling to discharge his Executive Duties as Governor and also was unwilling to turn the matter over to a Non Conflicted party in the Governor’s office for review. Further, the Governor’s office was refusing to enlist a Non Conflicted party to take action on behalf of the Governor of New York, in a situation where Conflicts of Interest precluded his direct involvement.

Cohen, is well aware of the Criminal Complaints filed against both he and Cuomo and has been directly handling them for several years, as exhibited in all of the following numbered 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.”

Multiple Criminal Complaints were filed with Andrew Cuomo while serving as Attorney General, and to my knowledge, nothing was done but to further Obstruct the Complaints or dismiss them without investigation. The Attorney General’s office has Illegally Obstructed numerous previous Criminal Complaints of Iviewit and Eliot Bernstein, dating back to filed Complaints with Eliot Spitzer as Attorney General, then as Governor as early as 2004. With continued Conflicts, illegal acts continue to ensue despite the repeated demand from the outset that if Conflicts existed, the Complaints required being turned over to a Non-Conflicted Independent Party. All parties were requested to sign Conflict of Interest Disclosure Forms and not a single party has prior to making decisions. If there are no Conflicts of Interest, one should have no problem signing and returning the Conflict of Interest Disclosure and no proceedings are legally valid when Conflicts are concealed.

* + - 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.”

* + - 1. <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, including but not limited to, handling complaints they are named Defendants in, and other matters relating to Criminal Misconduct of P. Stephen Lamont.

The most recent Criminal Complaints against Cohen and Cuomo, both named as Defendants in the Criminal Complaints, yet continue to be directly involved in processing the Complaints, comprise the integrity of any actions taken to this point, actions which are in Violation of Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Office Rules & Regulations and State & Federal Law. Cohen has personally handled the Complaints while serving under Cuomo at the Attorney General’s office and now at the Governor’s office. Unequivocally, Cohen and Cuomo’s failure to turn over the Criminal Complaints to a Non-Conflicted Independent Party and remove themselves from the Conflicts, since June 13 2009, or provide any response at all, adds further Criminal Acts to these matters, which will soon be reported, as soon as, a Non Conflicted party is in place to report them to. A tendered response by either Cohen or Cuomo, or even at this point the Governor or Attorney General’s offices, as the Governor and now the AG and their employees evinces gross conflicts, as further evidenced herein and in exhibits, is worthless, other than as Prima Facie Evidence of further Criminal Misconduct. Cuomo and Cohen instead have elected to Conceal the Complaints and Derail the Investigations, further Aiding and Abetting the RICO Conspiracy by further Obstructing Justice in Federal and State Proceedings, through intentional failure to perform their “Honest Services” and Public Office Duties by intentionally and with scienter Violating Attorney Conduct Codes, Violating Public Office Rules & Regulations and State & Federal Law.

Additional Illegal Conflicts of Interest, Violations of Public Office Rules & Regulations and State & Federal Law, arise from the fact that the Attorney General’s Office, and Officials from that office, are also named directly as State Actors/Defendants in my Federal RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit. The fact that they are State/Actor Defendants in the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit makes it virtually impossible for them to review Criminal Complaints in matters directly related to the very same nexus of events, yet they continue directly acting in efforts to derail the investigations.

The Conflict Swamp further thickens, when taking into account Conflicts created by the Attorney General’s additional role as Legal Counsel for State Actors/Defendants in the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit. The Attorney General’s Office is not only representing their own offices and employees in conflict, but also, illegally representing **39 PLUS** State Actors/Defendants as counsel of record, in further Violations of Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Office Rules & Regulations and State & Federal Law, and yet, still directly handle Criminal Complaints naming them as central Criminal RICO Actors. Additional Conflicts of Interest are further created by the illegal twofold representation by the Attorney General of the State Actors/Defendants in both a Professional and Personal capacity. The Attorney General may represent State Actors/Defendants in Lawsuits in a PROFESSIONAL capacity only on the State of New York’s funds and the Individual representations are illegal and further Violations of Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Office Rules & Regulations and State & Federal Law, further defined herein. This entire bizarre and convoluted myriad of ILLEGAL Conflicts of Interest and Obstructions create further massive Frauds on the Courts and Frauds on a Multiplicity of Government Agencies, all combining to further illegally deny Due Process and Obstruct Justice.

1. **The new york supreme court attorney Whistleblower, christine c. Anderson’s federal Lawsuit and the “Legally Related” Federal Lawsuits blow open a massive corruption of senior ranking new york and us government officials.**

Federal Judge Shira Scheindlin “legally related” my **TRILLION DOLLAR**[[5]](#footnote-5) RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit to that of an inside New York Supreme Court Whistleblower, Christine C. Anderson, a veteran Senior Staff Attorney in the New York Supreme Court Disciplinary Department. Anderson has blown the Whistle on a mass of Public Office Corruption, under Sworn Oath in an open Federal Court and made similar claims before the New York Senate Judiciary Committee[[6]](#footnote-6) in an ONGOING investigation by that Committee. Anderson’s testimony rips open a mob styled conspiratorial ring operating inside state and federal government agencies, at the highest levels, exposing illegal Patterns and Practices of **LEADING PUBLIC OFFICIALS, ALL WITH LEGAL DEGREES,** operating in concert to Violate Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Office Rules & Regulations, Judicial Cannons and State, Federal & International Law, in order to facilitate cover-ups of various crimes. Various crimes committed by other ATTORNEYS AT LAW, who have been complained of to Prosecutors and Disciplinary Agencies for a variety of criminal acts. What appears to be a “playbook” of “cookie cutter” **illegal legal crimes** used by these Law Firms and Lawyers to steal inventions, steal estates and more, and then another “playbook” of cover-up crimes, as exhibited in the “Legally Related” Lawsuits to Anderson, further enumerated herein.

Anderson further puts forth a sworn statement to the New York State Judiciary Committee Chairman, John Sampson containing allegations of FELONY Criminal Acts[[7]](#footnote-7) by STATE & FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, including but not limited to, Alteration & Destruction of Official Court & Prosecutorial Records, Destruction of Evidence in Federal & State Criminal & Civil Official Proceedings, Extorting and Threatening a Federal Witness[[8]](#footnote-8) in a Federal Whistleblower Lawsuit, Whitewashing Attorney Disciplinary Complaints, Obstructions of Justice and more. The Anderson sworn statement to the Judiciary Committee and others, includes but is not limited to, the following statement, quote,

On June 8, 2009, I testified at a hearing convened by John L. Sampson, New York State Senator and Chairman of the New York State Standing Committee On The Judiciary. (A copy of my affidavit submitted to the Committee is attached hereto as Exhibit B.) At that hearing, several witnesses testified as to their shocking experiences with the grievance and judiciary committees in New York State. Shockingly, within days of my testimony, in my lawsuit, my sealed medical and psychiatric records were filed and posted publicly on the court’s Internet filing system by counsel for the defendants – i.e., the New York State Attorney General’s Office. I regard those actions as horrifically unethical and malicious, and taken in deliberate retaliation for my testifying at the Senate hearing.

The detailed testimony presented by innumerable witnesses at the June 8th Senate hearing reveals the manifold reports of corruption and abuse by the State’s Disciplinary Committees. (A copy of the transcript of this hearing is attached hereto as Exhibit C.) Charges included concealment of evidence, obstruction of justice, extortionate sexual threats by attorneys, pilfering of estates by attorneys, abuse of power, fraud, conspiracy and repeated violations of state and federal constitutional rights.

The Violations of Law were exposed directly by Anderson to the New York Senate Judiciary Committee in the hearings, and Patrick Hanley, Suzanne McCormick and others[[9]](#footnote-9) also testified at the hearings. Further, evidences have been circulated and copied to each and every individual member of that committee regarding these matters, as investigations by that Committee continue. Again, Anderson made similar claims under oath in open court before Federal Judge Shira Scheindlin and therefore there can be no way that Prosecutors can fail to investigate these allegations from a credible Whistleblower eyewitness willing to testify under oath.

The Criminals Anderson fingered infect the entire legal/prosecutorial communities including at the highest posts of Public Office, including but not limited to, State & Federal Court Officials, State & Federal Prosecutorial Officials, State Regulatory Officials and certain corrupt “Favored Law Firms and Lawyers.” Anderson further stated in open Court during trial that a “CLEANER” exists inside the Ethics Department of the New York Supreme Court, the highest post for Attorney Regulation, named Naomi F. Goldstein, Esq. Deputy Chief Counsel of the New York Supreme Court. Yes, you heard correctly, a “Cleaner” within the New York Supreme Court’s ethics department! Ironically, John Gotti was tried upstairs in a separate action in the same courthouse at the same time that Anderson was testifying in her proceeding and Gotti’s mob trial did not even report having a “Cleaner.”

Goldstein, the “Cleaner,” Anderson exposes, with the aid of other senior ranking New York Supreme Court Officials, District Attorneys, US Attorneys and “Favored Law Firms and Lawyers” WHITEWASHED Attorney Disciplinary Complaints, Altered & Destroyed Official Court & Prosecutorial Records and Evidence and more, on behalf of other “US ATTORNEYS, DA’s, ADA’s and FAVORED LAW FIRMS & LAWYERS”. OUTRAGEOUS! The gang of criminals creating an impenetrable wall of corruption, protected by the very people elected to stop corruption, and, opening a Pandora’s Box to further unregulated crime. Once the portal was opened it has led from one crime to another, bigger and bigger, including possibly the Mortgage/Subprime Frauds and Financial Frauds rampant on Wall Street recently, all committed by Lawyers fearing no retribution from the Law with their Lawyer/Accomplices inside Government, there to derail any investigations, as further evidenced herein. Note that the same New York Supreme Court Department that Anderson worked for with Nicole Corrado is the department responsible for regulating Wall Street attorneys, as further discussed herein.

Anderson further complains in a Motion[[10]](#footnote-10) 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, in her case and the “legally related” cases. Anderson filed to remove the AG from her Whistleblower Lawsuit for ILLEGAL Conflicts of Interest and other Violations of Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Office Rules & Regulations and State & Federal Law, illustrating a further Pattern and Practice of Public Corruption designed to evade prosecution. Anderson’s allegations are almost identical to those claimed in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit about Public Officers violating Law. For years prior to having any knowledge of the inside mechanics of how the crimes operated from Anderson, I complained about these crimes at the SAME department Anderson and Corrado worked for but was unable to tie them all together in a neat conspiratorial picture. Once exposed to the mechanics of the crimes from the perspective of an inside Whistleblower, it became apparent that a Criminal Conspiracy beyond imagination existed, blocking due process and procedure to victims of the Criminal Enterprise crimes.

The CRIMINAL ACTS described by Anderson are NOT part of a “Conspiracy Theory,” but instead comprise a **FACTUAL LEGAL CONSPIRACY,** steeped in Factual Damning Evidence, whereby two or more individuals conspired against the rights of victims to due process and procedure, after committing Organized Criminal Acts against them. The difference between “Conspiracy Theory” and Factual Legal Conspiracy is that “Conspiracy Theories” are merely theories and Legal Factual Criminal Conspiracies come with very real PRISON SENTENCES at the end of trial if one is found guilty. A tad of the crimes alleged by Anderson, alleged in the Iviewit Criminal Complaints 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 and at the URL, <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/oneofthesedays/index.htm#_Toc107852933> fully incorporated in entirety by reference herein.

 The crimes include but far from limited to, a Car Bombing Attempted Murder of my Family in Boynton Beach Florida, for graphic detail and further information on the Car Bombing see the homepage at [www.iviewit.tv](http://www.iviewit.tv), which also has links for several thousands of pieces of supplemental evidence in these matters. **ALL EVIDENTIARY MATERIALS and LINKS ON THE IVIEWIT HOMEPAGE** are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety herein.

After Anderson’s trial, upon learning the shocking STATE & FEDERAL FELONY CRIMINAL VIOLATIONS OF PUBLIC OFFICES, ATTORNEY CONDUCT CODES and STATE & FEDERAL LAW, committed by Government Attorneys and Law Firms, notice was sent to Federal Judge Shira Scheindlin, on October 27th 2009, by eyewitnesses of Anderson’s CRIMINAL allegations in court, 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 on the letter to Scheindlin. Notice of these CRIMINAL allegations levied by Anderson against Senior Public Officials, via copy of the Scheindlin letter and other relevant documents, include all of the following State, Federal & International Authorities 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, demand that the noticed parties make formal docketed complaints of the matters and/or do their legal duty to report these alleged crimes, from a CREDIBLE NEW YORK SUPREME COURT ATTORNEY, or face Misprision of a Felony Charges and more.

<http://iviewit.tv/wordpress/?p=205>
“IVIEWIT LETTER TO US FED JUDGE SHIRA A. SCHEINDLIN RE CRIMINAL “WHISTLEBLOWER” ALLEGATIONS in Christine C. Anderson v. New York State et al. Docket 07cv09599 alleging Disciplinary Complaint Fixing by the “CLEANER” for US Attorneys, New York District Attorneys and ADA’s; Code of Conduct for US Judges Canon 3B(5), Protecting the People.”
Anderson’s Letter Titled, “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,” fully incorporated in entirety by reference herein.

The New York Attorney General’s Office and Andrew Cuomo while he was Attorney General are fully and intimately cognizant of Anderson’s FELONY CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS in OPEN FEDERAL COURT before Judge Scheindlin. FELONY CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS against **ATTORNEYS** working for Government Agencies, including but not limited to, the US ATTORNEY, the DA, the ADA, the New York Supreme Court, as the New York Attorney General was ACTING COUNSEL to Anderson’s State Actors/Defendants and therefore the Attorney General’s Office was factually present in Court at the time Anderson levied the Criminal Allegations.

Once cognizant of the alleged crimes, the Attorney General’s Office, while acting as Counsel of Record for the Anderson State Actors/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 by Anderson. Therefore, they are **legally obligated** in their OFFICIAL CAPACITIES by Attorney Conduct Codes, Judicial Cannons, Public Office Rules & Regulation and State & Federal Law, to report and/or investigate any reliable CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS, as mandated by the New York Lawyer's Code of Professional Responsibility, Judicial Cannons, Public Office Rules & Regulations and State & Federal 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[[11]](#footnote-11) 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.

1. **ALLEGED MISUSE OF PUBLIC FUNDS TO PURCHASE ILLEGAL LEGAL COUNSEL FOR PERSONAL REPRESENTATIONS OF ACCUSED PUBLIC OFFICIALS IN VIOLATION OF ATTORNEY CONDUCT CODES, PUBLIC OFFICE RULES & REGULATIONS AND STATE LAW.**

There might also be further criminal acts and financial abuses of PUBLIC FUNDS, by Public Officials exposed by Anderson! Abuse necessitating immediate investigation of Officials represented ILLEGALLY by the New York Attorney General in the Anderson Lawsuit and the “Legally Related” Lawsuits. Lawyers/State Actors/Defendants represented in these Lawsuits in their Professional Capacities by the New York Attorney General, and then, additionally and illegally represented by the Attorney General in their Individual Capacities, is in Violation of Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Office Rules & Regulations and State & Federal Law. Legal Fees for their defenses in their Professional Capacities paid for by the State of New York may be permissible but Legal Fees for Individual Legal Defenses, which presumably are paid for by the Attorney General’s office are Violations of Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Office Rules & Regulations and New York State Law, as further evidenced herein. Presumably, these Individual Legal Fees either are gifts by the Attorney General’s office to the Public Officials or distributed as income to them personally for tax reporting purposes. If not, the illegal legal fees for their Individual Defenses are paid for by the New York Taxpayers and may be a misuse of Public Funds according to Whistleblower Anderson, an expert in these matters.

These “free” legal fees give the accused State Actors/Defendants unlimited funds to defend themselves for the crimes they are accused of by their victims and such illegal representations also prejudice the lawsuits and any juries, as it appears the Attorney General is the attorney opposing the Plaintiffs in the Lawsuits. Doubtfully, these Individual Legal Fees, which in lawsuits such as my RICO & ANTITRUST and Anderson’s Whistleblower Lawsuit may range in the tens of millions of dollars for Individual counsel, are being reflected as personal income on the State Actors/Defendants personal income tax returns (both state and federal), therefore these returns should be audited immediately by the appropriate authorities. Further, the New York Attorney General would have to file such Individual Legal Fees properly in annual state and federal tax returns and fully disclose them to state auditors, separating out the legal billings for professional representation (which on information and belief the state can pay) and for individual representation (which the state cannot pay). These State of New York returns also deserve immediate audit by the proper authorities. If both the Attorney General and the State Actors/Defendants have not properly filed the Legal Fees, clearly this represents, on information and belief, Tax Evasion, Misuse of Public Funds and more.

1. **ACTIONS TO REMOVE ADMITTED AND ACKNOWLEDGED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST FROM ALL PROCEEDINGS AND CEASE AND DESIST ALL ILLEGAL REPRESENTATION OF STATE ACTORS/DEFENDANTS BY THE NEW YORK ATTORNEY GENERAL**

As Anderson’s Motion to Disqualify the Attorney General’s Office shows, there are Conflicts of Interest inherent in the ILLEGAL representation of the Public Officers both personally and professionally by the New York Attorney General’s office, that precludes such representations. Therefore, since the conflicted representations are in Violations of Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Office Rules & Regulations and State & Federal Law, all instances of these illegal representations must instantly Cease and Desist, and proper remedial actions taken. First, all State Actors/Defendants illegally represented currently by the Attorney General, now must be replaced with Non-Conflicted Independent Counsel, separate counsel for both their Professional and Individual Legal Defenses where they are sued in both capacities. In particular, Anderson claims, quote,

**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.[[12]](#footnote-12)) The Attorney General as a state attorney is bound by these rules as well.[[13]](#footnote-13)

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 State & 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, Attorney Conduct Codes and State & Federal Law.

Upon the forced resignation of Spitzer as Governor, for admitted Violations of the Federal Mann Act in Transporting Prostitutes across State Lines and other crimes, Spitzer’s Personal legal fees were paid from the Public Treasury to Proskauer Rose[[14]](#footnote-14), the central conspirator of my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, named in EVERY Criminal and Civil Complaint. So good were these lawyers, that Spitzer was never tried, almost as if he were “Above the Law” or more aptly, the crime were bought away on the Taxpayer dime and as Anderson claims “Whitewashed” by his friends in high places. Again, it is almost too bizarre that Proskauer represented Spitzer officially during the time the Iviewit Complaints were active and the Conflicts of Interest caused by this relationship between Proskauer and the Attorney General were NOT acknowledged prior or during the Attorney General’s representing the 39 plus State Actor/Defendants in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit[[15]](#footnote-15)[[16]](#footnote-16),[[17]](#footnote-17).

In the Bloomberg article in the last footnote, it should be noted that Dietrich Snell, of Spitzer’s Attorney General team, left the Attorney General’s office when Spitzer became Governor and went on to Proskauer Rose for INSTANT PARTNERSHIP. Proskauer/Schnell then went on to represent Governor Spitzer in his TROOPERGATE scandal involving Joe Bruno. This series of events shows the Revolving Door” the Law Firm Proskauer has created in the Attorney General’s Office and the Governor of New York’s Office, giving Proskauer inside information to complaints filed with these offices against them and legal control over those offices. Proskauer, the main and initial Criminal Conspirator in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, also ILLEGALLY represents their firm and themselves in the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, as if, like the Attorney General and Governor, Proskauer cannot obtain non-conflicted counsel to represent them. Now, one can see the reason for the never-ending insipid Conflicts of Interest, Violations of Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Office Rules & Regulations and State & Federal Law, necessary to derail the matters, the Conflicts the “Glue that Binds” the crimes in secrecy and prevents prosecution, precluding Fair & Impartial Due Process and Procedure under law to the victims. Of interest to note, is that Proskauer, almost, as if, realizing that the mass of Conflicts exposed by Anderson were insurmountable, in responding to the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit Amended Complaint, had their counsel, Gregg M. Mashberg and Joanna Smith of Proskauer, then begin representing themselves **PRO SE**, while still also acting as Counsel for their firm, defying Conflict laws again?

May 13, 2008 Proskauer Letter to Scheindlin regarding the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit Amended Complaint affirming Proskauer is responding to the DOCKETED Amended Complaint not the Original Complaint.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080513%20Proskauer%20Request%20for%20Amended%20Complaint.pdf>

June 28, 2008 Proskauer Reply Memorandum. Note that Proskauer here **RESPONDS IN WHOLE TO THE AMENDED COMPLAINT (AC)** and Proskauer represents Proskauer and further Proskauer Attorneys Representing Proskauer, Mashberg and Smith, are SUDDENLY for the first time, and without Court Approval, Representing Themselves PRO SE, which violates additional Conflict of Interest Rules and more. As this and all Proskauer filings tendered to the Court were filed in Conflict, which Violates Attorney Conduct Codes and more, the substance is worthless, other than as Prima Facie evidence of continued Fraud on the Court and Government Agencies.

<http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080728%20Proskauer%20Pro%20Se%20Reply%20Memorandum%20of%20Law.pdf>

**MAJOR NOTE!**  Recently, April 15, 2011, in attempts to harass an Investigative Blogger who is exposing the Proskauer Rose Crime Family Syndicate and more, Crystal C. Cox, in a LEGAL COMPLAINT AGAINST COX, with the WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION ARBITRATION & MEDIATION CENTER, Proskauer again **COMMITS FURTHER FRAUD ON A GOVERNMENT AGENCY.** Fraud in efforts to HARASS Cox using vexatious, malicious and bad faith LEGAL actions, as they claim FALSELY, QUOTE,

Mr. Bernstein's lawsuit was dismissed on August 8, 2008 (see Annex 6). **The court did not grant Mr. Bernstein leave to amend.** Mr. Bernstein appealed to the Second Circuit.

<http://www.docstoc.com/docs/76781231/Matthew-Triggs-Proskauer-Rose-LLP>

As was illustrated in the Reply Memorandum above, Proskauer not only knew the US District Court GRANTED the Amended Complaint but they FACTUALLY RESPONDED to the AMENDED COMPLAINT IN WHOLE. This illustrates further, how PROSKAUER ROSE commits FRAUD ON GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, using these tactics and Government Agencies to HARASS and INTIMIDATE those trying to expose the Criminal RICO Organization and efforts to scrub the evidences and information against them from the WEB.

On information and belief, the cost for Spitzer’s PERSONAL defense to Proskauer Rose was reputedly approximately US $400,000.00 dollars and over ONE MILLION, 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 14, 2011, a call was made to Harlan Levy, which was 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.

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 Lawsuits and Proceedings of IVIEWIT, Eliot I. Bernstein, 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 AG Officials are being sued in both their Professional and Individual capacities and thereby conflicted from handling ANY related matters, now forces the AG to IMMEDIATELY remove all prior court filings and have new NON- CONFLICTED PROSECUTORS or FEDERAL MONITORS review ALL prior decisions and determinations made by the AG in the Criminal Complaints prejudiced by the Conflicts, Violations of Public Office Rules & Regulations and Law. All previous representations by the AG’s office 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 or Federal Monitors, all brought in to the replace the AG’s multiple conflicted and illegal roles.**

Next, the Acknowledged and Admitted Conflicts of Interest by the Attorney General’s office, now cause ALL current ILLEGALrepresentations of New York State Actors/Defendants by the New York Attorney General’s Office in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, to cease and desist. This next forces the State Actors/Defendants to seek new and INDEPENDENT NON CONFLICTED COUNSELORS to represent them. The Attorney General must WITHDRAW IMMEDIATELY AS COUNSEL to all State Actors/Defendants 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 to represent the New York Attorney General’s Office and 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 at this time to new investigators and counsel in these matters due to many of the Ongoing Conflicts of Interest, Violations of Public Office Rules & Regulations and Law still PLAGUING and have ILLEGALLY INFLUENCING these lawsuits and Criminal Complaints in the courts and within prosecutorial offices.

The Anderson 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, a State Actor/Defendant in both the Anderson Lawsuit and my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, perjured court testimony and other violations of Law, further Obstructing Justice in Anderson’s Federal Whistleblower Lawsuit. In particular, Anderson claims,

**Newly Discovered Evidence At Trial Required Immediate Disqualification**

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, 2009. After the jury left the courtroom, the court 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…” (Exhibit A, pages 808-809) 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, and should have resulted in the Attorney General’s office immediately withdrawing from the case.

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.

Remand to the District Court for a new trial is highly likely as the trial court abused its discretion in denying a new trial. The Attorney General’s failure to withdraw is, in fact, sanctionable and worthy of referral to the attorney ethics committee.

Clearly the newly discovered fact that defendant Cahill, as the head of the DDC and supervisor of the other named defendants, had full knowledge of whitewashing activities would in all likelihood have changed the outcome of the case. This central fact establishing the liability of all named defendants could not have been discovered earlier and is not merely cumulative or impeaching. (See Farragher v. Boca Raton , 524 U.S. 775, 18 S. Ct. 2275 (1998) which imputes liability to supervisors in any event. In Farragher, the Supreme Court held that an employer is vicariously liable for actionable discrimination caused by a supervisor. All defendants are jointly and severally liable here. In fact, the State of New York is liable under Faragher, all while representation of the Attorney General’s office improperly continued.

Another reason for demanding immediate investigations by State & Federal Authorities is further uncovered in Anderson’s Motion and involves **EXTORTIONARY THREATS** on a Federal Witnesses in Anderson’s Whistleblowing Lawsuit by Senior New York Supreme Court Officials. In particular, Anderson states, quote,

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

The Attorney General and the trial court were aware that in August of 2008, one of the plaintiff’s witnesses, DDC staff attorney Nicole Corrado, was threatened. Two days prior to her deposition testimony, state employee, and DDC Deputy Chief Counsel, Andral N. Bratton, and who had been her immediate supervisor for approximately 5 years, confronted Corrado. Bratton advised Corrado that in 2007 he had admitted himself into a psychiatric hospital for serious emotional problems, that he had “suicidal tendencies,” and that he was “warning” her accordingly. When Corrado asked Bratton why he was warning her, Bratton simply repeated several times in a very serious and stern tone by saying, “I’m just warning you.”

Following Corrado’s deposition testimony on August 21, 2008, Bratton’s behavior toward Corrado became more harassing, troubling, frightening and threatening as he began to follow her inside and outside of the state office where they both worked. Corrado subsequently reported these serious issues to DDC chief counsel Allan Friedberg, Deputy chief Counsel Sherry Cohen, a defendant in the current proceeding, and DDC Chief Investigator Vincent Raniere- all of whom who took no required action.

Plaintiff’s former counsel, John Beranbaum, advised the court, and by copy, the Attorney General, of this incident in a letter to the court dated October 24, 2008. In the Beranbaum submission, it was made clear to the court and the Attorney General 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, “B” – Transcript of October 30, 2008 hearing, Page 26 (lines 17-25), and page 27 (lines 1-8). The court, in responding to the letter advising of the threat on plaintiff’s 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 plaintiff’s belief that the court had an obligation to report the matter to federal agents and, further, to interview Ms. Corrado concerning the incident. In addition, the Attorney General also had an obligation as the state’s top enforcer of the law.

Plaintiff believes she has been severely prejudiced by the threat upon her witness, Ms. Corrado, and, as the lower court and Attorney General were aware, Ms. Corrado did not appear as 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, she is 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, Moving respectfully requests that this Court in the interest of justice issue an order restraining the Office of the New York State Attorney General’s office from representing employees of the State of New York in any legal proceeding involving the herein before any federal or state court, agency or any other tribunal 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. This denial of basic rights was compounded by unclear, confusing and convoluted instructions to the jury, discovery of new evidence and serious allegations of intimidation of witnesses, which all support the de novo pending appeal and granting of the instant motion for disqualification.

Wherefore, Moving respectfully requests that the court grant the within Motion, as well as such other and further relief that may be just and proper. I declare under penalty perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on September 14, 2010

Note that Count 1 of Anderson’s Lawsuit, her claim to Violation of Free Speech (her Whistleblower Testimony) the Jury Verdict awarded in her favor, 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, quote,

**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 CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS of Anderson, the Conflicts of Interest, the Illegal Representations, Violations of Public Office Rules & Regulations, Violations of Attorney Conduct Codes, Violations of Judicial Cannons and State & Federal Law, 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, quote,

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][[18]](#footnote-18) 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][[19]](#footnote-19)” 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[[20]](#footnote-20), Scheindlin referred all the “legally related” cases, prior to resolution of the Anderson case, for investigations to the Attorney General’s Office, US Attorney and to the US Supreme Court. Scheindlin’s referrals to the Plaintiffs indicate that the Lawsuits and Criminal Complaints are far from over in either the courts or prosecutorial offices. With Scheindlin’s knowledge of further Criminal Acts committed directly in her Courtroom, evidencing perjury and other crimes committed by a State Actor/Defendant, almost certainly, all the “Legally Related” Lawsuits will now be remanded for full, fair and impartial rehearings, due to the factual **FRAUD ON THE COURTS AND STATE & FEDERAL AGENCIES.** Fraud on the Courts is yet another crime, one that invalidates the whole defenses tendered prior in violation of law and in essence Reboots the lawsuits with a prejudice in favor of the Plaintiffs. Scheindlin states, quote,

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.

In an earlier ORDER dated March 10, 2008, Scheindlin stated upon initial review of the Conflicts of Interest identified by Plaintiffs in the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, quote,

ORDER: I have considered plaintiffs' request and have determined that the Attorney General does not face an improper conflict of interest in representing the State Defendants. If, however, the Attorney General concludes that **an investigation of defendants is warranted, then independent counsel would be required.[[21]](#footnote-21)**

With Anderson’s Criminal Allegations the Attorney General was legally obligated to INVESTIGATE Anderson’s credible eyewitness accounts of Criminal Acts committed by numerous Defendants in both Anderson’s Lawsuit and my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit. Here again, we see that Independent Counsel is now required and the Lawsuit must be reheard free of the Conflicts of Interest that existed in all prior filings in that Lawsuit by the Attorney General. It is fascinating to note that despite Iviewit’s attempts to validate conflicts with the Attorney General, which Judge Scheindlin decided that at the time there was no conflict she could she, she failed to have the Attorney General confirm or deny ANY Conflicts and instead responded for them.

Therefore, the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit Appeal is on hold by Plaintiffs, pending investigations of the Criminal Complaints filed by Iviewit against;

1. Appeal Court Officials who continued adjudicating on the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit Appeal while allowing the Conflicts to persist (as the Attorney General continued to represent in the Appeal, amazingly even after Anderson’s Criminal Allegations against the AG and others in the Lower Court), and further for their failure to allow investigations to proceed prior to their efforts to illegally derail the Appeal through Dismissal further Obstructing Justice, and,
2. Prosecutorial Offices named by Whistleblower Anderson and their as yet unnamed Officials, including but not limited to,
	1. The New York Attorney General
	2. The New York District Attorney
	3. The New York Assistant District Attorney,
	4. The United States Attorney offices,
	5. New York Supreme Court Officials, including but not limited to Naomi Goldstein, and yet,
	6. unknown “Favored Law Firms & Lawyers.”

As the New York Courts, Regulatory Offices and Prosecutorial Offices are all center stage in the Whistleblower and RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, finding Non-Conflicted Officials in New York to represent these matters going forward 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>

hereby incorporated by reference in entirety herein, and, all those already defined herein.

1. **Ponzi Schemes Involving Current Defendants in the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit that Prior NY Attorney Generals Obstructed that now need IMMEDIATE new investigations, to preclude further fraud on victims and the courts caused by obstruction of relevant Information in the following criminal and civil lawsuits of;**
	1. **Bernard L. Madoff,**
	2. **Allen Stanford,**
	3. **Marc S. Dreier,**
	4. **Galleon,**
	5. **Enron Broadband,**
	6. **Enron Corporation, and,**
	7. **Arthur Andersen**

Information regarding these FRAUDS & SWINDLES, as they directly relate to the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, can be found at the URL’s listed below, fully incorporated by reference in entirety herein, and containing the Iviewit/Eliot Bernstein SEC Complaint. The allegations therein demand concurrent investigations by Federal and New York Criminal Authorities due to the number of issues relating the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit to the above-mentioned Criminal Investigations and Civil Actions. Where these Ponzis may in fact be Law Firm Money Laundering Schemes further using the Courts to effectuate these complex ILLEGAL LEGAL SCHEMES to WASH THE FUNDS OF THE CRIMINAL RICO ORGANIZATION. The SEC Complaint is at the URL’s

<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 exposes a gang, a Criminal RICO Organization that has committed more than the necessary Predicate Acts by far and comprised 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 has members who infiltrate public office to violate laws, laws they are sworn to uphold, in order 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. The picture that emerges is thus a Coup D’état on parts of New York and the US Government by these Law Firms and Lawyers, necessary to operate their Criminal RICO Enterprise and operate free of prosecution. The infiltration into Government, a central component of almost all Criminal RICO Lawsuits, is necessary to cover-up the crimes and hold off investigations while creating a fraudulent façade of Justice and Due Process or using brute force and threats when necessary, all as evidenced herein.

The Scheme to deny Due Process through Obstruction of Justice is simple to see with hindsight, after learning of Anderson’s inside Whistleblower claims, which clearly paints a gang of corrupted “Favored Law Firms & Lawyers,” committing sophisticated **illegal legal crimes** through intentional and maniacal misuse of their intimate knowledge of the law. The Criminal Enterprise operating through these Law Firms and Lawyers creates a “Revolving Door” of lawyers conspiring to Aid and Abet cover-ups inside the Government. The Criminals, disguised as Attorneys at Law/Public Servants, acting on behalf of the Criminal RICO Organization, are planted deep inside ALL the critical government agencies necessary to derail any complaints. If necessary, to preclude prosecution, these Attorneys at Law/Public Servants revert to more nefarious acts such as, Threatening Federal Witnesses, Destroying Whistleblowers, Altering Official Records, Destroying Official Records, Committing Fraud Upon the Courts, Whitewashing Attorney Disciplinary Complaints and Prosecutorial Complaints, all with the aid of a “Cleaner,” and well, you get the picture. If you were one of the victims of these insidious crimes, Anderson’s riveting revelations was a “Told You So” moment, as the Conspiracy operated secretly and effectively, making the victims of this LEGAL ABUSE feel paranoid and insane for many years prior, leaving them victims of what has been defined as **LEGAL ABUSE SYNDROME.** This abuse destroys the victims’ lives and faith in our system of Jurisprudence, leaving them with shattered homes, marriages, financially depraved and feeling there is nowhere and no one to turn to for help. In cases, like my own, when they are threatened with Prosecution and normal intimidation fails, they are capable of ATTEMPTED MURDER through MOB STYLED CAR BOMBINGS and you can imagine just how difficult it has become for my wife and I to start the car in the morning to take our children to school. Again, do to incredibly effective planting inside the government, the FBI agent investigating the Iviewit matters has disappeared according to the FBI, with the Iviewit Patent and Bombing Files, derailing investigation and thus prosecution of those involved for several years now.

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**[[22]](#footnote-22), WITHOUT a SINGLE ARREST of the ATTORNEYS AT LAW involved in the creation of each and every document which facilitated the Fraudulent Financial Crimes. 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. Again, 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. Behind every unprosecuted financial fraud, including but not limited to, the mortgage/housing frauds, the banking frauds, the stock frauds, the derivative frauds, the tax shelter frauds, the Ponzi Schemes/Criminal Law Firm Money Laundering Schemes and the TARP frauds, etc., lay prevaricatory lawyers. The Law Firms and Lawyers that compose the RICO Organization have not only failed to fulfill their legal obligations to the PEOPLE but have actively participated and profited from these crimes. They have 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 assisted in bipartisan fashion by Tom Coburn, Ranking Minority Member, titled **WALL STREET AND THE FINANCIAL CRISIS: Anatomy of a Financial Collapse.** The Report can be found at the following URL, hereby fully incorporated by reference herein at,

<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 to take place and why not, Crime Pays when no one is protecting the People[[23]](#footnote-23). One must ask where the New York Attorney General and the Governor of New York are, the “sheriffs” of Wall Street, whom instead look more like criminal accomplice disguised as sheriffs, again more lawyers. Further, reports[[24]](#footnote-24) show overwhelmingly that regulators “failed” to regulate appearing asleep at the wheel but look deeper and you will find the Regulators, again, mostly attorneys, were both complicit and essential to the actual commissioning of the financial frauds, which directly benefit the RICO Criminal Enterprise Law Firms. The regulators feign regulatory “failures” when the schemes are exposed. Yet, the Lawmakers and Law Firms began removing regulations over the years that, on information and belief, were removed with the intent of opening the door for these financial crimes to be committed.

Where they now they try and hide their criminal acts by referring them to in public as the result of “lax regulators” and “deregulation[[25]](#footnote-25)” in efforts to evade prosecution. Therefore, not one Regulator/Lawyer has been prosecuted for any of their massive “failures” aka Criminal Failures, as the Prosecutors appear holding the door open for their accomplices 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 or their Corrupt Clientele, leaving their government posts and landing for the most part **INSTANT 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 intentional “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 of public disservice. One must question why in many instances, the lawyers are leaving multimillion-dollar law firm Partnerships in the first place, 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 Criminal Clientele.

 Anderson has exposed the “Revolving Door” of corruption between the RICO Criminal Enterprise, composed mainly of Law Firms and Lawyers and Government Officials, and yet Prosecutors fail to investigate and the courts AID and ABET in efforts to derail her Lawsuit, prior to full formal investigations. Obviously, this INTENTIONAL FAILURE TO INVESTIGATE and Prosecute, is because they cannot and will not call for investigations of themselves and the Criminal RICO Organization they are beholden too. 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 and PROSECUTION? Anderson and many of the “Legally Related” Lawsuits have called for a FEDERAL MONITOR to intervene as required by Law, one free of Conflicts of Interest. The calls made to Prosecutors and the Courts to now follow Law and Procedural Rules have thus far 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 perhaps is NOT a LAWYER. Certainly not a lawyer who works for any of the “Favored Law Firms” or any of the accused Defendants in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, including but not limited to, lawyers who are registered with any of the Courts (in my case this involves The New York Supreme Court, the Virginia Supreme Court and the Florida Supreme Court), Bar Associations in those three states, Disciplinary Departments and any of the thousands of Lawyers/Criminals who work at any of the Law Firms sued and a PROSECUTOR/FEDERAL MONITOR who will sign the attached Conflict of Interest disclosure form, 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 has had with Government Agents and the Court Officials involved in these Criminal Frauds.

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 & oig.hotline@usdoj.gov

Cynthia A. Schnedar, Acting Inspector General ~ U. S. Department of Justice cynthia.a.schnedar@usdoj.gov & oig.hotline@usdoj.gov

HOUSE AND SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEES

The Honorable John Conyers Jr., Chairman ~ House Judiciary Committee john.conyers@mail.house.gov

The Honorable United States Senator Dianne Feinstein, Senate Judiciary Committee @ Facsimile (415) 393-0710 & senator@feinstein.senate.gov

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

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

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL, Eric Holder, Jr.,

inspector.general@usdoj.gov & AskDOJ@usdoj.gov

SEC, Chairperson Mary Shapiro CHAIRMANOFFICE@sec.gov and enforcement@sec.gov

SEC INSPECTOR GENERAL, H. David Kotz oig@sec.gov

Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, David Gouvaia Complaints@tigta.treas.gov and 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 @ tzinser@oig.doc.gov

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the US Patent Office, David Kappos david.kappos@USPTO.gov

Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Deputy Director of the USPTO, Sharon Barner Sharon.Barner@USPTO.gov

US PATENT OFFICE - OFFICE OF ENROLLMENT AND DISCIPLINE DIRECTOR, Harry I. Moatz Harry.Moatz@USPTO.GOV

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

Hon. William M. Welch II, Chief, Public Integrity Unit ~ United States Department of Justice AskDOJ@usdoj.gov

The Hon. John L. Sampson, Chairman ~ New York State Senate Judiciary Committee sampson@senate.state.ny.us

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 Loretta.A.Preska@NYSD.uscourts.gov

Andrew M. Cuomo, Governor ~ New York State <http://www.governor.ny.gov/contact/GovernorContactForm.php>

and Governor.Cuomo@exec.ny.gov and Andrew.cuomo@exec.ny.gov

Steven Michael Cohen, Secretary, Andrew M. Cuomo ~ New York State

steven.cohen@exec.ny.gov and lisa.cantwell@exec.ny.gov c/o Steven Cohen and Andrew Cuomo

The Hon. Luis A. Gonzalez, Presiding Justice ~ New York State Supreme Court Appellate Division

The Hon. Joseph M. Demarest, Jr., Assistant Director, International Operations Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation ny1@ic.fbi.gov

The Honorable Elena Kagan, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States ekagan@law.harvard.edu

The Honorable Neal Katyal, Acting Solicitor General of the United States, Solicitor General, US Department of Justice AskDOJ@usdoj.gov and katyaln@law.georgetown.edu

Robert S. Mueller, III., Director ~ Federal Bureau of Investigation ~ FBI Headquarters 935 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, D.C. 20535-0001 (202) 324-3000

Candice M. Will, Assistant Director, Office of Professional Responsibility ~ Federal Bureau of Investigation, Facsimile (202) 514-5050

The Honorable Shira A. Scheindlin, United States District Court ~ Southern District of New York shira\_a.\_scheindlin@NYSD.uscourts.gov

Peter L. McClintock, Deputy Inspector General ~ Small Business Administration peter.mcclintock@SBA.gov and oig@sba.gov

Daniel J. O’Rourke, Investigations Division ~ Small Business Administration daniel.o'rourke@sba.gov

Chris P. Mercer, President ~ Institute of Professional Representatives before the European Patent Office (epi) cpm@carpmaels.com and info@patentepi.com

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, LLP ~ Attorneys at Law

Select Press & Media

Select Iviewit Shareholders and Patent Interest Holders

Lawsuit Plaintiffs in “Legally Related” Anderson Case

Enclosure(s)/Attachment(s)/URL’s

**All Uniform Resource Locators ( URL’s ) and the contents of those URL’s are incorporated in entirety by reference herein and therefore must be included in your hard copy file WITH ALL EXHIBITS, as part of this correspondence and as further evidentiary material to be Investigated. Due to allegations alleged by New York State Supreme Court Whistleblower Christine C. Anderson and similar claims in the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, regarding Document Destruction and Tampering with Official Complaints and Records, please PRINT all referenced URL’s and their corresponding exhibits, attaching them to your printed copy, as this is now necessary to ensure fair and impartial review.**

**In order to confirm that NO DOCUMENT DESTRUCTION OR ALTERCATION has occurred to this Document or Exhibits, once you have printed the document, all exhibits and URL’s forward a copy of the printed document with all exhibits and materials included, to Eliot I. Bernstein at the address listed herein. This will insure that all parties are reviewing the same documentation and additional illegal activity has not taken place. If you, for any reason, are incapable of printing and/or sending this confirmation copy, please put your reasons for failure to comply in writing and send that to Eliot I. Bernstein at the address listed herein within 10 days of receipt of this communication. Note, that this is a request only for a copy of this Correspondence and the referenced materials and NOT a request for any Case Investigation information, which may be protected by law.**

cmb/eib

1. February 08, 2011 thru April 14, 2011 calls to New York Governor Cuomo and Attorney General Schneiderman

 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=naqEK3cTEy8> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 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, further defined at length herein. 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/Defendants as identified by Whistleblower Anderson and now all of whom are Defendants in the three lawsuits. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. [http://www.zimbio.com/photos/Maria+Cuomo+Cole/Emily+Cole/Cannes+Film+Festival/J5qqur\_otEh](http://www.zimbio.com/photos/Maria%2BCuomo%2BCole/Emily%2BCole/Cannes%2BFilm%2BFestival/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-3)
4. Cohen ironically responded to the fact that I was attempting to “Put him in Prison” by retorting, “Some would say I already am in Prison” at which point I responded “I agree”. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. State of New York Bond Holders, Liability Carriers, Auditors and other parties with “interest”, should be immediately noticed of the MASSIVE LIABILITY that may have been concealed over the last several years from all “interested” parties. The Conflicts of Interest and other Violations of Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Office Rules & Regulations and State & Federal Law, may have precluded proper reporting of this 12 TRILLION DOLLAR LIABILITY, as the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit is 12 Counts, each for 1 Trillion Dollars in Damages. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. New York Senate Judiciary Committee Hearings June 08, 2009

Public Hearing: Standing Committee On The Judiciary New York Senate Judiciary Committee John L. Sampson Chairman. SUBJECT: The Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee, the grievance committees of the various Judicial Districts and the New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct. PURPOSE: This hearing will review the mission, procedures and level of public satisfaction with the Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee, the grievance committees of the various Judicial Districts as well as the New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct.

June 08, 2009 New York Senate Judiciary Committee Hearing Anderson Testimony Video

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6BlK73p4Ueo>

Monday, September 21, 2009, Christine C. Anderson Letter “**Re: Request for Federal Investigation Into Allegations of Corruption and Witness Intimidation and Appointment of Federal Monitor**” addressed to all of the following parties;

The Hon. Eric H. Holder, Jr., Attorney General of the United States Office of the Attorney General

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

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

The Hon. John L. Sampson, Chairman, New York State Senate Judiciary Committee can be found at the following URL,

<http://iviewit.tv/wordpress/?p=114>

fully incorporated in entirety by reference herein.

June 08, 2009 New York Senate Judiciary Committee Hearing Transcript

[http://www.frankbrady.org/TammanyHall/Documents\_files/\*060809%20New%20York%20Judiciary%20Committee%20Hearing%20First%20Dept%20Transcript.pdf](http://www.frankbrady.org/TammanyHall/Documents_files/%2A060809%20New%20York%20Judiciary%20Committee%20Hearing%20First%20Dept%20Transcript.pdf)

September 24, 2009 Judiciary Committee Hearing Transcript

[http://www.frankbrady.org/TammanyHall/Documents\_files/\*\*\*%20092409HEARINGpgs1-247.pdf](http://www.frankbrady.org/TammanyHall/Documents_files/%2A%2A%2A%20092409HEARINGpgs1-247.pdf)

September 24, 2009 Judiciary Committee Hearing Eliot Bernstein Testimony Video

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8Cw0gogF4Fs> and <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Apc_Zc_YNIk>

Note that Senator Sampson honorably admits Conflict of Interest with the Main Defendant, his former employer Proskauer Rose, in the opening.

September 24, 2009 Judiciary Committee Hearing Suzanne McCormick/Patrick Hanley Testimony Video

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HJ7YelYZuVY> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. “Notice of Conflict Filings at the US Second Circuit Court of Appeals” by Investigative Blogger Crystal Cox

<http://www.stolenpatent.com/2010/01/notice-of-conflict-filings-at-us-second.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. 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 by a Senior New York Supreme Court Official. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. New York Senate Judiciary Committee Hearings Video

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HR8OX8uuAbw>

and

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=28afajRkDwY> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. 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 arguments 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”

<http://www.frankbrady.org/TammanyHall/Documents_files/CCA%20091410%20Filing.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Note that this language cited comes from a revised Code of Conduct on July 01, 2009. The Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit and the Anderson Whistleblowing Lawsuit, involve allegations of CORRUPTION against Senior Ranking Court Officials and Public Officials dating back to 1997. These same individuals involved in those Lawsuits are many of those directly in charge of State & National Lawyer Disciplinary Departments and Bar Associations. The same individuals also directly create codes of conduct and law, both State & Federal, mandating that Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Office Rules & Regulations and State & Federal Law codified prior to1997 be used in investigating these matters and determining any outcome. This “grandfathering” of the law and codes to the time of the crimes will insure that the State Actors/Defendants did not and are not now intentionally changing codes in order to create loopholes by watering down the codes to fit their crimes. Evidence of using code NOT codified, in order to illegally exculpate State Actors/Defendants in Bar & Disciplinary Complaints, has already been submitted to the courts and investigators. This establishes another illegal Pattern and Practice, which show previous attempts by named State Actors/Defendants in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit to change Disciplinary Codes to fit their crimes, using falsified un-codified codes to form dismissal letters to feather the caps of their criminal conspirators. See URL, <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2004%2007%2028%20Florida%20Supreme%20Court%20Case%20LAMONT%20SIGN%20SC04-1078%202.pdf> ,

Incorporated by reference in entirety herein. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. <http://www.law.cornell.edu/ethics/ny/code/NY_CODE.HTM> ; Conflict of Interest Disciplinary Rule 5 [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. 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-13)
14. “Spitzer hiring city lawyer on taxpayer expense in Troopergate” BY JOE MAHONEY DAILY NEWS ALBANY BUREAU CHIEF Saturday, October 13th 2007

<http://www.nydailynews.com/news/2007/10/13/2007-10-13_spitzer_hiring_city_lawyer_on_taxpayer_e.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. “Spitzer's mouthpiece has his own secrets to hide” March 18, 2008 by Peter Lance, Raw Story

<http://spitfirelist.com/news/spitzers-mouthpiece-has-his-own-secrets-to-hide> [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. “What’s Happened to the Lawyers Who Worked for Spitzer?” By ELLEN ROSEN Published: May 18, 2007, The New York Times

<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/05/18/business/18eliot.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. “Spitzer Troopergate Subpoenas Still Stand, Judge Told (Update1)” By Karen Freifeld - March 13, 2008, Bloomberg L.P.

<http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=aU3MoG5xmBRc&refer=home> [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. [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-18)
19. [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-19)
20. 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-20)
21. March 10, 2008 Federal Judge Shira Scheindlin ORDER in the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit.

[http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/Scheindlin%20Order%2003%2007%202008%20(2).pdf](http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/Scheindlin%20Order%2003%2007%202008%20%282%29.pdf)

March 05, 2008, Letter to Federal Judge Shira Scheindlin re Attorney General Conflicts

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080305%20Final%20Plaintiff%20Oposition%20to%20AG%20Cuomo%20letter%20email%20copy.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. “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-22)
23. “Cuomo And Geithner Skated” Investor’s Business Daily, IBD Editorial

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=571919&p=2>



 Cuomo, affirmative-action lender. AP [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. 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

--

New York Media LLC / New York Magazine SERIES

“The Post-Crash: Wall Street Won. So why is it so worried?”

<http://nymag.com/news/business/wallstreet/> New York Media LLC / New York Magazine

 

“Revolver - Why do some of the most capable public servants in America, people like economist Peter Orszag, keep circling back from Washington to Wall Street? One guess.” By Gabriel Sherman

Published Apr 10, 2011 New York Media LLC / New York Magazine

<http://nymag.com/news/business/wallstreet/peter-orszag-2011-4/>

--

“The Wall Street Mind: Triumphant…To the victors belong the spoils, right?” By John Heilemann

Published Apr 10, 2011 New York Media LLC / New York Magazine

<http://nymag.com/news/business/wallstreet/john-heilemann-2011-4/>

--



Stage 1 (left), Stage 2 (right) Stage 3 (left), Stage 4 (right)

(Photo: Joerg Klaus/Bransch)

 “The Wall Street Mind: Anxious...Now they’re getting paid … But where will the next big paydays come from?” By John Gapper Published Apr 10, 2011 New York Media LLC / New York Magazine

<http://nymag.com/news/business/wallstreet/john-gapper-2011-4/>

--

“The Wall Street Mind: Oblivious - At Davos, the Champagne is flowing again—a rain dance to keep the money flowing their way.” By Felix Salmon Published Apr 10, 2011 New York Media LLC / New York Magazine

<http://nymag.com/news/business/wallstreet/felix-salmon-2011-4/>

--

“The Next Best Crooks - With the masterminds of the financial crisis having escaped justice, United States Attorney Preet Bharara is left to prosecute this generation of insider traders. But is he too aggressive? And how valuable is second prize, anyway?” By Robert Kolker

Published Apr 10, 2011



Clockwise from top left: Rajiv Goel, Lloyd Blankfein, Rajat Gupta, Raj Rajaratnam, and Danielle Chiesi.

(Photo: Lipo Ching/Mercury News (Goel); Jemal Countess/Getty (Blankfein); Umesh Goswam/The India Today Group/Getty (Gupta); Jin Lee/Bloomberg via Getty (Rajaratnam, Chiesi); Getty (courtroom); C Squared Studios/Getty (Confidential); Mark Scott/Getty (Money). Illustrations by Gluekit.)

--

“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-24)
25. 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-25)