**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 and/or Federal Civil and Criminal 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.



More images @ [www.iviewit.tv](http://www.iviewit.tv)

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](mailto: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](mailto:iviewit@iviewit.tv)

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

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:**

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

iviewit logo big

***“Surf with Vision”***

**Eliot I. Bernstein**

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

Thursday, May 19, 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 call with James Rogers, Esq., acting on behalf of Harlan Levy referred by Steven Michael Cohen, Chief of Staff to Governor Andrew Cuomo and prior calls with the Governor’s office.

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, 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 in any related matters.

Rogers claimed that the Attorney General’s office, nor he, in any capacity, could speak to us until retaining an Independent Non-Conflicted Party to represent them. Rogers, for the first time since the Spitzer Administration in early 2000, took the correct and legal course of action on behalf of the Attorney General’s office. Rogers calling for Independent NON CONFLICTED Counsel and a Special Prosecutor to replace the Attorney General, in the review and investigation of the Iviewit Filed Criminal Complaints and my ongoing Federal RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, and any/all “legally related” lawsuits and proceedings, all further described herein.

1. **Summary of Telephone Calls with the new york state Governor and Attorney General Offices 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. acknowledgement of conflicts of interest by the new york attorney general**

William Wagener, a reporter 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 enormity a Conflict of Interest 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> .

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 Attorney General Andrew Cuomo, Chief of Staff Steven Michael Cohen & Asst Attorney General 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%20NYAttorney General%20Steven%20Cohen%20Letter%20signed%20low.pdf](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%20NYAttorney General%20Steven%20Cohen%20Letter%20Re%20Lamont%20Signed.pdf](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 Attorney General 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.

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, to inform and advise Mr. Rogers that;

* 1. the Attorney General’s office under Cuomo and now Schneiderman had previously received Criminal Complaints against Andrew Cuomo and Steven M. Cohen and failed to find Non Conflicted Independent Counsel to handle the complaints, while simultaneously representing as Counsel of Record, their offices and 39 plus State Actors/Defendants in my Federal RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit.
  2. the Attorney General’s office and two former Attorney General’s, Spitzer and Cuomo, are State Actors/Defendants in the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, acting as central players in the Public Office Cover-Ups alleged therein.
  3. the Attorney General is representing the Attorney General’s office and two former Attorney General’s while having further multiple Conflicts of Interests Representing other State Actors/Defendants in the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit. That this sets up Obstruction of Justice charges, as officials of the Attorney General’s office have failed to perform their Public Office duties to investigate the CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS against the Public Officials through the Attorney General’s Public Integrity Unit charged with investigating CORRUPT PUBLIC OFFICIALS in New York. That instead the Attorney General’s office shields their State Actors/Defendants clients from investigations. In the event the Attorney General is Conflicted from investigating certain Public Officials, for example, when Representing State Actors/Defendants, as Counsel of Record in a Lawsuit, as is the case in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, the Attorney General must then call in an Independent Special Prosecutor/Investigator in order to Investigate the Attorney General’s clients, the State Actors/Defendants.[[5]](#footnote-5) This is due to the Obvious Conflict caused if their offices tried to investigate the State Actors/Defendants they represent in the same matter. In fact, the Attorney General in this instance must call in someone else to investigate for certainly they cannot investigate themselves. Yet, up to this point, the Attorney General has failed to call in anyone and merely Obstructed Justice.
  4. the former Attorney Generals Spitzer and Cuomo, the Attorney General’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 Attorney General’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 Attorney General’s Conflicts of Interest in handling the matters directly, **Rogers then declared a Conflict of Interest existed with him and the Attorney General Office**. This Admission and Acknowledgement of ongoing conflicts now requires the Attorney General’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 Attorney General 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! Perhaps “The Buck Stops Here”.

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, exposing The “revolving door” of public office corruption and mandating investigations.**

Federal Judge Shira Scheindlin “legally related” my **TRILLION DOLLAR**[[6]](#footnote-6) 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[[7]](#footnote-7) 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 efforts to facilitate cover-ups of various crimes. Various crimes committed by ATTORNEYS AT LAW in private practice, mainly **ILLEGAL LEGAL CRIMES** that are then complained of to Prosecutors and Disciplinary Agencies by the victims. Instead of Due Process and Procedure, victims meet another layer of corruption. What appears is a “playbook” of “cookie cutter” **illegal legal crimes** used by these Law Firms and Lawyers to steal inventions, steal estates[[8]](#footnote-8) and more, and then another “playbook” of government cover-up crimes to stop any complaints against them, as exhibited in the “Legally Related” Lawsuits to Anderson, further enumerated herein.

Anderson further puts forth a damning sworn statement to the New York State Judiciary Committee Chairman, John Sampson, containing allegations of FELONY Criminal Acts[[9]](#footnote-9) by STATE & FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS. The Criminal Acts include but are 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[[10]](#footnote-10) 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, Richard Kuse/Catherine Wilson, The Honorable Duane A. Hart, Gizella Weisshaus[[11]](#footnote-11), Patrick Hanley/Suzanne McCormick and others[[12]](#footnote-12) also testified at the hearings. Evidence continues to be circulated and copied to each individual member of the Committee, including then Senator Eric T. Schneiderman the current New York Attorney General, by those who testified at the hearings, 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, showing a “Revolving Door” 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 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 along with the Attorney General, as further discussed herein.

Anderson further complains to the Federal Court in a Motion to Remove the Attorney General[[13]](#footnote-13) from illegal legal representations that **CUOMO IS ILLEGALLY REPRESENTING STATE ACTORS/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 Attorney General 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 Public Officials and their crimes involving members of the SAME department Anderson and Corrado worked for, the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee. Without Anderson’s revelations however, I was unable to tie how the various departments operated together in a neat conspiratorial Criminal RICO Organization. Once exposed to the mechanics of the crimes from the perspective of an inside Whistleblower, it becomes apparent that a Criminal Conspiracy beyond imagination exists, blocking Due Process and Procedure to Obstruct Justice to Victims of the Criminal Enterprise’s ILLEGAL LEGAL crimes, then misusing Public Offices to bury any complaints against them.

The CRIMINAL ACTS described by Anderson herein are NOT part of a “Conspiracy Theory,” but instead comprise a **FACTUAL LEGAL CONSPIRACY,** steeped in Factual Damning Evidence. 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 a trial, if one is guilty, in some instances, the end of a rope. A list 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, the crimes listed in [Exhibit 2](#Exhibit2) of this document and listed at the URL,

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/oneofthesedays/index.htm#_Toc107852933>

fully incorporated in entirety by reference herein.



The crimes include a Car Bombing in an Attempted Murder of my Family in Boynton Beach Florida, for graphic detail and further information on the Car Bombing see the Iviewit companies’ 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 SUPPLEMENTAL EVIDENTIARY MATERIALS and LINKS ON THE IVIEWIT HOMEPAGE ( currently 1087 exhibits, see** [**http://www.iviewit.tv/#Evidence**](http://www.iviewit.tv/#Evidence) **),** are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety herein.

On October 27 2009, after Anderson’s trial and 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, eyewitnesses to Anderson’s CRIMINAL allegations in court, Eliot Bernstein and Terrence Finnan, sent Notice to Federal Judge Shira Scheindlin of her obligations under law. The Letter/Notice to Scheindlin demanded that Scheindlin follow her Judicial Cannons and Law and report the CRIMINAL allegations, of not only a credible witness, but also an expert witness, Anderson, to the proper authorities.

Authorities for Scheindlin to notify, include but are not limited to, the New York Attorney General’s Office, the United States Attorney General, the United States Attorney General Office of Professional Responsibility, the New York District Attorney, the United States Department of Justice Inspector General, the New York Supreme Court Oversights, and, all offices specifically fingered by Anderson. Notice to begin IMMEDIATE CRIMINAL & INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATIONS of the CRIMINAL allegations levied by Anderson against Senior Public Officials in the government agencies.

Further, a copy of the Scheindlin letter and corresponding Criminal Complaint information, additionally requesting to add the new material to ongoing Iviewit Complaints and begin further new investigations of the new Criminal Acts exposed, was sent to the following State, Federal & International Authorities investigating the Iviewit complaint matters;

* 1. The Honorable Barack Hussein Obama II  
     President United States of America
  2. The Honorable Glenn A. Fine  
     Inspector General United States Department of Justice
  3. The Honorable John Conyers Jr.  
     Chairman House Judiciary Committee
  4. The Honorable United States Senator Dianne Feinstein  
     Senate Judiciary Committee
  5. Hon. Eric H. Holder, Jr.  
     United States Attorney General US Department of Justice
  6. The Honorable Elena Kagan  
     Solicitor General US Department of Justice
  7. Robert S. Mueller, III.  
     Director Federal Bureau of Investigation
  8. Candice M. Will  
     Assistant Director, Office of Professional Responsibility Federal Bureau of Investigation
  9. The Honorable Harry I. Moatz  
     Director, Office of Enrollment & Discipline United States Patent & Trademark Office
  10. Todd J. Zinser  
      Inspector General United States Department of Commerce
  11. David Kappos  
      Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office United States Patent & Trademark Office
  12. John J. Doll  
      Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office
  13. David L. Gouvaia  
      Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration
  14. Mary L. Schapiro  
      Chairperson United States Securities and Exchange Commission
  15. Peter L. McClintock  
      Acting Inspector General Small Business Administration
  16. Chris P. Mercer  
      President Institute of Professional Representatives before the European Patent Office (epi)
  17. Steven Michael Cohen  
      Counselor and Chief of Staff for Andrew Cuomo New York Office of the Attorney General
  18. Joseph M. Demarest, Jr.  
      FBI Assistant Director in Charge of the New York Division
  19. David A. Paterson  
      Governor New York State
  20. New York Senate Judiciary Committee Members:
  21. 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.
  22. Hon. Andrew Cuomo  
      Attorney General Office of the Attorney General
  23. Monica Connell, Esq.  
      Assistant Attorney General - Division of State Counsel Litigation Bureau, State of New York Office of the Attorney General
  24. Thomas P. DiNapoli  
      Comptroller State of New York
  25. Robert Morris Morgenthau  
      District Attorney of New York County

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 Felony Crimes to proper authorities or face Misprision of a Felony Charges and more. The Notice to Scheindlin can be found at the following URL, hereby incorporated in entirety by reference herein,

“IVIEWIT LETTER TO US FEDERAL 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.” <http://iviewit.tv/wordpress/?p=205>

The New York Attorney General’s Office, Andrew Cuomo (while he was Attorney General and as Governor) and Steven Cohen, 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 and 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, had no plausible deniability of the CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS levied under oath in federal court by Anderson. They are therefore **legally obligated** in their OFFICIAL CAPACITIES to report and/or investigate RELIABLE CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS, as mandated by the New York Lawyer's Code of Professional Responsibility, Public Office Rules & Regulations and State & Federal Laws, especially where Public Offices are involved in the crimes. Several sections of code regarding these duties to report, include but are 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[[14]](#footnote-14) 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. **ACTIONS TO REMOVE ADMITTED AND ACKNOWLEDGED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST FROM ALL PROCEEDINGS AND CEASE AND DESIST ILLEGAL REPRESENTATIONS 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 legal representations of the Public Officers both personally and professionally by the New York Attorney General’s office, which preclude 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.[[15]](#footnote-15)) The Attorney General as a state attorney is bound by these rules as well.[[16]](#footnote-16)

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 Attorney General 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 Attorney General’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 to ILLEGALLY by the Attorney General’s Office, whom was wearing a number of conflicting 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 exposed, again in Violation of Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Offices Rules & Regulations and State & Federal Law, combining to further Block Due Process & Procedure of the victims through Obstruction Justice to both the Criminal Complaints and the 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 Attorney General 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 Violations of the Federal Mann Act in Transporting Prostitutes across State Lines, Prostitution of a Young Woman and other crimes, Spitzer’s Personal legal fees were paid from the Public Treasury to Proskauer Rose[[17]](#footnote-17), the central conspirator of my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, named in EVERY Criminal and Civil Complaint. So “good” were these lawyers that Spitzer never went to trial, or faced arrest, almost as if he were “Above the Law,” or more appropriately, the crimes were bought off on the Taxpayer’s dime and then “Whitewashed” by his friends in high places, perhaps similar to what Anderson described. 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 or while investigating Proskauer, the main culprit in the Criminal Complaints “[[18]](#footnote-18),[[19]](#footnote-19),[[20]](#footnote-20) and [[21]](#footnote-21).

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 INDEPENDENT counsel to represent them. Proskauer most likely cannot get Independent counsel to represent them that would continue the Frauds on the Court.

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 complaint matters, the Conflicts being the “Glue that Binds” the crimes 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 (perhaps they too could not secure Independent Non Conflicted Counsel to represent them)**, while still also acting as Counsel for their firm, defying Conflict laws again? Evidence of these conflicts can be found at the following URL’s, hereby incorporated in entirety by reference herein,

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 the Agencies to HARASS and INTIMIDATE those trying to expose the Criminal RICO Organization and in efforts to scrub the evidences and information of their crimes from the WEB.

Now that Conflicts of Interest are affirmed and acknowledged by the Attorney General’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 criminal cases. Further, the Attorney General must notify all Relevant Parties, such as the courts and prosecutorial offices 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 Attorney General must DISQUALIFY/RECUSE their offices from investigating the CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS filed at the Attorney General and Governor’s Offices. Second, 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 Federal Judge Shira Ann 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 Attorney General’s Office, and, current and former Attorney General Officials are being sued in both their Professional and Individual capacities, conflicting them out of handling ANY related matters, forces the Attorney General to IMMEDIATELY remove all prior court and prosecutorial filings they have made in the past. All of these past filings, filed in conflict, now need to have new NON- CONFLICTED PROSECUTORS/FEDERAL MONITORS NON and NON CONFLICTED COURTS review ALL prior decisions and determinations made by the Attorney General in the Criminal Complaints and Court Cases that have been prejudiced by the Conflicts, Violations of Public Office Rules & Regulations and Law thus far. All previous representations by the Attorney General’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 Attorney General 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 Attorney General’s NON-CONFLICTED Independent Counsel and Investigated by NON-CONFLICTED Independent Special Prosecutors/Federal Monitors, all brought in to the replace the Attorney General’s multiple conflicted and illegal roles.**

Next, the Acknowledged and Admitted Conflicts of Interest by the Attorney General’s office, 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, forcing the State Actors/Defendants to seek new and INDEPENDENT NON CONFLICTED COUNSEL to represent them. The Attorney General must WITHDRAW IMMEDIATELY AS COUNSEL to all State Actors/Defendants in the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit both in their Professional and Individual capacities. The Attorney General 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 Professional and Individual Representations. Going forward, it would appear that while the State of New York may pay for the State Actors/Defendants Professional legal defenses, their Individual legal defenses should be separate and billed directly to them as personal expenses and further paid personally, precluding further misuse of Public Funds.

The New York Attorney General must also seek independent counsel to represent the New York Attorney General’s Office and the former Attorney General Officials directly named as State Actors/Defendants, again separate counsel for their Professional and Individual representation. 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 State Actors/Defendants both Professionally and Individually, 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. **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.**

Anderson claims, quote,

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.

This evidences further criminal acts and financial abuse 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 these illegal defenses in their Professional Capacities paid for by the State of New York may be permissible, but Legal Fees for Individual Legal Defenses for Criminal Acts outside the scope of their office duties, are Violations of Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Office Rules & Regulations and New York State Law, as evidenced herein. Presumably, these illegal 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 the Attorney General does not distribute the fees as income or gifts, the illegal legal fees for their Individual Defenses paid for by the New York Taxpayers may be a misuse of Public Funds according to Whistleblower Anderson, an expert in these matters.

These “free” legal services fees give the accused State Actors/Defendants unlimited funds to defend themselves for the crimes they are accused of by their victims on State Dime and the 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, 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 in their tax returns the Legal Fees, clearly this represents, on information and belief, Tax Evasion, Misuse of Public Funds and more.

On information and belief, the cost for Spitzer’s PERSONAL defenses to Proskauer Rose was reputedly approximately US $400,000.00 dollars and over ONE MILLION in total 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. Instead, the Great State of New York fleeced, paying personal defense funds for Public Officers committing felony crimes, including sexual crimes in Violation of the FEDERAL MANN ACT, crimes that are outside of the scope of their office duties. Further, several key Spitzer Officials, after Spitzer’s forced resignation, then landed Instant 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 Attorney General’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.

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

The new Investigators and new INDEPENDENT COUNSEL handling these matters, are apprised here 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 the matters and ILLEGALLY INFLUENCING these lawsuits and Criminal Complaints in the courts and within prosecutorial offices. Per Anderson, information may have been destroyed or altered in these cases and complaints Whitewashed, demanding a full and thorough review of the matters, with fresh complaint information tendered to assure the veracity of the materials.

The Anderson filing in Federal Court to remove the Attorney General, 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 committed other violations of Law. The perjured statements further Obstructed Justice in the Anderson Federal Whistleblower Lawsuit and will at some point in time demand rehearing due to the FRAUD ON THE COURT. In particular, Anderson claims, quote,

**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, as that is the count that exposes the corruption the victims have complained from. 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 states that any actions by the Courts, prior to fully resolving the CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS of Anderson, Conflicts of Interest, 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. That any actions taken by the Court prior to resolution would be submitted to Criminal Authorities as further Prima Facie evidence of further Criminal Fraud on the Courts and more. 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][[22]](#footnote-22) 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][[23]](#footnote-23)” 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[[24]](#footnote-24), 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.[[25]](#footnote-25)**

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 Non-Conflicted 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. Despite Iviewit’s attempts to confirm or deny conflicts with the Attorney General’s Office in one of the first filings of my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, Judge Scheindlin decided that at the time there were no conflicts she could she. Yet, Scheindlin failed to have the Attorney General or any other party charged with conflicts, confirm or deny if conflicts existed and instead responded for them, defying logic.

Therefore, the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit Appeal was put 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. The Court of Appeals allowed the Attorney General to continue to represent the State Actors/Defendants in the Appeals, amazingly even after Anderson’s Criminal Allegations against the Attorney General and others in the Lower Court. Further, charges were filed against the Appeal Court for their failure to allow investigations to proceed prior to their efforts to illegally derail the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit Appeal through instant Dismissal, further Obstructing Justice.
2. Prosecutorial Offices named by Whistleblower Anderson, and 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,
   6. Unknown “Favored Law Firms & Lawyers.”

As the New York Courts, Regulatory Offices and Prosecutorial Offices are all center stage in the Anderson Whistleblower Lawsuit and RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, finding Non-Conflicted Officials in New York now to represent these matters going forward seems virtually impossible. Any Special Prosecutors or Court Officials now coming into the fray must be thoroughly vetted and screened for conflict with the hundreds of Iviewit Defendants in the RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit[[26]](#footnote-26) directly culpable in the RICO Crimes, 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 & OTHER FINANCIAL SCHEMES THAT LED TO THE MELTDOWN ON WALL STREET/GREED STREET that Involve Current Defendants in the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit. Prior New York Attorney Generals Obstructed relevant complaint information that now needs IMMEDIATE new investigations, free of conflicts of interest. preclude further fraud on victims and the courts caused by obstruction of relevant Information in the following criminal and civil lawsuits of; Bernard L. Madoff, Allen Stanford, Marc S. Dreier, Galleon, Enron Broadband, enron Corporation, Arthur Andersen LLP and more.**

A new view of the internal corruptions inside Government Agencies illuminated by Anderson, reveals the Government as a “Revolving Door” to a Criminal RICO Organization composed mainly of Law Firms, Lawyers and Lawyers Inside Government Agencies and the courts, as outlined in Anderson’s testimony. What appears in this new light is that the Wall Street / Greed Street Meltdown and Ponzi Schemes, are actually diabolical intentional “CONTROLLED DEMOLITIONS.” Despite widespread exposure of the virtually never-ending Financial Crimes involved in the various phases of the US Economic meltdown, there also appears carefully constructed Cover-Ups as exposed by Anderson, so effective in fact that not a single prosecution, or minimalistic ones at best, despite the estimated TRILLIONS of DOLLARS STOLEN in the various illegal legal crimes and financial schemes.

A Government sponsored RICO and RECOVER strategy by the Department of Justice, targeting the few who have directly gained/profited from the orchestrated losses in the markets, to the detriment of now hundreds of millions of victims worldwide, is necessary in order to RECOVER the TRILLIONS of DOLLARS STOLEN. Without RECOVERING the MONIES STOLEN THROUGH CRIMINAL ACTS, the country cannot recover. If however, the RICO were successful, the RICO would require PAYBACK of Hundreds of Billions returned for Illegal Bogus Bonuses to those who bankrupted these blue-chip companies with intent. Hundreds of Billions more would be RECOVERED from those who benefited from the various Home Mortgage Scams. Hundreds of Billions more RECOVERED from those who benefited directly from the Stock Frauds & Illegal Price and Market Fixings. TRILLIONS more would be RECOVERED from those who took Fraudulent Government Bailouts based on covering other FRAUDS, which at the time the Public did not know that these Market Collapses were due to fraud and thus gave the bank robbers cab fare and a new house to chase the bank robbers.

Now simply add up the recovered LOOT a RICO would RECOVER and the country would no longer be bankrupt and a few would lose everything gained ILLEGALLY and would need a bailout, this time from CLUB FED. Keep in mind that ECONOMIC WARFARE is a WAR CRIME and a form of TREASON against the PEOPLE and at the end of trial for TREASON and WAR CRIMES, the punishment is the end of a rope. As always, NOOSES free @ [www.iviewit.tv](http://www.iviewit.tv)

Think of the Hundreds of Millions of VICTIMS WORLDWIDE directly impacted by the host of financial crimes. Victims of, for example, lost jobs in formerly Great American businesses that were forced illegally out of business through Anticompetitive WalMart tactics on Wall Street, while CEO’s carted off the Loot for intentionally bankrupting them, while SHAREHOLDERS & PENSION HOLDERS were wiped out in many instances. Homeless Victims ripped from homes based on bogus legal documents on usurious loans and fraudulent market manipulations caused by further fraudulent stock frauds underlying the rigged markets. Countries swallowed in debt from rigged markets and bogus financial instruments with AAA ratings sold to them under false pretence, TENS OF MILLIONS OF VICTIMS in each country devastated, HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS in our own country.

With ZERO PROSECUTION, one can see that the Fox is in the Henhouse and a bloodbath of Chickens has unfolded, the Criminal Organization with top down control of the Government and in charge of Key Regulatory Posts, with Justice Unguarded of Sword, the Scale of Justice tipped over, Lady Justice Weeping and HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF PEOPLE VICTIMIZED AND ROBBED. Shamefully, behind all of these events are LAWYERS/CRIMINALS who have created and approved all the legal documents for all of the CONTROLLED FINANCIAL FRAUDS and there are LAWYERS/CRIMINALS protecting them from PROSECUTION inside Government. For successful prosecution of the crimes, the LAWYERS MUST BE TRIED, all of them, despite their titles or public office positions, as they were CENTRAL RICO CONSPIRATORS to the whole FRAUDULENT CONTROLLED DEMOLITION OF THE US AND WORLD ECONOMIES WITH THEIR CORPORATE CLIENTELE.

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 Complaints. The allegations in the SEC Complaints 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 and Civil Actions. These Ponzis and Financial schemes, in fact may be, Law Firm Money Laundering Schemes that further use the Courts to effectuate complex ILLEGAL LEGAL SCHEMES, WASHING THE FUNDS OF THE CRIMINAL RICO ORGANIZATIONS CRIMES through further FRAUDS ON THE COURTS & OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, such as, the Securities & Exchange Commission, Bankruptcy Courts, FINRA, DOJ and more. The Iviewit SEC Complaints are at the URL’s,

Eliot Bernstein of Iviewit Technologies files SEC & FBI Complaint with Mary Schapiro & Others against Warner Bros., AOL Inc., Time Warner, Intel, SGI, Lockheed Martin, Proskauer Rose, Foley & Lardner”  
<http://iviewit.tv/wordpress/?p=288>

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

both fully incorporated in entirety by reference herein.

**New Evidence and Important additional Information for Ongoing government Investigations of; Allen Stanford, Bernard L. Madoff, Proskauer Rose, Marc S. Dreier, Galleon, Enron Broadband, Enron, Arthur Andersen and their direct RELEVANCY to this Complaint**

I am requesting that the ongoing investigations of Allen Stanford, Bernard L. Madoff, Proskauer Rose, Marc S. Dreier, Galleon, Enron Broadband, Enron and Arthur Andersen all be revisited and halted in light of the information contained herein, which may prove central to those investigations as further frauds and frauds on courts and government agencies. Converted royalties from my stolen technologies may have been funneled through these Ponzi and other securities trading schemes, especially where Defendants in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit are found directly involved in the schemes, some already behind bars. Investigators should therefore freeze all asset transactions and sales of stock in all of the following Ponzi schemes and other artifices to defraud, as they may be money-laundering operations, laundering converted royalties of my inventions for the law firms that stole them. The actual court cases may be further efforts by these all too clever law firms operating as a Criminal Enterprise to shuffle the stolen and converted Iviewit royalties (estimated in the hundreds of billions already) and other victims’ funds, in ever increasingly criminal frauds on the courts to further Wash the STOLEN LOOT.

Investigators should note Proskauer’s direct involvement in these schemes and ongoing SEC investigations, and, SEC & FBI Civil and Criminal Actions. Proskauer’s involvement pointed out in each scheme they are found to have direct involvement in, and again, Proskauer is the main Defendant in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit. Additionally, Investigators should take special note of Proskauer’s direct and criminally culpable involvement in the Sir Robert Allen Stanford Ponzi (“Stanford”), as Stanford tentacles into International Criminal Cartels, also deserving formal investigation by not only the SEC but also by the FBI and all other authorities addressed herein. Has Proskauer Rose reported these liabilities from their involvement in these schemes to their liability carriers, including their involvement in SEC and FBI CIVIL and CRIMINAL actions, including a Global Class Action Lawsuit by the VICTIMS, for the entire Stanford Seven Billion Dollar Loss? One must then wonder how their carrier permits them to operate and continues to insure them for Malpractice, etc.

Finally, from the SEC Lawsuit and Judicial Ruling in the Stanford debacle, it is unclear if Proskauer Rose was included in the court ordered freeze and injunction on assets and documents issued by the court in the SEC Stanford Lawsuit, as the language included all attorneys. Proskauer has been identified with Proskauer Partner Thomas Sjoblom (“Sjoblom”) as constituting one of the law firms listed in the SEC LAWSUITS by multiple news sources. News reports confirm that the FBI is already conducting investigations into Stanford but both the SEC and FBI should pay particular attention as to how that crime may also relate to the stolen technologies described herein, also known as “Patentgate.”

The following information regarding these schemes represent where correlations involve Defendants named in my Federal RICO & ANTITRUST lawsuit, including but not limited to, all of the following.

* 1. **Sir Robert Allen Stanford ~ SEC Ongoing Investigation, Indictment and FBI Investigation, sec/PROSKAUER ROSE are CENTER STAGE.**

The SEC Lawsuits and Indictments and the FBI and SEC ONGOING Investigations of Sir Robert Allen Stanford, involve the main Defendant in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit Proskauer and Partner Thomas Sjoblom. Sjoblom has since resigned from Proskauer[[27]](#footnote-27), both the firm and Sjoblom directly implicated in criminal activities in the Stanford investigation by the SEC and by Stanford Employees. Proskauer was acting as counsel for Stanford (Sjoblom a former SEC Enforcement Official) and Sjoblom acting as a Proskauer Partner, allegedly aided and abetted Stanford employees in lying to FEDERAL AGENTS investigating the Ponzi in a meeting in a Miami Airport Hanger. **Sjoblom was an SEC Enforcement Official Prior to Joining Proskauer, again watch as the Revolving Door Spins to AID & ABET the crimes and then to COVER-UP, using multiple government agencies.**

A Global Class Action lawsuit was also filed against Proskauer, for the entire SEVEN BILLION in DAMAGES resulting from the Stanford Ponzi, as indicated in the following URL’s, hereby incorporated by reference in entirety herein,

August 31, 2009 “Proskauer Targeted in Class Action Over Handling of Stanford Financial” by Leigh Jones @ The National Law Journal

<http://www.law.com/jsp/article.jsp?id=1202433436276&rss=newswire>

List containing filed legal actions in the Stanford Ponzi, which includes legal actions against Proskauer by Injured Investors and Stanford Employees.

<http://74.125.47.132/search?q=cache:zDFm5gEXCbYJ:www.oakbridgeins.com/clients/blog/stanfordlist.doc+Troice+v.+Proskauer+Rose&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us>

August 27, 2009 **“Proskauer Rose, LLP; Thomas V. Sjoblum [SIC Sjoblom]/ Samuel Troice; Horacio Mendez; Annalisa Mendez; Punga Punga Financial, Ltd., on behalf of all investors who purchased or held Certificates of Deposit or otherwise maintained accounts with Stanford International Bank as of February 2009.”**

<http://www.oakbridgeins.com/clients/blog/troice.pdf>

Legal action was also filed against Proskauer and Sjoblom by Laura Pendergest Holt, one of the Stanford officers arrested by the FBI in the Stanford Ponzi,[[28]](#footnote-28) as illustrated in the following URL’s, hereby incorporated by reference in entirety herein,

March 27, 2009 Thomas V. Sjoblom and Proskauer Rose, LLP/ Laura Pendergest-Holt

<http://amlawdaily.typepad.com/sjoblom.pdf>

Note that Stanford is also under ongoing investigation by the FBI for involvement with leading International Criminal Cartels and where it has been reported that the FBI has been conducting a long-standing investigation of this connection.

James Davis, a key figure also arrested by the FBI in Stanford and Allen Stanford’s longtime friend and second in command, copped a plea deal whereby he pointed to Proskauer and Sjoblom as directly involved, leading to further civil actions by Injured Investors against Proskauer.

February 19, 2009 “Charges Against Stanford a Long Time Coming, Offshore Banking Experts Say Accused Financier Under Federal Drug Investigation” ABC News by Justin Rood and Brian Ross.

<http://abcnews.go.com/Blotter/story?id=6907429&page=1>

August 27, 2009, “The Stanford Affair: Another Bad Day for Proskauer’s Tom Sjoblom” Wall Street Journal Legal Blog by Amir Efrati.

<http://blogs.wsj.com/law/2009/08/27/the-stanford-affair-another-bad-day-for-proskauers-tom-sjoblom/tab/article>

More information Regarding the Stanford, Proskauer and Iviewit correlations can be found at all of the following URL’s, hereby incorporated in entirety by reference herein,

February 25, 2009 Eliot Bernstein Petition to the US District Court for the Northern District of Texas in the SEC v Stanford lawsuits DOCKETS NO: 3:09-cv-00298-N, 3:09-cv-00298-L and 1:09-mc-00002-JAD titled **“IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION AND PETITION-COMPLAINT OF ELIOT BERNSTEIN TO INTERVENE AND/OR JOIN AS A PLAINTIFF IN THE WITHIN ACTION BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND AS TRUSTEE ON BEHALF OF JOSHUA ENNIO ZANDER BERNSTEIN IRREVOCABLE TRUST, JACOB NOAH ARCHIE BERNSTEIN IRREVOCABLE TRUST & DANIEL ELIJSHA ABE OTTOMO BERNSTEIN IRREVOCABLE TRUST”**

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090225%20USDC%20Northern%20TX%20Filing%20RE%20SEC%20STANFORD%20l.pdf>

March 02, 2009 “**EMERGENCY MOTION TO INVESTIGATE PROSKAUER ROSE DEFENDANTS INVOLVEMENT IN THE ALLEN STANFORD FINANCIAL, THE BERNARD MADOFF AND THE MARC DRIER FRAUD SCANDALS. REMOVE PROSKAUER FROM SELF REPRESENTATION IN THESE MATTERS UNTIL SUCH TIME THAT THE FBI REMOVES THEM FROM THE ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE STANFORD FINANCIAL FRAUD**”

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090302%20FINAL%20Emergency%20Motion%20Re%20Proskauer%20Stanford%20Madoff%20Dreier%20Scandals4017.pdf>

August 21, 2009 –08-4873-CV United States Court of Appeal for the Second Circuit “**Iviewit Motion to Compel US Second Circuit Court to Follow Law. Allen Stanford, Bernard Madoff, Marc S. Dreier links to Iviewit via Proskauer Rose and Foley and Lardner implicated in Trillion-Dollar Suit. Citizen Arrest of Judge Ralph Winter & Clerk Catherine O’Hagan Wolfe.**”

Online Interactive Version @

<http://iviewit.tv/wordpress/?p=78>

Original Signed Filed Motion @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090908%20FINAL%20Emergency%20Motion%20to%20Compel%20SIGNED44948.pdf>

September 24, 2009 New York Senate Judiciary Committee Hearing and Eliot Bernstein’s testimony before the Committee, Bernstein’s testimony begins at 3 Hours 38 Minutes into the hearings.

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

October 05, 2009 – “**Prepared Statement of Eliot I. Bernstein of Iviewit to New York Senate Judiciary Committee John L. Sampson Regarding Trillion Dollar Iviewit Federal Lawsuit Naming Proskauer Rose, Foley & Lardner, IBM, Intel, SGI, Lockheed and More”**

Online Interactive Version @

<http://iviewit.tv/wordpress/?p=165>

Filed Copy @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20091005%20FINAL%20NY%20Judiciary%20Cover%20Letter%20for%20Prepared%20Statement%20to%20Committee%20John%20Sampson1897%20Signed.pdf>

The links provided in the Stanford Section are also beneficial for the following sections on Madoff and Dreier Ponzi Schemes and therefore will not be relisted in those sections.

This information should be cause for the Investigators addressed herein to reanalyze the entire Stanford scheme in light of this new evidence. All asset sales and other distributions should instantly be halted until these material facts can be reviewed to determine if these funds are also relating to the Iviewit stolen patents.

* 1. **Bernard L. Madoff SEC Ongoing Investigation and Conviction as it Relates to Proskauer Rose**

Several ties between Proskauer and Madoff also exist, learned in part from the SEC OIG stinging report on Madoff, which harshly criticized lax regulators for overlooking the Madoff information from Whistleblowers and Insiders at the SEC, over a several year period. According to TPM, in 2004 an SEC attorney, Genevievette Walker-Lightfoot, notified the SEC of the Ponzi but was forced out of her job, the SEC later settling a claim filed by Lightfoot. Upon termination, Lightfoot turned over the Madoff file to Jacqueline Wood who then presumably buried the report, as it goes missing from that point, including information that could have exposed the Ponzi in 04. The SEC OIG’s report mentions Wood throughout the entire report as a key figure in the regulatory failure, after leaving the SEC, **Wood took a cozy Proskauer Rose partnership**[[29]](#footnote-29). Again, we find an SEC employee, Wood, taking a Proskauer partnership, similar to Sjoblom leaving the SEC for Proskauer and both directly implicated in the SEC failures. This pattern may identify to Investigators further how these alleged Criminal Enterprise Law Firms move in and out of Regulatory bodies to stave off investigations. All of the following URL’s expand on this Revolving Door of Proskauer’s and are fully incorporated by reference in entirety herein,

March 02, 2009 “**EMERGENCY MOTION TO INVESTIGATE PROSKAUER ROSE DEFENDANTS INVOLVEMENT IN THE ALLEN STANFORD FINANCIAL, THE BERNARD MADOFF AND THE MARC DRIER FRAUD SCANDALS. REMOVE PROSKAUER FROM SELF REPRESENTATION IN THESE MATTERS UNTIL SUCH TIME THAT THE FBI REMOVES THEM FROM THE ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE STANFORD FINANCIAL FRAUD**”

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090302%20FINAL%20Emergency%20Motion%20Re%20Proskauer%20Stanford%20Madoff%20Dreier%20Scandals4017.pdf>

I filed Motions at the US Second Circuit Court of Appeals and US District Court, already exhibited herein, with similar claims of regulatory failures of the prior Presidential administration. Failures allegedly directly related to the Madoff case and I have reported this to Federal Authorities. The Motions also discuss Conflicts centering on the Madoff saga where Proskauer publicly identified their firm as having the most clients in the Madoff Ponzi and now it is revealed in the press that many Madoff clients are the subject of ongoing SEC investigations as NOT VICTIMS BUT INSTEAD CRIMINAL ACCOMPLICES.

The Motion to Compel, already exhibited herein, at the US Second Circuit, is to Compel that court to address the Conflicts of Interest and other matters according to law, laws being ignored while the Court and the Defendants perpetuate never ending Conflicts and Crimes. Note here that the handling of the Madoff Ponzi is by the same courts handling my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit and that the same courts were notified for months of the correlations between the Madoff Ponzi and my Lawsuit and have failed to notify the proper authorities, including the SEC and instead attempted to bury my lawsuit and motions.

Investigators should further note that in the courts handling my Lawsuit, many of the judges and clerks are also Defendants in the Lawsuit and despite the obvious conflicts, they continue to handle the matters, as if no rules or laws apply to them. These illegal actions by members of the courts should also be cause for the SEC, FBI and others addressed herein to investigate the members of the courts involved for possible collusion and aiding and abetting these schemes through Fraud on the Courts by those Adjudicating in the Courts, in Violation Conflicts of Interest and Law.

All those addressed herein, should therefore immediately begin investigation of the Second Circuit and US District Court for the Southern District of New York court officials involved. Especially concerning their concealment from authorities of these material facts relating to these Ponzi and other schemes, again a Misprision of Felony and whereby had the courts acted within law they could have prevented injury to many Victims in these Schemes years earlier, when I initially reported Proskauer’s misdeeds to them.

This information should be cause for the Investigators summoned herein to reanalyze the entire Madoff Scheme in light of this new evidence. All asset sales and other distributions should instantly be halted until these material facts can be reviewed to determine if these funds are also relating to the Iviewit stolen patents.

* 1. **Marc S. Dreier SEC Investigation and Conviction**

The SEC Indictment and subsequent Conviction of Marc S. Dreier as it relates to Proskauer, comes from the connection to Patent Attorney Raymond A. Joao. Joao initially introduced to Iviewit as a Proskauer partner who was to take the patent disclosures on behalf of Proskauer Partner Kenneth Rubenstein. Joao was then found putting patents into his own name for inventions learned from Iviewit and myself, Joao now found with 90+ patents in his name. Joao’s fraud on Iviewit also was a FRAUD ON THE UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE and is under investigation as such with the US Patent Office and FBI, which has led to the Iviewit Patents and Intellectual Properties SUSPENSION by the Commissioner of the US Patent Office, pending investigations of Joao and many other patent attorneys.

Joao then joined the Marc S. Dreier law firm of Dreier & Baritz. This new information should be cause for the Investigators to reanalyze the entire Dreier Ponzi Scheme in light of this new evidence, and in fact, the monies of the Dreier Ponzi allegedly directly relate to royalties from sales and licensing of Joao’s stolen Intellectual Properties. The Dreier Ponzi is alleged to be another money-laundering scheme concocted by the Defendants in my Federal RICO & ANTITRUST lawsuit. Investigators should also cease distribution of assets in the Dreier Ponzi, especially where the Trustee appears conflicted with Proskauer and again the court actions may be further attempts by these all too clever law firms to abscond with funds in further illegal legal actions and Fraud on the Court.

In addition to the links in the Stanford section, which deal with the Drier / Joao / Iviewit connection, additional links below substantiate these claims and are included in entirety by reference herein,

Raymond Anthony Joao’s Biography from Dreier & Baritz LLP states, quote,

Raymond A. Joao joined Dreier & Baritz LLP in 2001 as Of Counsel to the Firm's intellectual property department. Mr. Joao brings to the Firm an extensive legal, business and engineering background encompassing virtually all aspects of intellectual property, including prosecution of patent applications; reexaminations; preparation of patent opinions; litigation; and counseling clients in the development, management and exploitation of their intellectual property assets.

Mr. Joao is also currently an intellectual property management consultant for various start-up software, telecommunication, Internet and e-commerce companies. He regularly directs new business and intellectual property development efforts; negotiates contracts; drafts license agreements; performs due diligence in mergers and acquisitions; assists in the preparation of business plans, executive summaries and other corporate documents; conducts competitive analysis studies; aids in the formulation of litigation strategies; and assists in capital raising efforts.

Notably, Mr. Joao is the inventor of 10 issued U.S. patents and has over 80 patent pending technologies. Mr. Joao was also a founder of Electroship (N.Y.), Inc. which was formed to exploit certain patent pending technologies of which Mr. Joao was a co-inventor. Electroship (N.Y.), Inc. was acquired by a public company within six months of its formation. Mr. Joao headed Electroship's intellectual property and corporate efforts, as well as the merger and acquisition deal leading up to the merger.

Prior to joining Dreier & Baritz, Mr. Joao was head of the Intellectual Property Department at Meltzer, Lippe, Goldstein & Schlissel, P.C. in Mineola, New York. He was also formerly a partner at Anderson Kill & Olick, P.C. in New York in the Intellectual Property Group. Prior to the commencement of his legal career, Mr. Joao was an electrical engineer with Loral Corporation in the Systems Engineering Group, and prior to that was an engineer with Sperry Corporation. Mr. Joao obtained a Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering in 1982 and a Master of Science in Electrical Engineering in 1984 from Columbia University School of Engineering and Applied Science. He received his law degree in 1990 from St. John's University School of Law. Most recently, in 1999, he obtained a Masters in Business Administration in Finance from Baruch College/City University. Mr. Joao is admitted to practice before the United States Patent and Trademark Office, the U.S. District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, and the New York State and Connecticut Bars. e-mail: [rjoao@dreierbaritz.com](mailto:rjoao@dreierbaritz.com).

January 02, 2009 ~ The WallStreet Journal “Former AUSA Selected as Bankruptcy Trustee in Dreier Case”, quote,

For a week, it’d been all quiet on the Marc Dreier front. But now a new lawyer is set to be welcomed to the Dreier Party. The NYLJ reports that Sheila M. Gowan (University of Minnesota, Brooklyn Law) has been selected as the bankruptcy trustee in the case. Dreier, founder and sole owner of the law firm Dreier LLP — for those of you took December off — is alleged to have perpetrated a massive fraud against a group of hedge funds. (Here’s our coverage.) Gowan, **a former Proskauer associate** [Emphasis Added] and AUSA in the Southern District of New York, is now a partner at Diamond McCarthy…

Again, Investigators should note Proskauer’s direct involvement in the Dreier matters as trustee Gowan was a former Proskauer associate. The conflict is absolute in light of the claims herein, now demanding full disclosure by Gowan and conflict waivers from the victims. When viewed in light of the Joao / Proskauer / Dreier connections described and evidenced already herein, these conflicts will preclude Gowan’s continued involvement. Again, the entire crime depends on continued conflicts of interests that preclude due process and procedure by infiltration of the Criminal Enterprise law firms into Regulatory, Prosecutorial and Court actions against them. The law firms are also well versed in court-orchestrated schemes and with infiltration into regulatory agencies are alleged to use the courts actually to effectuate further frauds. Further evidence of these crimes is at all of the following URL’s, hereby incorporated by reference in entirety herein,

March 03, 2009 ~ USDOJ Letter by Lev L. Dassin, Acting US Attorney to Judge Stuart M. Bernstein. Note that not only Gowan is copied but also Proskauer Attorney Jeffrey W. Levitan, Esq. ( Levitan ) is also copied. The SEC has absolute cause to investigate if Levitan, Gowan and/or Proskauer failed fully to disclose their involvement with Dreier through Joao and the Iviewit matters. Proskauer and presumably Gowan are fully aware of their alleged involvement in my patent theft through my Federal RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit against the Proskauer Rose Law Firm and all their Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, etc.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20090325%20Dreier%20USDOJ%20Letter%20to%20BK%20Judge%20copies%20Proskauer%20and%20former%20Proskauer%20Gowan.pdf>

Failure to disclose this material fact to the Bankruptcy court is allegedly further fraudulent activity. Investigators should also note that the courts have been notified in my legal actions and have obligations through Judicial Cannons to notify the proper authorities of any possible attorney misconduct they are aware of, or face Misprision of Felony charges and more. Thus, the courts should have also notified the SEC of the information given them in official court filings in my lawsuit regarding the Dreier lawsuit, including the correlating information in the Stanford case, which would have forced Gowan’s disclosures regarding her involvement with Proskauer and the Dreier matters and her withdrawal as Trustee.

Again, all this new information is cause for Investigators summoned herein to reinvestigate the Dreier Ponzi in light of these facts and whereby the Dreier Ponzi may be further efforts to launder monies gained from the stolen Intellectual Properties; this would represent additional Fraud Upon a United States Bankruptcy Court. All asset sales and other distributions should instantly be halted until these material facts can be reviewed to determine if these funds are also relating to the Iviewit stolen patents.

* 1. **Galleon SEC Ongoing Investigation and Convictions**

October 16, 2009 SEC Complaint Galleon

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20091016%20SEC%20Galleon%20Complaint.pdf>

NOVEMBER 04, 2009 SEC COMPLAINT GALLEON

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20091104%20Galleon%20SEC%20Complaint%20Ropes%20Gray%20etc.pdf>

With information just beginning in this massive SEC insider trading case, Investigators should again note that several of the key defendants in these matters are also Defendants in my Federal RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, as listed below.

1. **Intel Capital’s Rajiv Goel, indicted by the SEC and Intel Corporation a Central Defendant in my Federal RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit.**

Intel Capital’s, Rajiv Goel, Managing Director at Intel Corporation, implicated by the SEC in the Galleon Complaint. Investigators should take note that one of the first people on the scene at the time of the Iviewit inventions was a one Hassan Miah (“Miah”), who signed NDA’s while analyzing Iviewit as an Investment for EarthLink founders Sky Dylan Dayton and Kevin O’Donnell. Miah had worked at the Intel / Creative Artist Agency (“CAA”) Multimedia Lab prior to involvement with Iviewit and upon viewing the inventions, called them the “Holy Grail” of the Digital Imaging and Video world, including the Internet. Later, Miah again joined Intel at Intel Capital the subject of the Galleon Lawsuit. From Miah’s Biography @ Digital Hollywood, fully incorporated by reference in entirety herein, quote,

Hassan Miah is the former Managing Director of Intel Capital, where he led worldwide media and entertainment investments. Today, he remains an advisor to Intel Corporation’s Digital Home Group, which is responsible for the company’s global consumer PC product line. He is also the former head of New Media for CAA, one of Hollywood’s leading entertainment and talent agencies. While at Intel, Mr. Miah led such media related investments as Bellrock Media, Synacor, Zinio, Black Arrow, Clickstar and Gametrust. At CAA, Mr. Miah established and headed the CAA/Intel Media Lab, the first significant collaboration between Hollywood and a major technology company, and helped form Tele-TV, a joint investment by NYNEX, PacBell and Bell Atlantic to provide interactive video television services over phone lines. Before joining CAA, Mr. Miah was a Management Consulting Partner for KPMG LLP, specializing in media and entertainment transactions. At KPMG, he helped structure such transactions as the sale of MCA Universal Studios to Matsushita, the sale of Geffen Records to Universal and Polygram’s acquisition of A&M Records. Mr. Miah also has extensive operating/managerial experience having developed and sold companies in the digital media sector during his career, e.g., after creating the first consumer MP3 recording software, Mr. Miah successfully sold Xing Technology Corp. to Real Networks at a 10x multiple from when he joined the company less than two years after becoming CEO. Mr. Miah is a CPA and received a B.A. in Business from the University of Michigan and a M.B.A. from Stanford University’s Graduate School of Business.

<http://www.digitalhollywood.com/%231-DHEurope/London-WednesdayFive.html>

Miah’s involvement is also noted in an April 27, 1999 letter from Richard R. Rosman, Esq. to Miah regarding the Iviewit inventions and Proskauer Rose’s Intellectual Property Partner Rubenstein’s opinion on the technologies. Note that Rubenstein and Miah know each other through MPEG and Miah’s former employer XING. Immediately after learning of the Iviewit inventions, Miah sold XING to Real Networks as indicated above.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/1999%2004%2026%20Wheeler%20Letter%20to%20Rosman%20re%20Rubenstein%20opinion.pdf>

The following links further identify the relation to Miah and are fully incorporated in entirety by reference herein,

June 01, 1999 – Donald G. Kane, Managing Director at Goldman Sachs letter regarding Hassan Miah and Miah’s letter requesting to speak to Rubenstein.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/1999%2006%2001%20HASSAN%20LETTER%20FORWARDED%20TO%20RUBENSTEIN.pdf>

Roomy Khan, a convicted felon and former Intel employee is pleading guilty in the Galleon case and the relations between Iviewit and Intel are already described herein.

1. **Robert W. Moffat, Jr. ~ Senior Vice President, Integrated Operations at IBM Corporation.**

Investigators should note all of the following;

1. IBM is a Defendant in my Federal RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit.
2. Defendant William Dick of Defendant Foley & Lardner LLP was former IBM patent counsel for their far eastern patent pooling scheme and Iviewit Patent Counsel.
3. Defendant Brian Utley, former President of Iviewit was formerly a General Manager at the IBM Boca Raton Florida facility.
4. Christopher Clarke Wheeler of Proskauer claimed to have been the real estate legal agent for the Boca Raton, IBM facility.
5. Wheeler, Dick and Utley were part of an attempted theft of Intellectual Property from Florida businessperson Monte Friedkin.
6. Former Chief Judge of the New York courts Chief Judge Judith Kaye was a former IBM lawyer and married to Proskauer Partner Stephen R. Kaye (deceased). Stephen Kaye became an Intellectual Property partner in the Proskauer Intellectual Property group formed immediately after learning of my inventions. Both Judith Kaye and her deceased husband’s estate are Defendants in my Federal RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit.
7. Wheeler not only introduced Utley to Iviewit with a falsified resume but that Utley, Dick and Wheeler also brought in a one Michael Reale, a former IBM employee to work for Iviewit.
8. Wheeler and Utley recommended Dick to Iviewit after Joao’s termination from Iviewit and under false pretenses, again failing to notify Iviewit Management, Officers, Board Members and Investors of their prior attempted theft at Friedkin’s business and the resulting loss to Friedkin. Utley also provided a materially false resume for the Wachovia Private Placement.
9. It is alleged in my Federal RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit that IBM is part of a Criminal Patent Theft Ring committing Fraud Upon the US Patent Office and world Intellectual Property Offices.
10. The recent appointment by President Barack Obama, whom also has been notified of the Iviewit claims as evidenced further herein, of David Kappos (“Kappos”) as Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property. Kappos was a former IBM Vice President and Assistant General Counsel for Intellectual Property.

<http://www.uspto.gov/biographies/bio_kappos.htm>

1. IBM has also been notified of the same liabilities as described in the Iviewit SEC Complaint defined herein regarding Warner Bros et al. and is believed to have also concealed these liabilities from their Shareholders and where this is again cause for the SEC to investigate IBM to prevent Massive Liabilities to IBM Shareholders.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20090313%20IBM%20Notice%20of%20Liabilities%20Robert%20Weber%20Samuel%20Palmisano.pdf>

1. **Anil Kumar, Director at McKinsey & Co.**

John Calkin’s of Warner Bros. was a former McKinsey employee. Investigators should also note that H. Hickman Powell, of Iviewit’s largest investor, Crossbow Ventures, was also from McKinsey.

1. **Ropes & Gray – Arthur Cutillo, Esq. – Intellectual Property Attorney**

Investigators should note that Ropes & Gray is directly involved as counsel in the Silicon Graphics, Inc. bankruptcy, whereby Iviewit has already filed papers in that case, exhibited herein,

1. **Ropes & Gray - Brien Santarlas – Intellectual Property Attorney**

Investigators should note that 3Com is an early purveyor of the Iviewit technologies and under NDA. Investigators should also note that Ropes & Gray has patents listed at its website in digital imaging and video and that patent transfers occurred in SGI’s multiple Bankruptcy cases filed since learning of the Iviewit technologies through Real 3D, Inc. in 1998.

1. **Sullivan & Cromwell ~ Michael Kimelman, Esq. – Sullivan & Cromwell may also be involved in the SGI Bankruptcy case.**

<http://www.liquidatingtrustee.com/2010/01/continued-culture-of-conflict-and.html>

Sullivan Cromwell, Bankers Trust, Deutsche Bank Felony Conviction of Bankers Trust information at the following link, hereby incorporated by reference in entirety herein,

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20110519%20Pat%20Hanley%20Suzanne%20McCormick%20Bankers%20Trust%20Deutsche%20Bank%20Sullivan%20and%20Cromwell.pdf> .

Since the Galleon case is unfolding this information represents the initial correlations of several of the key defendants companies that may have further involvement with the Iviewit matters herein described, amendments will be made to this Formal Complaint with all those agencies addressed herein as more information is learned.

1. **Iviewit SEC Complaint Filed Against Intel, Lockheed Martin and SGI (Formerly Owners of Real 3D, Inc.)**

Please note that this Request for Investigation and Formal Complaint against Warner Bros et al. directly relates to my prior formal complaint to the SEC[[30]](#footnote-30) involving the Intel Corporation, Lockheed Martin, and Silicon Graphics, Inc. These three companies were all owners of the Real3d Inc. company ( later wholly acquired by Intel ), where my Technologies were first tested, used, viewed, approved, validated, Contracted and Licensed under Non Disclosure and other Licensing Agreements. Leading Industry Experts of the three companies at the Real3d Inc. laboratories, similar to Warner Bros et al. completed validation of the novelty of the Intellectual Properties in 1998-1999. Real 3D prior to acquisition by the minority interest owner Intel (20%), were previously located on Lockheed Martin properties in Orlando, Florida. Gerald Stanley was CEO of Real 3D, Inc. until the sale of the company to Intel, whereby Lawrence S. Palley, Director of Business Development for Intel took over the Iviewit agreements.

Complaints are on file already with the SEC against these companies for likely fraudulent stock transactions similar to those described herein committed by Warner Bros et al., as well as, likely massive fraud upon their Shareholders, Auditors and Regulators. All transactions, stock transfers, mergers and acquisitions dating back to 1998 should be part of the investigation of these companies, in addition to likely violations of FASB No. 5 and other corporate accounting rules for failure at minimum to book liabilities on the corporate financials and provide notice to Shareholders.

* 1. **Intel**

March 06, 2009 Iviewit Letter of Liabilities to Intel

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090306%20Intel%20Demand%20Letter%20&%20Liability%20Exposure%20%20Signed%203549l.pdf>

March 25, 2009 Iviewit SEC Complaint Filed

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090306%20Intel%20Demand%20Letter%20&%20Liability%20Exposure%20%20Signed%203549l.pdf>

September 15, 2009 Apple Press Release ~ Intel Counsel Bruce Sewell departs Intel to Apple

<http://www.apple.com/pr/library/2009/09/15sewell.html>

January 16, 2002 The Register “SGI transfers 3D graphics patents to MS [Microsoft]

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20020116%20SGI%20transfers%20patents%20to%20MICROSOFT.pdf>

* 1. **Lockheed**

April 16, 2009 Iviewit Letter to Lockheed’s Counsel James Comey Regarding Iviewit Liabilities

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090416%20FINAL%20SIGNED%20Demand%20Letter%20to%20Lockheed%20Comey4841clow.pdf>

April 27, 2009 Iviewit SEC Complaint Against Lockheed

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090427%20FINAL%20Lockheed%20SEC%20Complaint2064.pdf>

* 1. **Silicon Graphics Inc.**

March 19, 2009 Iviewit Letter to Elena Ramirez regarding SGI Liabilities in the Iviewit matters.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20090319%20SGI%20Notice%20of%20Liability%20Counsel%20Elena%20Rameriz.pdf>

After notification of their liability, on April 01, 2009, SGI then Filed a Chapter 11 Bankruptcy proceeding, without disclosing the liability to the Bankruptcy Court.

Investigators should note the immediate proximity of notice to SGI counsel Elena Ramirez on March 18, 2009 to the filing of the Bankruptcy and where Ramirez fails to the notify the court of the Liabilities she was aware of already, evidencing concealment from the Federal US Bankruptcy Court. This transaction may also trigger Rescissory SGI Shareholder Rights for Fraud involving this transaction.

Investigators should note that all transactions of SGI stock from 1998-Present should be investigated for fraud based on SGI’s involvement with Real 3D, Inc. and as it relates to the Iviewit matters.

Voluntary Petition (Chapter 11). Order for Relief Entered. Filed by Mark R. Somerstein of Ropes & Gray LLP on behalf of Silicon Graphics, Inc.. (Somerstein, Mark) (Entered: 04/01/2009)

April 13, 2009 Inside HPC News “A visual timeline of the rise and sale of SGI”

<http://insidehpc.com/2009/04/13/a-visual-timeline-of-the-rise-and-sale-of-sgi>

Timeline of SGI

<http://insidehpc.com/images/04132009/SGItimeline.jpg>

Vizworld Articles regarding what led to Rise and Fall of SGI

<http://www.vizworld.com/tag/sgi-bts>

<http://www.vizworld.com/?s=iviewit>

April 09, 2009 Federal Bankruptcy Complaint Silicon Graphics, Inc. **“Emergency Motion to Establish Proof of Claim; Vacate or Modify Order of Sale; Injunction; Priority of Claims; and Other Relief”**

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090409%20FINAL%20US%20Bankruptcy%20Court%20SDNY%20SGI%20Motion.pdf>

May 05, 2009 Ropes & Gray **“OBJECTION OF THE DEBTORS TO EMERGENCY MOTION OF ELIOT I. BERNSTEIN TO ESTABLISH PROOF OF CLAIM; VACATE OR MODIFY ORDER OF SALE; INJUNCTION; PRIORITY OF CLAIMS; AND OTHER RELIEF”** (related document(s) 102 ) filed by Mark R. Somerstein on behalf of Silicon Graphics, Inc.. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A - Original Complaint# 2 Exhibit B - Amended Complaint (Part 1)# 3 Exhibit B - Amended Complaint (Part 2)# 4 Exhibit B - Amended Complaint (Part 3)# 5 Exhibit C - District Court Order) (Somerstein, Mark) (Entered: 05/05/2009)

Objection to Motion

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=318>

Related Document

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=102>

# 1 Exhibit A - Original Complaint

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=318&sd=1>

#2 Exhibit B - Amended Complaint (Part 1)

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=318&sd=2>

# 3 Exhibit B - Amended Complaint (Part 2)

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=318&sd=3>

# 4 Exhibit B - Amended Complaint (Part 3)

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=318&sd=4>

# 5 Exhibit C - District Court Order)

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=318&sd=5>

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/SGI%20Bankruptcy/Bernstein%20Objection.pdf>

May 05, 2009 SGI Counsel Elena Rameriz Declaration to Bankruptcy Court titled, **“Affidavit Declaration of Elena Ramirez in Support of the Objection of the Debtors to the Emergency Motion of Eliot I. Bernstein to Establish Proof of Claim; Vacate or Modify Order of Sale; Injunction; Priority of Claims; and Other Relief”** filed by Mark R. Somerstein on behalf of Silicon Graphics, Inc.. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A - Bernstein Letter to General Counsel of Intel Corporation# 2 Exhibit B - Bernstein Letter to the President of the United States# 3 Exhibit C - Bernstein Complaint to SEC) (Somerstein, Mark) (Entered: 05/05/2009)

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/SGI%20Bankruptcy/Ramirez%20Declaration.pdf>

May 08, 2009 Eliot Bernstein prepared statement read into record during hearing of SGI Bankruptcy @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/SGI%20Bankruptcy/20090508%20SGI%20BK%20Hearing%20Script%20into%20records.pdf>

A copy of this hearing was presumably transcribed into the record and where the SEC and others addressed herein may wish to obtain copies of the hearing as part of this Formal Complaint.

May 08, 2009 – Order Denying **“Emergency Motion of Eliot I. Bernstein to Establish Proof of Claim; Vacate or Modify Order of Sale; Injunction; Priority of Claims; and Other Relief.”** (Related Doc # 102 , Doc # 318 ) (Tetzlaff, Deanna) (Entered: 05/08/2009)

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=367>

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=102>

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=318>

June 16, 2009 Iviewit **“Proof of Claim”** SGI Bankruptcy @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090616%20FINAL%20NYSD%20BK%20Proof%20of%20Claim%20and%20Letter%20SGI%20BK.pdf>

August 14, **2009 “Motion for Objection to Claim(s)** Number: 225 - Objection of the Debtors to Claim of Eliot I. Bernstein with hearing to be held on 9/15/2009 at 10:00 AM at Courtroom 501 (MG) Responses due by 9/10/2009, filed by Mark R. Somerstein on behalf of Graphics Properties Holdings, Inc.. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A# 2 Exhibit B - Part 1# 3 Exhibit B - Part 2# 4 Exhibit B - Part 3# 5 Exhibit C - Ramirez Declaration# 6 Exhibit A to Ramirez Declaration# 7 Exhibit B to Ramirez Declaration# 8 Exhibit C to Ramirez Declaration# 9 Exhibit D# 10 Exhibit E# 11 Exhibit F - Gibson Declaration# 12 Exhibit G# 13 Exhibit H - Proposed Order)(Somerstein, Mark) (Entered: 08/14/2009)

Docket for SGI Bankruptcy

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/Dockets/sgi/09-11701>

August 14, **2009 “Notice of Hearing regarding Objection of the Debtors to Claim of Eliot I. Bernstein** (related document(s) 606 ) filed by Mark R. Somerstein on behalf of Graphics Properties Holdings, Inc.. with hearing to be held on 9/15/2009 at 10:00 AM at Courtroom 501 (MG) Objections due by 9/10/2009, (Somerstein, Mark) (Entered: 08/14/2009)”

September 11, 2009 **“Response - Claimant - Creditor Eliot I. Bernstein’s Response and Cross Motion to Debtor’s Objections to the Bernstein Proof of Claim”** No. 225 filed by Debtor Counsel Ropes and Gray, LLP filed by Eliot I. Bernstein. with hearing to be held on 9/15/2009 at 10:00 AM at Courtroom 501 (MG) (Lopez, Mary) (Entered: 09/11/2009)

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=660>

September 13, 2009 **“Response - Reply Of The Debtors To Claimant Creditor Eliot I. Bernstein’s Response And Cross Motions To Debtor's Objections To The Bernstein Proof Of Claim** No. 225 Filed By Debtor Counsel Ropes and Gray, LLP, And Motion To Estimate The Claim Of Eliot I. Bernstein (related document(s) 660 ) filed by Mark R. Somerstein on behalf of Graphics Properties Holdings, Inc.. with hearing to be held on 9/15/2009 at 10:00 AM at Courtroom 501 (MG) (Somerstein, Mark) (Entered: 09/13/2009)

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=664>

September 15, 2009 **“Order Signed on 9/15/2009 Sustaining the Objection of the Debtors to Claim of Eliot I. Bernstein”**. (related document(s) 606 ) (Tetzlaff, Deanna) (Entered: 09/15/2009)

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=676>

November 19, **2009 “Motion to Compel - Letter to the Clerk’s Office with Motion to Compel and Disqualify and Other Relief Under Rule 9024 and FRCP Rule 60 filed by Eliot Ivan Bernstein.”** (Lopez, Mary) (Entered: 11/24/2009)

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=841>

Investigators should note here that this document was not docketed when received by the court on September 18, 2009.

December 30, 2009 **“Order Denying Eliot Bernstein’s (1) Motion for Reconsideration Under Bankruptcy Rule 9024 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60 and (2) Motion to Disqualify (Related Doc # 841 ) signed on 12/30/2009”** (White, Greg) (Entered: 12/30/2009)

<http://www.donlinrecano.com/cases/docketfile.ashx?cl=sgi&c=09-11701&d=865>

Investigators should note that this document was not served upon me and was found on the docket while preparing this Formal Complaint. Again, all those addressed herein, should note how Federal Bankruptcy Judge Martin Glenn, similar to the US Second Circuit, failed to address the factual conflicts in the case and instead tried to dismiss the complaint while failing to address the conflicts of interest and further conceal the Fraud on the Bankruptcy court. Glenn’s actions reek of illegal behavior, formal criminal complaints will follow this complaint, with all appropriate authorities.

Investigators should intercede in this Bankruptcy on behalf of the Shareholders of SGI. The Bankruptcy attempts to shift intellectual properties, which may also be related to these matters. Of course, if fraud is determined to have occurred by Executive Officers of Real 3D, Inc., Intel, Lockheed Martin and SGI, again the Shareholders of those companies would have Rescissory Shareholder Rights due to the fraud. Again, the results will be catastrophic, as already described herein and in the former SEC Official Complaints filed against these companies. Whereby the bankruptcies may represent a shell game scheme through another Fraud on a US Federal Bankruptcy court, attempting to hide and distribute assets to Officers and Directors at the expense of Shareholders, again in violation of a mass of SEC laws.

**Iviewit Additional NEW Information Regarding SEC Investigations of Enron Broadband, Enron and Arthur Andersen**

This Formal Complaint, as it relates to the herein relevant Federal, State and International Crimes may have direct bearing of the Ongoing Investigations of Enron and Andersen and if those investigations are not currently active, this information may be cause for further new Investigations or re-opening prior investigations in light of this information already provided herein.

**2004-Present SEC Investigation of Iviewit Allegations and False Statements by Boca Raton Police Department Detectives to SEC**

2004-Present SEC Investigation Regarding Iviewit and Boca Raton, Florida, Police Department regarding Investigations of Stolen Funds and Intellectual Properties. SEC Investigators claim that statements made by the Boca Raton Police Department were false regarding a two-year SEC investigation that the SEC was supposed to have been conducting with the Boca PD per detectives at the Boca PD. SEC agents involved denied ever being informed or jointly working on any investigation with the Boca PD and further denied that they were invited to a meeting at the Boca Raton PD that the Boca PD stated they would be attending. Based on these false claims by the Boca PD, the agents involved at the SEC claimed they were beginning an investigation of the matters at that time.

October 07, 2004 Iviewit Petition to the Florida Supreme Court regarding the SEC and Boca Raton, FL Police Department Bogus Joint Investigation @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2004_10_07_Supreme_Court_Florida_Motion_Final_Cert_Signed.pdf>

October 08, 2004 Supplemental Petition to Florida Supreme Court Regarding SEC and Boca Raton Police Department Bogus Joint Investigation @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2004%2010%2008%20Flordia%20Supreme%20Court%20SC104%201078%20motion%20supp%20cert%20.pdf>

August 28, 2003 Written Statement to Boca Raton PD Regarding Stolen Funds, Including SBA funds @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/POLICE%20REPORT%20-%20STOLEN%20CASH%20TIEDEMANN%20PROLOW%20PROSKAUER.pdf>

September 02, 2003 Written Statement to Boca Raton PD Regarding Stolen Intellectual Property @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/Written%20Statement%202%20-%20Stolen%20Intellectual%20Property.pdf>

1. **THE REVOLVING DOOR OF CONFLICTS FROM “FAVORED” LAW FIRMS TO THE COURTS, TO PROSECUTORIAL OFFICES, TO REGULATORY OFFICES, TO OVERSIGHT AGENCIES AND THEN BACK AGAIN ~ THE CRIMINAL GOLDEN PARACHUTE THAT LED TO THE CONTROLLED DEMOLITION OF WALL STREET AND WORLD MARKETS, THE LARGEST CRIMINAL THEFT IN US HISTORY**

Anderson’s allegations exposes a gang, a Criminal RICO Organization that has committed more than the necessary Predicate Acts by far to satisfy a Criminal RICO and comprised of corrupted “FAVORED LAW FIRMS AND LAWYERS,” including but not limited to, Court Officials, Prosecutors and Regulators, all Violating masses of Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Office Rules & Regulations and State & Federal Law. Further, the gang has members who infiltrate Public Office with intent to Violate Law, laws they are sworn to uphold. Infiltration top down, in order to facilitate the crimes with scienter, subterfuge of the highest posts at the US Attorney, the DA, the ADA, the New York Supreme Court and all of their corresponding Regulatory Agencies. The picture that emerges is of a Coup D’état on parts of New York and the US Government by these Law Firms and Lawyers, parts 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 and the Courts. 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 are 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[[31]](#footnote-31).** This abuse destroys the victims’ lives and faith in our system of Jurisprudence, leaving them with shattered homes, marriages, financially depraved and feeling that there is nowhere and no one to turn to for help. In cases, like my own, when legal abuse alone is not enough to drive the victim to the ground and normal intimidations fail, the RICO Organization is capable of ATTEMPTED MURDER through MOB STYLED CAR BOMBINGS.

  
(where the kids would have been)

You can imagine just how difficult it has become for my wife and me to start the car in the morning to take our children to school. Again, due to incredibly effective planting inside the government, the FBI agent investigating the Iviewit matters have disappeared according to the FBI with the Iviewit Patent and Bombing Files, derailing investigation and thus prosecution of those involved for several years now and elevating the matters to the Department of Justice Inspector General and the Department of Justice Office of Professional Responsibility.

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**[[32]](#footnote-32), WITHOUT a SINGLE ARREST of the ATTORNEYS AT LAW involved in the creation of each and every document which facilitated all of the rampant 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, it is critical to 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 with their corporate clientele[[33]](#footnote-33). 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 MASS FRAUD 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. The Committee is Chaired by Hon. Carl Levin and assisted in bipartisan fashion by Tom Coburn, Ranking Minority Member and is titled **WALL STREET AND THE FINANCIAL CRISIS: Anatomy of a Financial Collapse.** The Report is located at the following URL, hereby fully incorporated in entirety by reference herein,

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

This detailed stinging report alleges fraud over 200 times in 650 pages and still not a single arrest, while most of this Criminal Activity defined in the report is taking place in New York and continues to take place, and why not. Crime Pays when no one is protecting the People[[34]](#footnote-34) and Justice is complicit in the crimes. 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 and again more lawyers with interests in the controlled demolition of the markets. Further, reports[[35]](#footnote-35) 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 and then leave their government posts and enter the “Revolving Door” of the Criminal Law Firms[[36]](#footnote-36). Note that the Lawmakers and Law Firms began removing regulations over the years and, on information and belief, deregulation had ulterior motive of opening the door for these financial crimes to be committed and purposefully lead to the “CONTROLLED DEMOLITION of the MARKETS.”

They now try to hide their criminal acts, by referring to them as resulting from “lax regulators” and “deregulation[[37]](#footnote-37)” the cover story in efforts to evade prosecution.

Therefore, not one Regulator/Lawyer has been prosecuted for any of their massive “ Regulatory Failures” aka Criminal Failures, as the Prosecutors and Regulators[[38]](#footnote-38) appear holding the door open for their accomplices as the loot is carted off. In fact, after their government disservices the “REGULATORS”/CROOKS, appear then to enter the never-ending “Revolving Door” to the Corrupt Law Firms, 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 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 even “The Cleaner” and the courts AID and ABET the Criminal Enterprise in efforts to derail her Lawsuit, prior to full formal investigations. Obviously, this **INTENTIONAL FAILURE TO INVESTIGATE AND PROSECUTE** is because the guilty parties 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 registered with any of the Courts or Court Agencies sued in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit. The conflicted parties include but not limited to, the New York Supreme Court, the New York Second Circuit, the Virginia Supreme Court, the Florida Supreme Court and the Bar Associations/Disciplinary Departments in those three states and any of the thousands of Lawyers/Criminals/Defendants who work at any of the Law Firms sued. Finally, a PROSECUTOR/FEDERAL MONITOR must be found who will sign and affirm 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 Court Officials involved in the 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 Attorney General represents against

Whistleblower Anderson & Iviewit, acting as Counsel to State

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

Prosecutor to investigate

where Attorney General 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 Attorney General 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.

1. **Relief sought**
   1. Investigate Emily Cole to determine if she is related to Andrew Cuomo and investigate the Conflict of Interest created by her handling complaint information for her boss, Steven Michael Cohen.
   2. Investigate Steven M. Cohen and Andrew Cuomo for further Conflict of Interest in handling complaint matters where he is a complained of party in several Criminal Complaint filed.
   3. Remove the New York Attorney General from further representations in the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, the Anderson Whistleblower Lawsuit and all “Legally Related” Lawsuits.
   4. Remove the New York Attorney General from handling Iviewit Criminal Complaints filed with the Attorney General’s office dating back to those filed with the Spitzer Administration and have them reviewed by a NON CONFLICTED SPECIAL PROSECUTOR/FEDERAL MONITOR, noting the prior Conflicts.
   5. Replace the New York Attorney General with NON-CONFLICTED INDEPENDENT COUNSEL in the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit for the New York State Attorney General’s Office, New York State Attorney General Officials already named herein and ALL State/Actor Defendants already defined herein and in my RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit and Anderson’s Whistleblower Lawsuit.
   6. Notify the State Actors/Defendants in the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit, the Anderson Whistleblower Lawsuit and the “Legally Related” Lawsuits that due to ADMITTED AND ACKNOWLEDGED Conflicts of Interest at the Attorney General’s office, they must seek new NON CONFLICTED INDEPENDENT COUNSEL to represent them both Professionally and Individually.
   7. Send notice to all parties listed herein of the Conflicts of Interest identified by the New York Attorney General and that any submission by the New York Attorney General’s Office in any Criminal Complaint and/or Court Filing was tendered in Conflict and thereby invalidated.
   8. Begin immediate investigations of the Iviewit Criminal Complaints defined herein and in exhibit and notify Courts adjudicating any Ponzi Schemes listed herein, or other financial crimes listed herein, of the relationship of these schemes to the Iviewit Criminal Complaints. Seek an Order to Halt these cases and freeze any asset distribution until such time that these matters can be evaluated in light of the suppressed Iviewit information.
   9. Witness Protection paid for by New York State for Anderson and ALL “Legally Related” Lawsuits. ALL of these “Legally Related” Whistleblowers are in DANGER based on, as yet uninvestigated claims of EXTORTIONARY THREATS ON A FEDERAL WITNESS, Nicole Corrado, a New York Supreme Court Official, made by SENIOR NEW YORK SUPREME COURT OFFICIALS and a CAR BOMBING ATTEMPTED MURDER OF INVENTOR ELIOT BERNSTEIN AND FAMILY, as already defined herein.
   10. Secure and Retain Records and make Copies of Records from ALL Iviewit/Eliot Bernstein Proceedings and Complaints, now necessary from all Government Agencies involved in the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit and that have had formal complaints filed with their offices, due to the Anderson’s eyewitness testimony of File Tampering, Destruction & Altercation of Official Records. Copies of Records, in entirety, dating back to 2000 and forward to today’s date, formally requested herein, in order to verify the veracity of the Public Records against what was filed. Iviewit and Eliot I. Bernstein Proceedings must be copied and delivered to Eliot Bernstein/Iviewit at the address, 2753 NW 34th St. Boca Raton, Florida 33434, from all of the following agencies;
       1. The New York Attorney General & The New York Attorney General Office of Public Integrity – Copies of all Files and Records regarding Iviewit and Eliot I. Bernstein
       2. The New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department
       3. The New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee
       4. The New York Supreme Court Appellate Division Second Department
       5. The New York Supreme Court Appellate Division Second Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee
       6. The United States District Court Southern District of New York records for the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuits
       7. The United States Second Circuit Court of Appeals records for the Iviewit RICO & ANTITRUST Lawsuit
       8. The Department of Justice, United States Attorney Office ~ New York
       9. The District Attorney ~ New York.
   11. If the Receiver of this letter does not tender a Written Response to this Letter/Complaint within 10 business days, please be advised that your name may be included in future criminal Obstruction & RICO investigations. Please also take note that any review or adjudication on these matters by ANY party, prior to a full and formal Written and Affirmed, Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form will automatically result in Criminal Charges being filed against you for OBSTRUCTION of JUSTICE and RICO related crimes, as already defined herein.
   12. Notify State & Federal Auditors of Twelve Count Twelve Trillion Dollar Liability against State of New York Prosecutorial Agencies and Courts.
   13. Notify State & Federal Auditors of Legal Fee issues defined already herein.

**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 MANAttorney GeneralEMENT & 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’HAttorney GeneralEN 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 & 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 Related to Christine C. Anderson
* 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  
[iviewit@iviewit.tv](mailto:iviewit@iviewit.tv)   
2753 NW 34th St.  
Boca Raton, FL 33434  
(561) 245-8588 (o)  
(561) 886-7627 (c)  
<http://www.iviewit.tv>

cc/ec:

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

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

Cynthia A. Schnedar, Acting Inspector General ~ U. S. Department of Justice [cynthia.a.schnedar@usdoj.gov](mailto:cynthia.a.schnedar@usdoj.gov) & [oig.hotline@usdoj.gov](mailto:oig.hotline@usdoj.gov)

HOUSE AND SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEES

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

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

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

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

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL, Eric Holder, Jr.,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Hon. Preet Bharara, United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York ~ United States Department of Justice [Preet.Bharara@usdoj.gov](mailto:Preet.Bharara@usdoj.gov)

Hon. William M. Welch II, Chief, Public Integrity Unit ~ United States Department of Justice [AskDOJ@usdoj.gov](mailto:AskDOJ@usdoj.gov)

The Hon. John L. Sampson, Chairman ~ New York State Senate Judiciary Committee [sampson@senate.state.ny.us](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:Governor.Cuomo@exec.ny.gov) and [Andrew.cuomo@exec.ny.gov](mailto:Andrew.cuomo@exec.ny.gov)

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

[steven.cohen@exec.ny.gov](mailto:steven.cohen@exec.ny.gov) and [lisa.cantwell@exec.ny.gov](mailto: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](mailto:ny1@ic.fbi.gov)

The Honorable Elena Kagan, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States [ekagan@law.harvard.edu](mailto:ekagan@law.harvard.edu)

The Honorable Neal Katyal, Acting Solicitor General of the United States, Solicitor General, US Department of Justice [AskDOJ@usdoj.gov](mailto:AskDOJ@usdoj.gov) and [katyaln@law.georgetown.edu](mailto: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](mailto:shira_a._scheindlin@NYSD.uscourts.gov)

Peter L. McClintock, Deputy Inspector General ~ Small Business Administration [peter.mcclintock@SBA.gov](mailto:peter.mcclintock@SBA.gov) and [oig@sba.gov](mailto: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](mailto:cpm@carpmaels.com) and [info@patentepi.com](mailto: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 individually filed several prior separate 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. “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. <http://www.zimbio.com/photos/Maria+Cuomo+Cole/Emily+Cole/Cannes+Film+Festival/J5qqur_otEh> [↑](#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. New York State Public Officers Law § 17 Sec 2 (b) - New York State Public Officers Law. § 17. 2 (b) Subject to the conditions set forth in paragraph (a) of this subdivision, the employee shall be entitled to be represented by the attorney general, provided, however, that the employee shall be entitled to representation by private counsel of his choice in any civil judicial proceeding whenever the attorney general determines based upon his investigation and review of the facts and circumstances of the case that representation by the attorney general would be inappropriate, or whenever a court of competent jurisdiction, upon appropriate motion or by a special proceeding, determines that a conflict of interest exists and that the employee is entitled to be represented by private counsel of his choice. <http://www.ogs.state.ny.us/supportservices/defibrillators/PublicOfficersLawSect17.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 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-6)
7. 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/*060809%20New%20York%20Judiciary%20Committee%20Hearing%20First%20Dept%20Transcript.pdf)

   fully incorporated in entirety by reference herein.

   September 24, 2009 Judiciary Committee Hearing Transcript

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

   fully incorporated in entirety by reference herein.

   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>

   fully incorporated in entirety by reference herein.

   \*\*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-7)
8. “Elder abuse, neglect rampant in US” Mike Kellerman, Press TV, Washington, May 9, 2011

   <http://www.presstv.ir/detail/179086.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. “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-9)
10. 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-10)
11. “Patentgate Ethics Scam Hits Holocaust Survivor...” Expose Corrupt Courts Blogspot, Frank Brady aka Kevin McKeown

    <http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2007/08/patentgate-ethics-scam-hits-holocaust.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. New York Senate Judiciary Committee Hearings Video

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

    and

    <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=28afajRkDwY> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Anderson’s Motion to Remove the Attorney General can be found at the following URL’s and Anderson’s arguments for removing the Attorney General 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-13)
14. 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-14)
15. <http://www.law.cornell.edu/ethics/ny/code/NY_CODE.HTM> Conflict of Interest Disciplinary Rule 5 [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. 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-16)
17. “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-17)
18. “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-18)
19. “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-19)
20. “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-20)
21. Insurance Noir - Private eyes – Eliot’s (Small) World, by Neil Weinberg and Michael Maiello, November 29, 2004 Forbes Magazine

    <http://iviewit.tv/Eliot%20Spitzers%20Small%20World.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. [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-22)
23. [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-23)
24. 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-24)
25. 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>

    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%20Attorney General%20Cuomo%20letter%20email%20copy.pdf](http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080305%20Final%20Plaintiff%20Oposition%20to%20AG%20Cuomo%20letter%20email%20copy.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. The number of Iviewit Defendants in toto is enormous, tens of thousands infringers of the PATENT PENDING technologies exist in manufacturing the inventions alone. If end users of the technologies are included, it would be hundreds of millions of infringers, including everyone who watches a digital video on the Internet, the TV and cell phone/pda, everyone who uses digital scalable zoom on cameras, medical devices, telescopes, flight simulators, etc. Without the technologies, there would be, NO YouTube, NO Video over the Internet at Full Screen Full Frame Rate, NO Low Band Video Conference or Cell Phone Video and more. The inventions literally changed the World and everything Digital in it, thus why leading engineers worldwide deemed them the “The Holy Grail.” In fact, Video Transmissions over the Internet account for the vast majority of use over the Internet and on PDA’s, making Multimedia far more valuable than say the Operating System, i.e. Windows. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. The SEC should also note that Christopher Clark Wheeler of Proskauer has taken early retirement from Proskauer Rose after ALMOST twenty years. See February 04, 2010 Press Release from the GEO group @

    <http://www.docstoc.com/docs/24373589/The-GEO-Group-Announces-the-Appointment-of-Christopher-C-Wheeler-to-Its-Board-of-Directors> [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. February 27, 2009 “FBI make first arrest in $8 billion Allen Stanford fraud investigation” Telegraph Media Group Limited @

    <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/4860579/FBI-make-first-arrest-in-8-billion-Allen-Stanford-fraud-investigation.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. “Bernie Madoff: SEC Investigator Fingered Bernie In '04; SEC Chief Lori Richards "Resigns"

    TPM Media LLC. July 9, 2009 @

    <http://tpmcafe.talkingpointsmemo.com/talk/blogs/mrs_panstreppon/2009/07/bernie-madoff-sec-investigator.php> [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. March 25, 2009 SEC COMPLAINT – Real 3D, Inc,, Intel, Silicon Graphics and Lockheed Martin

    <http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090325%20FINAL%20Intel%20SEC%20Complaint%20SIGNED2073.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Citizens for Judicial Accountability Inc.

    <http://www.judicialaccountability.org/legalabuse.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. “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-32)
33. “New York Investigates Banks’ Role in Fiscal Crisis” By GRETCHEN MORGENSON, Published: May 16, 2011, © 2011 The New York Times Company <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/17/business/17bank.html?adxnnl=1&src=un&feedurl=http://json8.nytimes.com/pages/business/index.jsonp&adxnnlx=1305630229-UHO7weikER9kfLAhNwOmNg> [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. “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-34)
35. 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>

    “Former S.E.C. Official Said to Be Subject of Criminal Inquiry” By EDWARD WYATT Published: May 13, 2011, The New York Times Company

    <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/14/business/14sec.html?_r=1&partner=rss&emc=rss>

    “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>

    “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

    <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=woXzgoja7Ao>

    “The People vs. Goldman Sachs ~ A Senate committee has laid out the evidence. Now the Justice Department should bring criminal charges” By Matt Taibbi, May 11, 2011 , The Rolling Stone

    <http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/the-people-vs-goldman-sachs-20110511?print=true>

    New York Media LLC / New York Magazine SERIES

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

    New York Media LLC / New York Magazine

    <http://nymag.com/news/business/wallstreet/>

     

    “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

    <http://nymag.com/news/business/wallstreet/preet-bharara-2011-4>

    

    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-35)
36. “Revolving door between SEC, law firms spins at dizzying speed ~ New database shows more than 200 ex-SEC staff appeared at agency on behalf of corporate clients” By Ben Hallman, May 13, 2011, i watch news / Center for Public Integrity
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