

End Discrimination Now-Judicial Reform Now

End Discrimination Now-Judicial Reform Now

Distributed by Free-Press-Release.com

917 596 2319

www.enddiscriminationnow.com

CHIEF JUDGE SUED FOR "OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE" IN LANDMARK CASE OF "CASE FIXING".

JUDGES JONATHAN LIPPMAN, SHIRA SCHEINDLIN CHARGED WITH "FIXING" CASES FOR VERIZON, WPP GROUP IN "FAVORS FOR PROMOTIONS" SCAM; AG ASKED TO INVESTIGATE JUDICIARY " AS ORGANIZED CRIME UNIT";

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

(Free-Press-Release.com) Aug 5, 2012 -- March 5th 2011, New York, N.Y.: Chief Judge Jonathan Lippman and thirty other defendants including two corporations, Verizon Communications and WPP Group, 13 appellate-federal judges, five law firms, and the Judicial Conduct Commission itself in New York have been served a lawsuit by Plaintiff Kathryn Jordan in Federal Court (09 cv 10616) alleging "obstruction of justice" and eight other acts of civil fraud. Jordan is President and Founder of End Discrimination Now and a former Fortune 100 executive and management consultant. The Chief Judge has been charged with transforming the Judiciary from the enforcer of Federal and State laws into an arcane, corrupt system of favors, partisanship and political ideology where justice is bought and sold everyday". The complaint alleges that the Defendant judges illegally used their judicial power and discretion to "fix" cases and litigation outcomes, frequently manipulating and circumventing the Rules of Evidence and the Rule of Law in the process. Under the "favors for promotions" scam, corporate defendants would be relieved of liability for violations of federal and state laws, even judgments after trial, or cut unspoken deals to have their cases positioned for early "settlements", the latter of which were always a fraction of the corporate exposure. In return for dispensing these favors, the judicial defendants would often receive valuable references, introductions and vetting assistance from grateful corporations. Several of the jurists involved in the instant matter, including Chief Judge Jonathan Lippman, former Chief Judge Judith Kaye, Judge Luis Gonzales, and Judge Rolando Acosta all received promotions within a year of these "deals". Judge Acosta's promotion was announced four days after Judge Lippman issued the First Department Opinion that reversed the jury verdict, an opinion that not only declared an open bias on the case, but endorsed the misconduct of the trial judge (Acosta) who had been accused of allowing a discharged attorney to improperly influence him about a \$1.3M contingent legal fee. The Rules of Judicial Conduct require that all judges report misconduct by fellow jurists, not cover up the complaints or discredit the complainants. The lawsuit alleges that both WPP Group and Verizon Corporation's CEO's, Sir Martin Sorrell and Ivan Seidenberg, authorized their General Counsel's to perpetuate frivolous appeals and prolong litigation after they defaulted on their obligations to mitigate the acts of discrimination against the Plaintiff. The goal was clearly to wage a 15 year "war of attrition" against the Plaintiff, who was known to suffer from MS. Jordan has been a long time advocate for enforcement of discrimination laws which have been weakened over the years by judges who "settle" strong discrimination cases, or who manipulate outcomes to enable corporate defendants' circumvention of New York Laws. Ms. Jordan was formerly a disabled executive at both companies. WPP Group

refused to pay the \$3.3M Bond, after losing the jury case on the merits and agreed law of the case", and Verizon deployed coercion to force a token settlement" under fraudulent circumstances then reneged on the token terms a month after the deal".

The Chief Judge s fingerprints" are all over the Jordan v. Bates case (118785-99-cv), arguably the most important perceived disability" discrimination case in decades, to dispense a favor to Drinker Biddle s client, WPP Group, finding that there was no evidence" to support a rational jury verdict, or that the Judgment Notwithstanding the Verdict (JNOV) post trial pleading was improperly denied by the trial court (Acosta). Ironically, Lippman failed to consider the narrow legal provisions for reconsidering JNOV s at the appellate level and improperly considered the allegations of misconduct against Judge Acosta filed by Jordan as evidence" of Appellant s alleged lack of credibility" during the discrimination case. This was a serious fallacy as the misconduct" allegations not only were not before the jury, they had not even occurred at the time the discrimination case was heard. Further, the all male Lippman panel was so biased that it completely disregarded the sworn admissions of guilt by the employer. Finally, instead of denying the WPP appeal as frivolous", Judge Lippman used this opportunity" to re-write discrimination law from the bench and convinced the Court of Appeals not to hear the most important perceived disability" appeal in decades, instead adjudicating the Bianca Jagger Eviction Case". Consequently, it came as no surprise that Judge Lippman, having dispensed several large favors to parties who had cases before him, was later put on the "short list" of candidates for Chief Judge of the New York Court of Appeals, despite his obvious paucity of qualifications for the job, being neither a scholar nor experienced trial judge.

United States District Court Judge Shira Scheindlin is also accused of fixing" a disability discrimination case involving the Plaintiff so that the case would be secretly settled" and not tried before a jury as Plaintiff demanded. Scheindlin herself illegally intervened in the settlement process, deployed improper threats of litigation and sanctions" to scare the Plaintiff into accession, and refused to allow the litigant the right to counsel or legal review of the legalese riddle Agreement". Paul Hastings conspired with Plaintiff s attorneys at Outten & Golden s Gary Phelan, and David Fish, to coerce Plaintiff into accepting the token settlement. As in the Jordan v. Bates" case, the "Second Circuit" appellate review panel acted to enable the cover up. Four related malpractice cases were then disposed of prior to discovery by Supreme Court Judge Marcy Friedman, despite the First Department Decision determination that there were fatal" defects in handling of evidence and law. The Malpractice cases were denied on appeal again when Judges Acosta and Catterson made appearances again, despite clear conflicts of interest, instead of recusing themselves and dismissed the appeals. The matter is now before the Court of Appeals.

A key defendant is the Commission for Judicial Conduct, which has been alleged to have abdicated its role as the regulatory oversight for the Judiciary and acted to enable the violations, frauds and cover ups. The 2009 Annual Report attests to a historic rise in complaints against judges", while investigating only a fraction of the same, and rarely issuing any censure or sanction and systematically avoiding censure of the higher level judges, especially at the appellate level. Forty complaints against appellate judges were filed in 2009, but none were investigated. The instant case tests the underlying premise that judges are immune" from prosecution for violations of New York Law. Apparently because the judges involved acted outside their authorized role, and committed crimes against the State, the normal immunity" that Judges are afforded is not available to them. It is not known if the allegations rise to the criminal felony" level at this time. Legally, the case has been given a boost by the Judicial Conference s recent amendment in July 2009 which strengthened the basis upon which judges can be found in violation of Judiciary Law Canon I: if they demonstrate conduct which gives the appearance of impropriety"; and under Canon II; the section

addressing improper influence“ has been codified to support the impropriety“ violation. Recent impeachment cases that have been successful involved matters where the actions of the jurist were willful, there was an attempt to evade investigators, or where the Judge used taxpayer funds to effect the frauds. Jordan has petitioned the Attorney General to represent her on behalf of the People of New York, while the Defendants are claiming entitlement to representation under Public Officer s Law 17“. End Discrimination Now has condemned the judges attempt to deploy tax payer resources to run a tax payer financed defense“ while the disabled plaintiff, who has already endured 15 years of litigation, would have to prosecute the case not only against the 30 Defendants but the Attorney General s office. Jordan s landmark case was filed after she realized that there was a pattern of misconduct with multiple judges in multiple related cases conspiring to fix“ the outcomes and cover up the deceptions with the arms-length assistance of corporate attorneys“. Importantly, Jordan recognized that the judges involved not only stepped outside the broad protections of their immunity but the deus ex machina“ for the frauds was the conversion of judgments or potential judgment risks against large corporate defendants into favors dispensed by the Judges, which would then be converted back into favors, IOU s“, with the same corporate law firms, options“ that would be exercised at a future date. This was a real epiphany. Monetizing the fraud was the key“, Jordan observed. It was clear that the judges were doling out favors. We had to define the premise that made this favors illegal, and it was the conversion of the favors to promotions, &/or favors into future IOU s, along with clear pattern of cooperation (conspiracy) by multiple judges in multiple courts acting outside their legislated role“.

Judicial Reform Now activist groups testified to the pervasiveness of the culture of corruption“ in the Judiciary and Chief Judge Lippman's leadership role at the Public Hearings before the NY Senate in July 2009,have lobbied the Attorney General to investigate the claims and for the Senate to sponsor the "Impeachment Bill". Senator Sampson, who aligned with Judge Lippman after a deal was cut for his district, has declined to support the bill. END and JRN are seeking a comprehensive "Judicial Reform Mandate" and paradigm for the Modern Court.

#

Free Press Release

Free-Press-Release.com is a press release distribution service since 2001.