

EXHIBIT 1

Expose Corrupt Courts Stories Relevant to this RICO

THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 2007

“SEX SCANDAL AT THE ATTORNEY COMMITTEE ON CHARACTER & FITNESS...THE LID IS OFF THE COVER-UP OF THE RECENT SEX SCANDAL ROCKING THE COMMITTEE ON CHARACTER & FITNESS AT THE NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT, APPELLATE DIVISION, FIRST DEPARTMENT ON MADISON AVENUE.”

<http://www.exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2007/06/sex-scandal-at-attorney-committee-on.html>

SATURDAY, JULY 21, 2007

“COURT OVERHAUL BEGINS: ATTORNEY DISCIPLINARY CHIEF COUNSEL CAHILL FIRST TO GO...”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2007/07/court-overhaul-begins-disciplinary.html>

Selected quotes from that story,

Thomas J. Cahill, Chief Counsel of the First Department Attorney Disciplinary Committee, was summoned to a meeting with New York State Office of Court Administration officials on Tuesday, July 17, 2007. He was told to bring along his First Deputy Chief Counsel, Sherry K. Cohen, sources say. The two top lawyers at the State office charged with overseeing attorney ethics in the Bronx and Manhattan sat, uncomfortably, through most of the day at various high-level conferences. In the end, it was made clear that immediate changes were being made at their Departmental Disciplinary Committee. Changes that didn't necessarily include them. Two days later, on Thursday, July 19th, Mr. Cahill called a staff meeting where he said that he had "good news." He first announced that he had a new grandchild, and then added that he had

decided to resign. He was reportedly delighted to be "... one of the few who is leaving under his own steam." Sources say he indicated that he was hoping to stay on through the end of August but was awaiting 1st Department Presiding Justice Jonathan Lippman's decision on the actual date of his final day." That Defendant Cahill in this Lawsuit and the Anderson lawsuit "resigned" due to the unfolding scandal according to ECC.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 24, 2007

“JUSTICE DEPARTMENT WIDENS ‘PATENTGATE’ PROBE BURIED BY ETHICS CHIEF THOMAS J. CAHILL. IN A LETTER DATED JULY 16, 2007, THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY, ANNOUNCED FROM ITS WASHINGTON, D.C. HEADQUARTERS THAT IT WAS EXPANDING ITS INVESTIGATION INTO A BIZARRELY STALLED FBI INVESTIGATION THAT INVOLVES AN ALMOST SURREAL STORY OF THE THEFT OF NEARLY 30 U.S. PATENTS, AND OTHER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, WORTH BILLIONS OF DOLLARS.”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2007/08/justice-dept-widens-patentgate-probe.html>

Selected quotes from that story,

The probe reaches some of New York's most prominent politicians and judges, and has already proven to be a stunning embarrassment to the State's ethics watchdog committees.

Coming Soon: Iviewit's Patentgate –

Part II - Naming the Patentgate Players (New York's Top Politicians and Judges)

Part III – Why a Once-Top Law Firm Thought They'd Get Away with It (\$\$)

Part IV – The Groundbreaking Iviewit Technology & Patentgate Fraud Proof

Justice Department Widens "Patentgate" Probe Buried by Ethics Chief Thomas J.

Cahill..." That Patentgate is the moniker ascribed to Plaintiffs IP theft claims as more fully described in the Amended Complaint.

TUESDAY, AUGUST 28, 2007

“PATENTGATE ETHICS SCAM HITS HOLOCAUST SURVIVOR...AS A YOUNG GIRL, MRS. GIZELLA WEISSHAUS SURVIVED THE HOLOCAUST, BUT RECENTLY AND NOW 77-YEARS-OLD, SHE FINDS HERSELF ON THE GROWING LIST OF VICTIMS ENSNARLED IN THE MANHATTAN ATTORNEY ETHICS SCANDAL SHAKING THE NEW YORK STATE COURT SYSTEM....”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2007/08/patentgate-ethics-scam-hits-holocaust.html>

MONDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2007

“NEWLY FILED LAWSUIT SEEKS FEDERAL MONITOR OVER NY STATE ETHICS COMMITTEE...BREAKING STORY”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2007/10/newly-filed-lawsuit-seeks-federal.html>

Selected quotes from that story,

An OCA rattling federal lawsuit was filed late Friday, October 26, 2007, in The United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. The allegations by an insider reveal a previously hidden look into the systemic corruption within the statewide court system and, most horrifically, concerns the very body charged with overseeing ethics and integrity within the state's courts. The named defendants include The State of New York's Office of Court Administration (OCA), and the Hon. John Buckley, Thomas J. Cahill [Defendant in Plaintiff Lawsuit], Sherry K. Cohen, Catherine O'Hagen Wolfe [Defendant in Plaintiff Lawsuit] and David Spokony- all senior level state employees involved with the 1st Judicial Department's Departmental Disciplinary Committee (DDC), which is charged with overseeing the ethics of attorneys in The Bronx and Manhattan. The papers filed in federal court include, "Plaintiff

requests the appointment of a federal monitor to oversee the day-to-day operations of the DDC for an indefinite period."

MONDAY, DECEMBER 10, 2007

“FEDERAL JUDGE ORDERS ETHICS SCANDAL HEARING. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE, SHIRA A. SCHEINDLIN, HAS ISSUED A FEDERAL COURT ORDER REQUIRING THAT ALL PARTIES APPEAR IN HER COURT AT THE U.S. COURTHOUSE AT 500 PEARL STREET IN MANHATTAN ON WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2007.”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2007/12/federal-judge-orders-ethics-scandal.html>

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2007

“ETHICS SCANDAL HEARING GREETED WITH \$1.5 BILLION DOLLAR LAWSUIT.”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2007/12/ethics-scandal-hearing-greeted-with-15.html>

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 30, 2007

“3RD FEDERAL LAWSUIT FILED IN NY LEGAL ETHICS SCANDAL...TAMMANY HALL II – UPDATE

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2007/12/3rd.html>

Selected quotes from that article,

And then there were three. A third lawsuit in the New York State attorney ethics scandal was filed Friday, December 28, 2007 in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in ManhattanSee the 20-page "ESPOSITO ETHICS SCANDAL COMPLAINT" to the right....The latest filing was made by Luisa Esposito who says her former New York attorney,

Allen H. Isaac, allegedly sexually abused her and wanted oral sex in exchange for his legal representation. And she has tape recordings to prove it.”

FRIDAY, JANUARY 11, 2008

“NY FEDERAL JUDGE: ETHICS SCANDAL CASES RELATED...”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2008/01/ny-federal-judge-ethics-scandal-cases.html>

Selected quotes from that article,

On Thursday, January 10, 2008, U.S. Federal District Court Judge Shira A. Scheindlin directed that the 1.5 Billion dollar Iviewit “patentgate” case, filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York on December 12, 2007, be assigned to her court. Judge Scheindlin accepted the Iviewit lawsuit, Bernstein v. Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee, as related to the pending New York attorney ethics scandal case, Anderson v. The State of New York. Allegations of covering-up and whitewashing complaints against favored attorneys find both cases seeking the appointment of a federal monitor to take over New York’s statewide attorney ethics committees. A third lawsuit, filed December 28, 2007, is currently under review by Judge Scheindlin to be designated as an associated case in the state ethics scandal, Tammany Hall II.”

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 2008

“NY ETHICS SCANDAL TIED TO INTERNATIONAL ESPIONAGE SCHEME...TAMMANY HALL II ETHICS SCANDAL REACHING NEW HEIGHTS.

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2008/04/ny-ethics-scandal-tied-to-international.html>

Excerpts from the article,

Reports surfaced in New York and around Washington, D.C. last week detailing a massive communications satellite espionage scheme involving major multi-national corporations and the interception of top-secret satellite signals. The evidence in the corporate eavesdropping cover-up “is frightening,” according to an informed source who has reviewed the volumes of documentation. The espionage scheme, he says, is directly tied to the growing state bar ethics scandal at the Appellate Division First Department, Departmental Disciplinary Committee (DDC) in Manhattan. Rumors had been Circulating Linking the NY Bar Scandal to International Corporate Espionage Ops Using Satellites.”

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2008

“BREAKING NEWS.....CLICK HERE FOR OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE INVESTIGATION...FBI PROBES THREATS ON FEDERAL WITNESSES IN NY ETHICS SCANDAL”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2008/11/breaking-news.html>

Selected quotes from that article,

New York, New York, November 21, 2008- Sources have confirmed that Federal Agents in New York and Washington, D.C. are actively investigating complaints of witness tampering in the New York State Ethics Scandal pending in the federal District Court in Manhattan.”

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2009

“U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDER: ‘NO ONE IS ABOVE THE LAW’...NEW ATTORNEY GENERAL PROMISES TO RESTORE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT'S REPUTATION”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2009/02/us-attorney-general-holder-no-one-is.html>

Selected quotes from that story,

The National Law Journal, by Joe Palazzolo and Devlin Barrett – WASHINGTON - Attorney General Eric Holder, on his first day on the job, signaled a clean break with past policies of the Bush administration and promised to hold Wall Street accountable if any major financial institutions engaged in fraud that contributed to the global financial crisis. Vice President Joseph Biden swore in President Barack Obama's choice - the first black to hold the post - in a ceremony yesterday before dignitaries and employees at the Justice Department. The lanky, 58-year-old former prosecutor, federal judge and No. 2 official during the Clinton administration promised the start of a new era at the department, which was wracked by Bush administration scandals over politically motivated hirings and firings.”

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2009

“MANHATTAN ETHICS CHAIRMAN, ROY L. REARDON, ACCUSED OF WHITE-WASHING CRIMES BY ATTORNEYS”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2009/02/breaking-news-manhattan-ethics-chairman.html>

Selected quotes from that story,

Breaking News: Manhattan Ethics Chairman, Roy L. Reardon, Accused of White-Washing Crimes by Attorneys Appellate Division, First Department, Disciplinary Committee Chairman, Roy L.

Reardon has been formally accused of the widespread covering-up of serious ethics complaints by attorneys who conduct business in the Bronx and Manhattan, according to a source close to his Lexington Avenue law firm. Mr. Reardon, of Simpson Thacher & Bartlett, was once regarded as a gentlemen with high ethical standards but, according to the source, ‘he has sold his soul.’

The source says many workers are furious that Reardon has personally allowed crimes by connected attorneys to be swept under the rug. ‘This animal [Reardon] has a blind eye toward

sexual assaults upon woman by New York Lawyers, and he has even blanket free passes to any attorney who is politically connected.”

THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 2009

“U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL ERIC HOLDER ASKED TO APPOINT NEW YORK ETHICS PROSECUTOR...PART I - MANHATTAN ETHICS CHAIRMAN, ROY L. REARDON, ACCUSED OF WHITE-WASHING CRIMES BY ATTORNEYS...PART II - STATEWIDE JUDICIAL ETHICS CHAIRMAN, ROBERT TEMBECKJIAN, ACCUSED OF WIDESPREAD CORRUPTION.”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2009/03/us-attorney-general-eric-holder-asked.html>

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 2009

“ANDERSON ADVANCES, FEDERAL JURY TO HEAR 'ETHICS' CORRUPTION, WHITEWASHING CLICK HERE TO READ THE OPINION AND ORDER”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2009/04/anderson-advances-federal-jury-to-hear.html>

Selected quotes from that article,

(April 27, 2009)...The Corruption of New York's 'Ethics' Oversight Going Public. A New York Federal District Court Judge, the Hon. Shira A. Scheindlin, ruled Monday that a federal jury, and importantly the public, will hear testimony into exactly how corrupt the Manhattan attorney 'ethics' department is and how serious ethics complaints for favored attorneys have been improperly whitewashed. Equally alarming is the expected testimony that will shed light into the systemic corruption within the attorney and judicial ethics oversight agencies. The widespread allegations of retaliation within and about New York's court system will be provided a proper public forum upon which accountability may be restored.”

WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 2009

**“SENATOR JOHN SAMPSON ANNOUNCES PUBLIC HEARINGS ON ETHICS
OVERSIGHT SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY NOTICE OF
PUBLIC HEARING. MONDAY, JUNE 8TH, 2009, 10:00 AM - 3:00 PM SENATE
STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING”**

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2009/05/senator-john-sampson-announces-public.html>

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.”

THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2009

**“VIDEO OF SENATOR JOHN L. SAMPSON'S 1ST HEARING ON COURT 'ETHICS'
CORRUPTION. CLICK HERE TO SEE**

Part 1 - Monday, June 8, 2009 Hearing

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=28afajRkDwY&feature=channel>

Part 2 - September 24, 2009 Hearing

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=28afajRkDwY&feature=channel>

Part 1-2 Transcript of Testimonies

<http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/Judiciary%20Committee%20Hearing%20Testimony%20TRANSCRIPTS%20COMBINED%20LOW.pdf>

TUESDAY, JUNE 30, 2009

**“GOVERNOR NAMES KRANE TO COMMISSION ON PUBLIC INTEGRITY.
FORMER STATE BAR PRESIDENT NAMED TO INTEGRITY AGENCY.”**

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2009/06/governor-names-krane-to-commission-on.html>

Excerpts from that article,

The New York Law Journal - NEWSBRIEFS - June 30, 2009 Governor David A. Paterson has appointed Steven C. Krane, Proskauer Rose partner and former president of the New York State Bar Association, to the Commission on Public Integrity. He will replace Sullivan & Cromwell partner Robert J. Giuffra Jr., who has been a holdover on the commission since his term expired in October 2008. Mr. Krane's term will run through October 2014. Mr. Krane, state bar president in 2001-02, was also once clerk to former state chief judge Judith S. Kaye. His appointment to the 13-member commission is not subject to confirmation by the state Senate. Members are not paid. Mr. Giuffra was originally named to the Ethics Commission by former Governor George E. Pataki and appointed by Eliot Spitzer to the Public Integrity Commission when it was formed in 2007 by the merger of the Ethics and Lobbying commissions.” — Joel Stashenko.

August 11, 2004 the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department in an unpublished Order, ordered to have complaints against RICO Defendant Steven C. Krane (deceased) moved for investigation and disposition for Conflicts of Interest and the Appearance of Impropriety. That these investigations were further perverted when the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division Second Department actors charged with handling the investigations were also found to be in direct Conflict with RICO Defendant Steven C. Krane and RICO

Defendant Proskauer Rose, to date no investigation has been conducted as ordered as the complaints were dismissed without investigation, the Second Department claiming they were not bound by the First Department Court Order.

<http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2004%2008%2011%20new%20york%20first%20departm ent%20orders%20investigation%20Krane%20Rubenstein%20Joao.pdf>

FRIDAY, JULY 3, 2009

“NEW YORK'S CORRUPT "CHARACTER AND FITNESS" COMMITTEE AT IT AGAIN...EMPIRE STATE'S ETHICS HYPOCRISY: ‘NEW YORK’S COURTS HAVE OVERLOOKED MISCONDUCT LIKE LAWYERS’ SOLICITATION OF MINORS FOR SEX, EFFORTS TO DECEIVE JUDGES AND POSSESSION OF COCAINE...”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2009/07/new-yorks-corrupt-character-and-fitness.html>

MONDAY, JULY 27, 2009

“ROY I. REARDON, CORRUPT CHAIRMAN OF CORRUPT MANHATTAN ETHICS COMMITTEE FEDS SUMMON COURT CORRUPTION MEMBERS TO WASHINGTON, D.C.”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2009/07/roy-i-reardon-corrupt-chairman-of.html>

Excerpts from the article,

by Franklin N. Brady - July 27, 2009...”NEW YORK-

Incontrovertible evidence that federal crimes have been committed in and about New York’s federal and state courts have produced numerous meetings in Washington, D.C. this year.

While the New York criminal conduct that would come under review by the various federal agencies has been discussed for years, the October 2007 filing of Anderson v. The State of New

York, et al., 07Civ9599, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York brought increased interest and, subsequently, a long list of credible witnesses. The review by federal employees involving New York's "Ethics Scandal" quickly caught the eye of a growing number of officials in Washington, D.C. when nine (9) related federal cases, with similar allegations, followed the Anderson insider filings. Formal requests were then made to hold public hearings with a view toward the eventual oversight of the New York State Court System by a federal monitor, and to be followed by the appointment of a federal prosecutor.

Notably, in one meeting held in Washington, D.C., an attorney and Washington, D.C. insider, predicted that, "New York's about to be rocked." That insider quoted the current Chairman of Manhattan's Departmental Disciplinary Committee, Roy I. Reardon, as saying that New York's judges belong to one of three categories, "one third are decent, honest and hardworking... another third aren't very smart.... and one third are corrupt...While Mr. Reardon once enjoyed a reputation of high integrity, and one who was wronged by his appointment as chairman of the flame-engulfed DDC sinking ship, the Manhattan-based attorney ethics committee. But now, however, Mr. Reardon is believed to be just another member of the Tembeckjian-Friedberg state corruption whitewashing machine."

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2009

"NY STATE COURT INSIDER CALLS FOR FEDERAL PROSECUTOR..."

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2009/09/public-airs-concerns-on-disciplinary.html>

Excerpts from that article,

LETTER FROM: Christine C. Anderson

Attorney at Law

September 13, 2009 (via Confirmed Overnight Delivery)

TO: The Hon. Eric H. Holder, Jr.
Attorney General of the United States
Office of the Attorney General
United States Department of Justice

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

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

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

RE: REQUEST FOR FEDERAL INVESTIGATION INTO ALLEGATIONS OF
CORRUPTION AND WITNESS INTIMIDATION AND APPOINTMENT OF FEDERAL
MONITOR.”

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2009

**“HIGHLIGHTS OF NEW YORK SENATE SAMPSON HEARING...SENATOR
ADAMS ASKS CHAIRMAN SAMPSON TO APPOINT A TASK FORCE....THE NEXT
HEARING WILL BE IN OCTOBER..... EXACT DATE TO BE ANNOUNCED
SOON...MORE HORRIFIC EXAMPLES OF 'CRIMINAL ENTERPRISE' IN AND
ABOUT STATEWIDE COURTS.”**

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2009/09/ny-state-court-insider-calls-for.html>

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2009

**“PUBLIC AIRS CONCERNS ON DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES...PUBLIC AIRS
CONCERNS ON DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES...”**

Selected excerpts from that article,

The New York Law Journal - September 25, 2009 (page 6)

A PANEL led by Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman John Sampson, D-Brooklyn, and including Senator Ruben Diaz, D-Bronx, held a second public hearing yesterday on the procedures for disciplining attorneys and judges. At the hearing, Senator Eric Adams, D-Brooklyn, suggested creating a task force to investigate alleged corruption in New York courts. The task force, Mr. Adams told some 80 people at the lower Manhattan hearing, "would assist us in navigating how this problem is being hidden from public view." Victor A. Kovner, a partner at Davis Wring Tremaine and a former chairman of the Commission on Judicial Conduct, testified in support of more transparency by holding open hearings to remove "any rumor or innuendo" from the outcome of disciplinary proceedings for judges. Over four hours, a dozen witnesses complained about the confidential nature of the process, as well as about how their own cases had been handled. The panel's first hearing was held in Albany in June (NYLJ, June 6), and a third hearing may be held for Buffalo, although no date has been set."

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2009

“ANDERSON PULLS IN POWERHOUSE TRIAL TEAM TO CONFRONT COURT ETHICS CORRUPTION...BREAKING NEWS IN NEW YORK STATE COURT CORRUPTION TRIAL...LOVETT AND BELLANTONI FILE NOTICE OF APPEARANCE ON OCTOBER 8, 2009.”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2009/10/anderson-pulls-in-powerhouse-trial-team.html>

Tuesday, October 13, 2009 at 10:00am - Anderson Jury Selection Begins

Monday, October 19, 2009 at 10:00am - Anderson Trial Begins”

OCTOBER 20, 2009

“PRESS RELEASE ON COURT CORRUPTION TRIAL...CHRISTINE ANDERSON’S ATTORNEY, JONATHAN LOVETT OF LOVETT AND BELLANTONI, WAS QUITE CLEAR TO THE JURY IN HIS OPENING STATEMENT. ‘THE CASE YOU ARE ABOUT TO HEAR IS VERY STRAIGHTFORWARD. IT INVOLVES CORRUPTION. IT INVOLVES WHITEWASHING.’”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2009/10/press-release-on-court-corruption-trial.html>

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2009

“JURY FINDS AGAINST ANDERSON RETALIATION (UPDATED 5PM)...”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2009/10/jury-finds-against-anderson-retaliation.html>

Excerpts from that article,

A federal jury found late Thursday, October 29, 2009 that Thomas Cahill, Sherry Cohen and

David Spokony had not fired former Manhattan Ethics Committee staff attorney Christine

Anderson in retaliation for her exposure of widespread corruption by the ‘whitewashing’ of

complaints against attorneys in the Bronx and Manhattan. **Earlier in the day, Judge**

Scheindlin had found that Cahill, Cohen and Spokony were knowledgeable of

the ‘whitewashing,’ but that ruling was read into the record in open court only

after the jury had left the courtroom. Anderson's legal team is reported to be

considering a declaratory judgment action in Federal Court to declare that the

defense of Cohen, Cahill and Spokony by the New York State Attorney General's

office was improper as it raises a series of conflicts and requires that the

defendants be provided independent outside counsel.”

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2009

“NEW TRIAL SOUGHT IN NY STATE CORRUPTION CASE, AG BLASTED FOR MASSIVE CONFLICTS...NEW FEDERAL TRIAL REQUESTED IN NY STATE CORRUPTION CASE, AG BLASTED FOR MASSIVE CONFLICTS...”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2009/11/new-trial-sought-in-ny-state-corruption.html>

Excerpts from that article,

Christine C. Anderson yesterday filed a Motion for a New Trial in Manhattan's federal district court. The case is again before U.S. District Court Judge Shira A. Scheindlin after an October 29, 2009 jury found against Anderson. The motion for a new trial includes startling revelations including the fact that the District Court failed to take appropriate action after learning that there had been threats made against at least one witness in the federal proceeding. The largest problem for those involved appears to be the little tested issue of the usually-accepted widespread conflicts of interest inside the New York State Attorney General's office.

Highlights from the motion for a new trial include:

- Apparent abuse of discretion by the District Court Judge.
- A new trial to “avoid a miscarriage of justice.”
- Correction: “the district court possesses the power to rectify its own mistakes in the period immediately following the entry of judgment.”
- “Irregularity of Proceedings: The State of New York Attorney General's Representation of Defendants Unduly Prejudiced Plaintiff and Denied Her Due Process Rights.
- Anderson was confronted with an unquestionably unfair set of circumstances as the defendants were defended by the New York State Attorney General; and while the plaintiff charged the defendants with serious violations of law, the Attorney General stood before the jury defending these very same actions as proper and within the law. This arrangement seriously prejudiced plaintiff Anderson, as jurors could and most likely did conclude that the State of New York supported fully the conduct of the defendants.
- Not only did the Attorney General's representation of the defendants unduly prejudice the Anderson, it also raised serious conflict of interest issues with respect to the defendants themselves. To protect their own rights, each of the defendants should have had their own attorneys in order to permit them to cross claim or make admissions.
- **VIOLATIONS OF ETHICS RULES:** 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.) The Attorney General as a state attorney is bound by these rules as well. New York State law requires that the attorney who violates these safeguards to be immediately removed from the case.

- **CONFLICT:** As a result of these conflict of interest issues, the Attorney General cannot properly represent the defendants, either as a group or individually. Each defendant must have the right 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. Without question, the Attorney General violated its ethical rules and the public trust in undertaking to represent all of the defendants.
- The involvement of the New York Attorney General in refuting plaintiff's allegations, which involved serious violations of federal and state law and ethical standards, and in presenting the case of each defendants, denied plaintiff's due process and equal protection guarantees, and right to a fair and impartial trial.
- **WHY DIDN'T THE NYS ATTORNEY GENERAL INVESTIGATE??** - 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 Office to review the basic claims given that Anderson was formerly a Departmental Disciplinary Committee staff attorney with considerable experience. 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. She carried out her duties as a duly authorized officer of the Court. The New York State Attorney General Office was therefore obligated to protect her and to investigate her claims of serious misconduct against the named parties. For no reason, the New York State Attorney General 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 investigatory agency with prosecution powers.
- Federal law mandates that a special prosecutor be substituted into the case, and this was not done. The actions of the Attorney General here confused, misled and confounded the jury, by creating a false impression that the acts were officially sanctioned by the state.
- Christine Anderson's allegations have substantial impact on the public, the bench and bar, and cannot be ignored by the New York State Attorney General Office just because they were motivated to defend this lawsuit. This serious conflict demanded independent counsel for the defendants as a matter fairness and high ethical conduct to all involved, particularly to Christine Anderson.
- Having denied independent counsel to the defendants, the Attorney General prejudiced plaintiff by making it appear to the jury that the State of New York and the New York

State Attorney General Office supported defendants' conduct. This was a burden Christine Anderson could never overcome and, at a minimum, warrants a new trial.

- The Court was concerned about the aforesaid conflict of interest and in one of its last instructions to the jury, the Court warned the jury not to draw a negative inference adverse to the defendants for their joint representation by the New York State Attorney General Office. That instruction was injurious to the plaintiff, Christine Anderson, in that it prejudiced the jury against her and in and of itself warrants a new trial.
- It was one of the last instructions to the jury and was thus ingrained in the minds of the jury as a lasting impression. Furthermore, as one of the last instructions to the jury, it elevated its importance over and above all prior instructions as something that had to be considered in deference to all else.
- There was no countervailing instruction to the jury not to draw a negative inference of the joint representation by the New York State Attorney General Office adverse to the plaintiff. This failure prejudiced the jury against the plaintiff by implying at a minimum, that the state supported all of the defendants' conduct and found that it was within the bounds of the law.
- By the Court issuing the jury instruction not to draw a negative inference adverse to the defendants for their joint representation by the New York State Attorney General Office, the court preserved the argument to be raised in this motion and/or appeal.
- Allowing all of the defendants to be represented jointly by the same counsel and by the New York State Attorney General Office created an impermissible conflict of interest. Indeed, the conflict was so strong, that had the jury ruled against any one or all of the defendants, they would have been entitled to seek a new trial for impermissible conflict of interest, as they would be entitled to their own independent counsel.
- The court is thus faced with the fact any unsuccessful litigant in this case could be expected to move for and would be entitled to a new trial because of the impermissible conflict of interest, as all of the defendants are required to have their own independent counsel, and to not be represented by the New York State Attorney General's Office.
- The American Bar Association's Code of Professional Responsibility elaborates on the duty of a public prosecutor such as the New York Attorney General to seek justice as follows: "This special duty exists because: (1) the prosecutor represents the sovereign and therefore should use restraint in the discretionary exercise of governmental powers, such as in the selection of cases to prosecute; (2) during trial the prosecutor is not only an advocate but he also may make decisions normally made by an individual client, and those affecting the public interest should be fair to all"
- A prosecutor's duty of neutrality is born of two fundamental aspects of his employment. First, the prosecutor, in this case the Attorney General, is a representative of the sovereign, and consequently must act with the impartiality required of those who govern. Second, the Attorney General can at all times call upon the vast power of the government, and therefore must refrain from abusing that power by failing to act evenhandedly.
- These key duties are not limited to criminal prosecutions, but must also be observed in civil cases as well. These safeguards are included in the ABA Code. "A government lawyer in a civil action or administrative proceeding has the responsibility to seek justice

and to develop a full and fair record, and he should not use his position or the economic power of the government to harass parties or to bring about unjust settlements or results."

- In the present case, the Attorney General was under the ethical duty to withdraw in order to preserve plaintiff's right to a fair and impartial trial. In a case such as this, not only is the Attorney General's neutrality essential to a fair outcome for the plaintiff, it is critical to the proper function of the judicial process as a whole. Our system of justice relies for its validity on the confidence of society. Without a continuing belief by the people that the system is just and impartial, the concept of the rule of law cannot survive.
- The New York State Attorney General is a public official elected by statewide ballot . The American Bar Association's Code of Professional Responsibility addresses the special considerations applicable to a lawyer who is also a public official as follows: "A lawyer who is a public officer, whether full or part-time, should not engage in activities in which his personal or professional interests are or foreseeably may be in conflict with his official duties." The government's investigative and prosecutorial interests must be balanced against the public interest in insuring that the individuals and organizations receive effective representation, and are accorded their full constitutional rights and protections.
- There are at least two reasons why a court should satisfy itself that no conflict exists or at least provide notice to the affected party if one does. First, a court is under a continuing obligation to supervise the members of its Bar.(district court obligated to take measures against unethical conduct occurring in proceedings before it). Second, trial courts have a duty "to exercise that degree of control required by the facts and circumstances of each case to assure the litigants of a fair trial."
- Occupying a position of public trust, the Attorney General, as any public prosecutor is 'possessed ... of important governmental powers that are pledged to the accomplishment of one objective only, that of impartial justice.' The duty of a government attorney has been characterized as 'a sober inquiry into values, designed to strike a just balance between the economic interests of the public and those of the landowner,' is of high order."
- Central to the issue of preventing prejudicial influence of government attorneys on court proceedings, it is common for states to adopt statutes or regulations that prohibit those holding the office of Attorney General, as well as their deputies and staff attorneys, from participating as attorneys in private litigation matters. The reason for adopting these restrictions is most obvious. For the Attorney General or any member of the staff to participate in a civil trial involving a private litigant will create the prejudicial inference that the state has reviewed and approved the position advocated by the government attorney. Such an inference can and likely will influence the outcome of the matter to the detriment of the opposing party. It is for the stated reasons that no Attorney General or staff member should be permitted to represent a private litigant in any adversarial proceeding. Only such an outright prohibition will properly preserve the standards of fairness and impartiality guaranteed to all litigants under federal and state constitutions. The present lack of statutory and/or ethical policy guidelines barring the

participation of state law officers from representing private litigants in civil proceedings which must be addressed by courts and policy makers.

- Irregularity of Proceedings: Confusing, Misleading and Prejudicial Instructions to the Jury.
- The Court issued detailed Verdict Sheets to the jury addressing the plaintiff's allegation of retaliation and the related issues of deprivation of a federal right and plaintiff's acts of speech. During the jury's deliberation, the foreman submitted a question to the court for review. The question (SEE EXHIBITS) sought the Court's guidance with respect to instruction number 1b which was described as "ambiguous." The Court provided an answer (SEE EXHIBITS) to the question which addressed the fact that the plaintiff had made certain statements rather than the way in which the "DDC responded (investigated) properly to the statements [plaintiff] made."
- In answering the jury, the court addressed only the initial question, which dealt with the critical issue of the lawsuit, i.e., whitewashing. This key issue was specifically removed from consideration by the jury, when the Court circled the question as to whether the plaintiff had made statements to her superiors and not whether those statements averred that the DDC was not diligently prosecuting allegations of misconduct by respondent attorneys. Having circled that question for consideration, the succeeding questions were dealing only with plaintiff's statements [not defined] and NOT with issue of whitewashing. Thus, the succeeding questions were asked in a vacuum and expected to be answered in a vacuum. Also, by structuring the questions as the court did, the jury never reached other issues of retaliation or damages, even after it found in plaintiff's favor in Question 1. The jury was confused by the unclear, very puzzling and convoluted nature of the instructions.
- This confusion on the part of the jury resulted in a verdict which is in a word repugnant.
- By eliminating whitewashing from Question 1, the court effectively excised the key gravamen of the complaint, i.e., retaliatory discharge, as a result of plaintiff's complaints of whitewashing and corruption. This constitutes judicial error of the highest order.
- Juries only get to see and use the instructions for a short time, thus it is crucial that they be clear and understandable to the laymen and laywomen. The court and counsel have the luxury of days to craft and understand the instructions as professionals. The instructions presented in this case are unclear, quite confusing and simply impossible to apply to the facts adduced at trial.
- There is also no record that the role of the Attorney General as defense counsel was properly and adequately explained to the jury. This also constitutes another reversible error by the Court which could have been rectified.

Newly Discovered Evidence

- The court gave the jury above-referenced instructions and its members adjourned to the jury room to deliberate at approximately 1:25 pm on Thursday, October 29. After the jury left the courtroom, Judge Scheindlin first announced that she had denied the defendants' pending motion for a directed verdict. She next stated words to the effect that she found that, "...Cahill was aware of the whitewashing allegations..." The judge

read this statement related to defendant Cahill's conduct into the record as part of her order denying defendant's directed verdict. This fact alone requires a new trial.

- In addition, Courts have an obligation to report and order investigation into official and at times criminal misconduct. This is a duty of the Court. There is no record to date as to any action having been undertaken by the Court regarding this central question. The Court's finding of culpability on the part of Defendant Cahill constitutes newly discovered evidence, which directly supports the fundamental allegations of Plaintiff.
- 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.
- The new evidence establishes that in the view of the Court, Defendant Cahill, the head officer of the DDC and the supervisor of Cohen, had full knowledge of the practice of whitewashing as alleged by Plaintiff, leading to the parallel conclusion that whitewashing was accepted as a common practice by the defendants, and presumably other staff members of the DDC. Had such facts been confirmed during the trial stage, the jury would have come to know and understand the illegal activities that were accepted as everyday practice by the DDC staff, a finding totally consistent with a main element of Plaintiff's case.
- The Court's statement after the close of trial accepting the establishing the whitewashing activities by Defendant Cahill must be found to constitute grounds for granting the instant motion.

Witness Tampering – Threat on Witness in a Federal Proceeding

- Based on information submitted in the proceeding, the court is aware that one of Plaintiff's witnesses, DDC staff attorney Nicole Corrado, was confronted by her DDC supervisor on the street just prior to her deposition in this proceeding.
- As the court was also aware, plaintiff's former counsel, John Beranbaum, advised the court of this incident in a letter to the court dated October 24, 2008. (SEE EXHIBITS) In the Beranbaum submission, it was made clear to the court that Ms. Corrado was given a "'warning' about the testimony she was to give 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 EXHIBITS– Transcript of October 30, 2009 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 reported 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. Plaintiff believes she has been severely prejudiced by the threat upon witness Corrado, and, as the court is aware, Ms. Corrado did not appear at a witness in this proceeding.
- While plaintiff is aware that counsel within the Office of the New York Attorney General's office offered to "fully" compensate Mr. Beranbaum for ALL of his legal fees, expenses, etc., if plaintiff settled her case, I am unaware of the exact timing of when the

compensation offer, believed to be between \$120,000.00 and \$150,000.00, was actually made.

Conclusion

- For the reasons set forth in detail herein, Movant respectfully requests that this Court in the interest of justice grant a new trial. As noted, the participation of the Attorney General in failing to investigate the charges submitted by plaintiff against the defendants, and subsequently representing these same persons in the instant court proceedings, denied plaintiff's constitutionally protected right to a fair and impartial trial. 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 instant motion for a new trial. For all of the reasons set forth herein, the plaintiff is entitled and warrants being accorded a new trial. Furthermore, Movant is Ready willing and able to go to trial immediately and no delay, harm, or prejudice will occur to the other parties as a result of Movant's motion. Inasmuch as the Attorney General should even be denied the opportunity to answer, and as justice demands, the court should sua sponte, grant the herein sought relief.

Christine C. Anderson

****CLICK HERE TO SEE THE FILED MOTION AND EXHIBITS****

<http://www.frankbrady.org/TammanyHall/Documents.html>

See: "ANDERSON LAWSUIT" <http://www.frankbrady.org/TammanyHall/Documents.html>

"Motion for New Trial, November 16, 2009"

<http://www.frankbrady.org/TammanyHall/Documents.html>

MONDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2009

“NEXT SAMPSON HEARING ON COURT CORRUPTION SET FOR DECEMBER 16TH*** IMPORTANT UPDATE *****”**

The Next New York State Senate Court Corruption Hearing will NOT be held on December 16th

.... A new date will be announced soon.”

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2010

“ANDERSON MOVES TO DISQUALIFY NY ATTORNEY GENERAL...”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2010/09/anderson-moves-to-disqualify-ny.html>

**CLICK HERE TO READ ANDERSON'S FILING TO DISQUALIFY THE ATTORNEY
GENERAL**

[.http://www.frankbrady.org/TammanyHall/Documents_files/CCA%20091410%20Filing.pdf](http://www.frankbrady.org/TammanyHall/Documents_files/CCA%20091410%20Filing.pdf)

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2010

“CORRUPT ETHICS ATTORNEY SHERRY K. COHEN DEPARTING, FINALLY SHERRY KRUGER COHEN, THE CORRUPT DEPUTY CHIEF COUNSEL OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION, FIRST DEPARTMENT ATTORNEY DEPARTMENTAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE (THE "DDC") HAS AGREED TO TAKE THE STATE-OFFERED BUY-OUT.”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2010/09/corrupt-ethics-attorney-sherry-k-cohen.html>

Selected excerpts from the article,

Mrs. Cohen, a graduate of Hofstra University Law School, will leave her post at the 61 Broadway state offices at the end of the year.”

That Anderson coined Cohen “THE CLEANER” in her riveting testimony before this Court, stating how Cohen cleaned complaints for US Attorneys, DA’s, ADA’s and FAVORED LAWYERS AND LAW FIRMS.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2010

“FEDERAL COURT ASKED TO REOPEN ANOTHER NY STATE CORRUPTION CASE...”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2010/09/federal-court-asked-to-reopen-another.htm>

CLICK HERE TO SEE FILED DOCUMENT WITH EXHIBITS

[http://www.frankbrady.org/TammanyHall/Documents_files/08cv2391%20Reopen%20Motion.p
df](http://www.frankbrady.org/TammanyHall/Documents_files/08cv2391%20Reopen%20Motion.pdf)

WEDNESDAY, MAY 16, 2012

“ATTORNEY FOR DEPARTMENT DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE SUES COURT SYSTEM”

http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2012/05/attorney-for-department-disciplinary_16.html

Excerpts from the article

The New York Law Journal by John Caher ---An attorney for the Appellate Division, First Department's disciplinary committee alleges in a federal lawsuit that she was sexually harassed by two now-retired officials at the watchdog agency while a third retaliated against her for complaining. Nicole Corrado also suggests that after she lodged a complaint officials retaliated by targeting her attorney in an unrelated property matter. She claims that the committee launched an investigation into allegations of bribery and forgery against her attorney, and then suddenly dropped the matter when he abandoned her case. Additionally, Corrado claims she was punished for supporting a lawsuit brought against the court system by a colleague.

Corrado v. New York State Unified Court System, 12-cv-1748, filed in the Eastern District on April 10, alleges violations of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Corrado, who has served as a principal attorney at the disciplinary committee since 2006, claims she endured years of harassment by her supervisor, Andral Bratton, and that the committee's chief investigator, Vincent Raniere, touched her inappropriately and forcibly kissed her on several occasions. According to the complaint, when Corrado reported the "pattern of sexual harassment" by Bratton and Raniere in 2008, the court system referred the matter to its inspector general. However, only the allegations against Bratton were investigated, the complaint claims. The complaint states that Bratton admitted during the Office of the Inspector General probe that he was "smitten" with Corrado and crossed "an emotional boundary." Bratton was transferred to another unit at the same salary and Corrado was simply told to "avoid" him, according to the complaint. Corrado alleges that while her sexual harassment complaint was pending, she

retained an attorney to represent her in an unrelated action involving a property dispute. She claims the disciplinary committee instigated an investigation into that attorney—who is not named in her complaint—involving allegations of bribery and forgery. Corrado contends that after the attorney withdrew from her case and her claim was dismissed, all of the ethical charges against her lawyer were dropped. She claims that because of her attorney's abrupt withdrawal, her civil case was dismissed and she was "ultimately forced to settle her case for a fraction of its value." Bennitta Joseph of Borrelli & Associates in Great Neck, who is representing Corrado in the civil rights claim, declined to identify the allegedly intimidated attorney who represented her client in *Corrado v. East End Pool & Hot Tub*. Corrado also claims in her complaint that she was retaliated against for supporting the claim of a colleague who accused the agency of racial discrimination.

The complaint does not identify that employee, but Joseph confirmed in an interview that it was Christine Anderson, a former staff attorney who alleged she was wrongfully discharged in June 2007 on a pretext of insubordination after she revealed that the panel was protecting well-connected attorneys. A jury rejected her claims, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed the verdict (NYLJ, Oct. 30, 2009). Corrado contends that after she agreed to corroborate Anderson's allegations of "racial discrimination and other improper conduct" by the disciplinary committee, Alan Friedberg, the committee's chief counsel, threatened her and gave her an unreasonable workload. Additionally, Corrado says Bratton threatened her."

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 2012

“NY LEGAL ETHICS SCANDAL WHISTLEBLOWER BACK IN FEDERAL COURT...WITNESS TAMPERING BRINGS NY ATTORNEY CHRISTINE

**ANDERSON BACK TO FEDERAL COURT...WIDESPREAD 'ETHICS' CORRUPTION
NOW INCLUDES THREAT ON WITNESS IN A FEDERAL PROCEEDING...CLICK
HERE TO SEE THE STORY AND THE JUNE 25, 2012 FILED PAPERS.”**

<http://ethicsrouser.blogspot.com/2012/06/ny-legal-ethics-scandal-whistleblower.html>

Following are excerpts FROM THE NOTIFICATION TO SCHEINDLIN OF FELONY CRIMES EXPOSED
IN HER COURT and then NEW FELONY CRIMES COMMITTED IN HER COURT TO COVER THEM UP,
MISPRISION OF A FELONY AND MORE.

Tuesday, October 27, 2009

Hon. Shira A. Scheindlin
United States District Judge
Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse
500 Pearl St.
New York, NY 10007-1312

**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**

Dear Hon. Shira Scheindlin,

Please take appropriate action in reporting the alleged criminal misconduct of attorneys apparent in the Christine C. Anderson v. New York State et al. (07cv09599) action before you to appropriate authorities. The revised Code of Conduct for Judges, effective July 1, 2009, in Canon 3D(5) says, “A judge should take appropriate action upon learning of reliable evidence indicating the likelihood ... a lawyer violated applicable rules of conduct.” Also, please consider the Commentary to this Canon.

The Anderson “Whistleblower” lawsuit, coined a “Whistleblower” by yourself, revealed conduct, including “Whitewashing” of complaints by attorneys, including but not limited to, from the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department, the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department ~ Departmental Disciplinary Committee, the US Attorney, the District Attorney and the Assistant District Attorney violating DR 1-102 A (1), (3), (4) and (5) of the NY Lawyer’s Code of Professional Responsibility and Law. Further revealed were allegations of a “Cleaner”, Naomi Goldstein, Deputy Chief Counsel of the First Department. Attorneys also allegedly violated NY Penal laws requiring criminal investigation, including but not limited to: § 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).

The attorneys , including but not limited to, from the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department, the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department ~ Departmental Disciplinary Committee, the US Attorney, the District Attorney and the Assistant District Attorney also violated, Federal Criminal Law § 241 Conspiracy against Rights, not only against Christine Anderson, but also against the class of people whose complaints were allegedly “cleansed,” and the class ‘The People of NY.’”

Anderson also provided testimony of a similar nature, with similar CRIMINAL allegations of Whitewashing, Favoritism and Cronyism for favored Law Firms and Lawyers, at a New York Senate Judiciary Committee Hearing Chaired by Hon. Senator John L. Sampson, which can be found @

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HR8OX8uuAbw&feature=player_embedded
Anderson is the second speaker.

Another issue requiring appropriate action concerns the failure of the NY Attorney General’s Office to do its duty under,
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 under,

Public Officers Rule 17 (2)(b)

(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.

The Attorney General’s office representing the State Defendants in Anderson, creates a Conflict of Interest by conflicting their offices from representing Anderson and the People of New York as obligated, acting to Obstruct Justice, as the Attorney General is charged with investigating Public Office Corruption, leaving no one guarding the hen house. Certainly, the NY Attorney General’s Office based on Anderson’s revelations in your Federal Court now has legal obligations to investigate Anderson’s claims, although the conflicts should have been assessed prior to their now conflicted position.

Obviously, being in the same courtroom when Anderson reveals “Cleaners” and the likes leaves the Attorney General’s Office calling for criminal investigations of their current clients and perhaps officials from their offices, notifying the appropriate Inspector Generals and Investigatory Agencies.

These criminal matters and the need for criminal investigations are not something for the jury in the civil case to decide, unless the court so decides. I have copied this correspondence to the attorneys for Christine Anderson and to the NY Attorney General so that they may have input and so this is not an ex parte communication. I am also unclear as to if this an ex parte communication of my case, 1:07-cv-11196-SAS, which is on Appeal after your “legally relating” my case to the Anderson “Whistleblower” case? I do not know whether all of the attorneys affected are admitted before this court. Please do what is required by your Oath of Office, your Judicial Canons and any other legal obligations requiring your reporting the allegations levied by Anderson in Your Court, of disciplinary complaint Whitewashing for the US Attorney, the District Attorney and the Assistant District Attorney, as well as, all other alleged Criminal Activity exposed by the “Whistleblower” Anderson, to ALL appropriate authorities and investigators your obligations require.
Respectfully Yours,

Eliot I. Bernstein
Founder & Inventor
Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – DL

THURSDAY, JULY 5, 2012

“MORE FILINGS IN NY'S FEDERAL ETHICS SCANDAL CASE...”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2012/07/more-filings-in-nys-federal-ethics.html>

CLICK HERE TO SEE THE PAPERS ENTERED JULY 3, 2012

[HTTP://ETHICSROUSER.BLOGSPOT.COM/](http://ethicsrouser.blogspot.com/)

FRIDAY, JANUARY 25, 2013

**“FORMER INSIDER ADMITS TO ILLEGAL WIRETAPS FOR NYS ‘ETHICS
BOSSSES’”**

[HTTP://EXPOSECORRUPTCOURTS.BLOGSPOT.COM/2013/01/FORMER-INSIDER-ADMITS-TO-ILLEGAL.HTML](http://EXPOSECORRUPTCOURTS.BLOGSPOT.COM/2013/01/FORMER-INSIDER-ADMITS-TO-ILLEGAL.HTML)

This story is written and posted by McKeown. The article details Obstruction of Justice against

Related Case to this Lawsuit (07cv09599) Anderson v The State of New York, et al. filed by

Whistleblower Christine C. Anderson, Esq. former Attorney at Law for the DDC and an expert in Attorney at Law Disciplinary complaints. The article details an invasion of privacy against Anderson to "OBSTRUCT JUSTICE" so outrageous as to completely have prejudiced not only the Anderson related lawsuit but this Lawsuit and every lawsuit related to Anderson, including but not limited to the following:

- *(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., and,*
- *(08cv4053) Gizella Weisshaus v The State of New York, et al.*
- *(08cv4438) Suzanne McCormick v The State of New York, et al.*
- *(08 cv 6368) John L. Petrec-Tolino v. The State of New York*

Selected Quotes from this story,

“FORMER INSIDER ADMITS TO ILLEGAL WIRETAPS FOR NYS "ETHICS BOSSES

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2013/01/former-insider-admits-to-illegal.html>

Evidence was obtained on Thursday, January 24, 2013, confirming the position of a former NYS attorney ethics committee insider that various illegal actions were employed by New York State employees to target and/or protect select attorneys.

For purposes of this article, a first in a series, the former insider will be referred to as "The Cleaner's Man" or "The Man."

The Cleaner

During the wrongful termination case of former Manhattan ethics attorney Christine Anderson, it was revealed that New York State employees had a nick-name for supervising ethics attorney Naomi Goldstein. Naomi Goldstein was, "The Cleaner."

"Ethics" Retaliation Machine Was Real.

The focus of this initial article concerns the 1st and 2nd judicial department, though the illegal methods are believed to have been utilized statewide in all 4 judicial departments.

The Cleaner's Man says that he would receive a telephone call from Naomi Goldstein, who would say, "we have another target, I want to meet you..." The Man also says that Thomas Cahill, a former DDC Chief Counsel, and Sherry Cohen, a former Deputy-Chief Counsel, were knowledgeable of all of Naomi Goldstein's activity with him and his team.

The meetings, he says, were usually at a park or restaurant near the Manhattan Attorney ethics offices (the "DDC") in lower Manhattan, however he did over time meet Goldstein at his office, the DDC or in movie theater- a venue picked by Naomi. Goldstein would provide her Man with the name, and other basic information, so that the Man's team could begin their "investigation."

The Man specifically recalls Naomi Goldstein advising him to "get as much damaging information as possible on Christine [Anderson]."

The Man says that they then tapped Ms. Anderson's phones, collected ALL "ISP" computer data, including all emails, and set up teams to surveil Anderson 24/7. The Man says he viewed the improperly recorded conversations and ISP data, and then personally handed those items over to Naomi Goldstein.

Anderson should not, however, feel like she was a lone target. According to The Man, "....over 125 cases were interfered with...." And there were dozens of "targeted" lawyers, says The Man, adding, that the actions of his teams were clearly "intentionally obstructing justice."

If Ms. Goldstein had identified the Ethics Committee's newest target as an attorney, it was quickly qualified with whether the involved lawyer was to be "screwed or UNScrewed." Unscrewed was explained as when an attorney needed to be "protected" or "saved" even if they did, in fact, have a major ethics problem.

The Man has a nice way of explaining his actions, the "authority" to so act and, he says, over 1.5 million documents as proof..... The U.S. Attorney is aware of The Man and his claims...."

FEBRUARY 10, 2013

“UPDATE ON ATTORNEY "ETHICS" COMMITTEES' ILLEGAL WIRETAPS FORMER INSIDER ADMITS TO ILLEGAL WIRETAPS FOR "ETHICS" BOSSES.”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2013/02/update-on-attorney-ethics-committees.html>

Excerpts from the article,

Evidence was obtained on Thursday, January 24, 2013, confirming the position of a former New York State attorney ethics committee insider that various illegal actions were employed by New York State supervising employees to target and/or protect select attorneys.

The Cleaner

Many of the most powerful attorneys in the United States are licensed to practice law in New York State, and if the business address for that lawyer is located in The Bronx or Manhattan, legal ethics is overseen by the Departmental Disciplinary Committee (the "DDC"), a group that falls under Manhattan's Appellate Division of The NY Supreme Court, First Department.

A few years ago, and during a wrongful termination case involving a former DDC ethics attorney, Christine Anderson, it was revealed that DDC employees had a nick-name for a supervising ethics attorney, Naomi Goldstein. "Ethics" Supervising Attorney Naomi Goldstein was known as "the Cleaner."

"Ethics" Retaliation Machine Was Real

There are usually cries of "retaliation" whenever charges of violating regulations of attorney ethics rules are lodged against a lawyer. However, an investigation of activity at the DDC for a ten year period reveals startling evidence of routine and improper retaliation, evidence tampering and widespread coverups.

Importantly, an insider, who says he was involved in the illegal activity, including widespread wiretapping, has provided the troubling details during recent interviews. He says he supervised the teams that acted illegally. The insider says that he was Naomi Goldstein's 'man' - The Cleaner's 'man' - and that he would simply receive a telephone call from Naomi Goldstein, and who would say, "we have another target, I want to meet you..." He also says that Thomas Cahill, a former DDC Chief Counsel, and Sherry Cohen, a former Deputy-Chief Counsel- and now

in private practice helping lawyers in "ethics" investigations, were part of, and knowledgeable of, the illegal activity.

The meetings, the insider says, were usually at a park or restaurant near the DDC's lower Manhattan ethics' offices, however he did over time meet Goldstein at his office, inside the DDC or in movie theater- a venue picked by Naomi. Goldstein only needed to provide him with the name and other basic information, so that his team could begin their "investigation."

He specifically recalls Naomi Goldstein advising him to "get as much damaging information as possible on Christine [Anderson,]" the former DDC staff attorney who had complained that certain internal files had been gutted of collected evidence.

Naomi's "man" says that they then tapped Ms. Anderson's phones, collected ALL "ISP" computer data, including all emails, and set up teams to surveil Anderson 24/7.

He says he reviewed the illegally recorded conversations and ISP data, and then personally handed those items over to Naomi Goldstein.

Attorney Christine Anderson should not, however, feel like she was a lone target. Initially, Goldstein's "man," indicated that "...over 125 [attorney] cases were interfered with...." But a subsequent and closer review of approximately 1.5 million documents has revealed that there may have been many hundreds of attorneys, over the ten-year-period, involved in the DDC's dirty tricks, focused retaliation and planned coverups.

Previously identified "targeted" lawyers were only numbered in the "dozens," but that was before the years-old documents were reviewed. In initial interviews, the insider says that if Ms. Goldstein had identified the DDC ethics committee's newest target as an attorney, it was quickly qualified with whether the involved lawyer was to be "screwed or UNScrewed." Unscrewed was explained as when an attorney needed to be "protected" or "saved" even if they did, in fact, have a major ethics problem. But targets, it is now revealed, were not always identified as having a law license.

The DDC insider also says that litigants (most of whom were not attorneys) were also DDC targets. The on-going document review continues to refresh the memory of the insider, after initially only remembering names from high-profile cases involving "big-name" attorneys. But one fact remains constant, says the insider- the actions of his teams were clearly and "intentionally obstructing justice."

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2013

“JUDGES WERE ILLEGALLY WIRETAPPED, SAYS INSIDER”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2013/02/judges-were-illegally-wiretapped-says.html>

Not only were attorneys targeted for 24/7 wiretapping of their personal and business phones, but judges in New York also became victims of the illegal whims of political insiders, according to a former insider who says he supervised parts of the operation for years.

It was previously reported that evidence was obtained on January 24, 2013 confirming illegal actions against New York attorneys, **including the continuous and illegal wiretapping of their phones and the complete capture and copying of all internet ISP activity, including email.** CLICK HERE TO SEE BACKGROUND STORY "Former Insider Admits to Illegal Wiretaps for "Ethics Bosses"

The Manhattan-based attorney ethics committee, the Departmental Disciplinary Committee (the "DDC"), a state-run entity that oversees the "ethics" of those who practice law in The Bronx and Manhattan, has been identified of **utilizing the illegal activity- at will, and by whim- to either target or protect certain attorneys.**

One Manhattan supervising ethics attorney, Naomi Goldstein, was identified as a regular requestor of the **illegal tape recordings, and former chief counsel [DEFENDANT] Thomas Cahill has been described in interviews as being "very involved" to those who were conducting the illegal activity.** Cahill subsequently retired, however New York State-paid attorney Naomi Goldstein still supervises "ethics" investigations from her Wall Street DDC 2nd floor office at 61 Broadway. THERE'S MORE TO THIS STORY, see the first 3 judges identified CLICK HERE TO SEE THE LATEST ETHICSGATE UPDATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2013

“JUDGES WERE ILLEGALLY WIRETAPPED, SAYS INSIDER”

<http://ethicsgate.blogspot.com/2013/02/judges-were-illegally-wiretapped-says.html>

Not only were attorneys targeted for 24/7 wiretapping of their personal and business phones, but judges in New York also became victims of the illegal whims of political insiders, according to a former insider who says he supervised parts of the operation for years.

It was previously reported that evidence was obtained on January 24, 2013 confirming illegal actions against New York attorneys, including the continuous and illegal wiretapping of their phones and the complete capture and copying of all internet ISP activity, including email. [CLICK HERE TO SEE BACKGROUND STORY "Former Insider Admits to Illegal Wiretaps for "Ethics Bosses"](#)

The Manhattan-based attorney ethics committee, the Departmental Disciplinary Committee (the "DDC"), a state-run entity that oversees the "ethics" of those who practice law in The Bronx and Manhattan, has been identified of utilizing the illegal activity- at will, and by whim- to either target or protect certain attorneys.

One Manhattan supervising ethics attorney, Naomi Goldstein, was identified as a regular requestor of the illegal tape recordings, and former chief counsel Thomas Cahill has been described in interviews as being "very involved" to those who were conducting the illegal activity. Cahill subsequently retired, however New York State-paid attorney Naomi Goldstein still supervises "ethics" investigations from her Wall Street DDC 2nd floor office at 61 Broadway.

Ethicsgate

According to the source, one New York "ethics" legend, Alan Friedberg, was "very well known" to those conducting the illegal wiretapping activity. Friedberg, who has become the poster child for unethical tactics while conducting "ethics" inquiries, appears to have been present in the various state offices where illegal wiretaps were utilized. Friedberg worked for the New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct (the "CJC") before running the Manhattan attorney "ethics" committee as chief counsel for a few years. Friedberg then resurfaced at the CJC, where he remains today. The CJC investigates ethics complaints of all judges in New York State.

Judges Deserve Justice Too, Unless Political Hacks Decide Otherwise

While court administrators have effectively disgraced most judges with substandard compensation, it appears that at least the selective enforcement of "ethics" rules, dirty tricks and retaliation were equally employed on lawyers and judges alike.

According to the insider, targeted judges had their cellphones, homes and court phones wiretapped- all without required court orders. In addition, according to the source, certain courtrooms, chambers and robing rooms were illegally bugged.

A quick review of notes from over one million pages of evidence, according to the insider, reveals that the "black bag jobs" included: NYS Supreme Court Judge, the Hon. Alice Schlesinger (Manhattan), Criminal Court Judge, the Hon. Shari R. Michels (Brooklyn) and NYS Supreme Court Judge, the Bernadette Bayne (Brooklyn).

More coming soon..... sign up for email alerts, at the top of this page.....

[CLICK HERE](#) to see, "Top Judicial 'Ethics' Lawyer Settles Lack-of-Sex Lawsuit"

FRIDAY FEBRUARY 15, 2013

**“NY GOVERNOR ANDREW CUOMO ASKED TO SHUT DOWN JUDICIAL
"ETHICS" OFFICES.”**

<http://ethicsgate.blogspot.com/2013/02/ny-governor-andrew-cuomo-asked-to-shut.html>

Selected Quotes from that story,

New York State Governor Andrew Cuomo has been formally requested to immediately shut down the offices of The Commission on Judicial Conduct (the "CJC"), the state agency charged with overseeing the ethics of all judges in the Empire State. The request comes from a public integrity group after confirmation that the CJC has been involved in illegally wiretapping and other illegal "black bag operations" for years.

Governor Cuomo is asked to send New York State Troopers to close and secure the state's three judicial ethics offices: the main office on the 12th floor at 61 Broadway in Manhattan, the capital office in Albany at the Corning Tower in the Empire State Plaza, and the northwest regional office at 400 Andrews Street in Rochester.

The Governor is asked to telephone the Assistant United States Attorney who is overseeing the millions of items of evidence, most of which that has been secreted from the public- and the governor- by a federal court order.

Governor Cuomo was provided with the direct telephone number of the involved federal prosecutor, and simply requested to confirm that evidence exists that certain state employees in New York's so-called judicial "ethics" committee illegally wiretapped state judges.

The request to the governor will be posted at www.ethicsgate.com later today. (Media inquiries can be made to 202-374-3680.)

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013

**“SEE THE LETTER TO NEW YORK GOVERNOR ANDREW CUOMO RE:
WIRETAPPING JUDGES...”**

CLICK HERE TO SEE THE LETTER, AT

**[HTTP://ETHICSGATE.BLOGSPOT.COM/2013/02/LETTER-TO-NEW-YORK-
GOVERNOR-ANDREW.HTML](http://ethicsgate.blogspot.com/2013/02/letter-to-new-york-governor-andrew.html)**”

Selected quotes from that article and the letter to Cuomo,

Friday, February 15, 2013

Letter to New York Governor Andrew Cuomo Re: Wiretapping Judges

The letter was delivered to the Governor's Manhattan and Albany offices:

Reform2013.com

[**REDACTED**]

202-374-3680 tel

202-827-9828 fax

[**REDACTED**]

February 15, 2013

The Honorable Andrew M. Cuomo,

Governor of New York State

NYS Captiol Building

Albany, New York 12224 [**REDACTED**]

[**REDACTED**]

[**REDACTED**]

**RE: ILLEGAL WIRETAPPING OF JUDGES BY THE COMMISSION ON
JUDICIAL CONDUCT**

Dear Governor Cuomo

I respectfully request that you telephone Assistant U.S. Attorney [**REDACTED**] and ask whether there is any credible evidence in the millions of documents, currently under

court seal in case # [**REDACTED**] regarding the illegal wiretapping of New York State judges and attorneys [**REDACTED**]

I believe you will quickly confirm that certain NYS employees at the judicial and attorney “ethics” committees routinely directed such “black bag operations” by grossly and illegally abusing their access to [**REDACTED**]

New York judges and lawyers, and obviously the public, deserve immediate action to address the widespread corruption in and about the state’s so-called “ethics” oversight entities. Accordingly, it is requested that you temporarily shut down and secure New York’s “ethics” offices and appoint, by executive order, an Ethics Commission to investigate, etc.

Please take immediate action regarding this vital issue, and so as to continue your efforts to help all New Yorkers restore their faith in their government. [**REDACTED**]

cc: Assistant U.S. Attorney [**REDACTED**]

The Hon. [**REDACTED**]

[**REDACTED**]

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2013

**“ETHICSGATE UPDATE FAXED TO EVERY U.S. SENATOR
WWW.ETHICSGATE.COM “THE ULTIMATE VIOLATION OF TRUST IS THE
CORRUPTION OF ETHICS OVERSIGHT” EXCLUSIVE UPDATE”**

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2013/02/ethicsgate-update-faxed-to-every-us.html>

Tuesday, February 19, 2013 --- New York State Governor Andrew Cuomo asked to shut down judicial “Ethics” offices after evidence reveals illegal wiretapping of judges - Andrew Cuomo was formally requested on Friday, February 15, 2013 to shut down the NYS Commission on Judicial Conduct, the state agency charged with overseeing the ethics of all non-federal judges in the Empire State. Governor Cuomo will confirm with federal prosecutors that a case, where millions

of documents are held under seal, contains evidence of widespread "black bag operations" that advanced, over more than a decade, knowingly false allegations against targets while protecting favored insiders, including Wall Street attorneys.... See the full story at:

www.ethicsgate.com”

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2013

“NEW YORK SENATORS ASKED TO APPOINT ETHICS CORRUPTION LIAISON...EVERY NEW YORK STATE SENATOR HAS BEEN REQUESTED TO APPOINT AN "ETHICS CORRUPTION LIAISON" SO THAT TIMELY INFORMATION IN THE EVER-GROWING SCANDAL INSIDE NEW YORK'S SO-CALLED "ETHICS" ENTITIES MAY BE PROVIDED TO EACH STATE SENATOR.”

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2013/02/new-york-senators-asked-to-appoint.html>

Reform2013.com

Ethicsgate.com

February 28, 2013

Via Facsimile [as noted below]

RE: Illegal Wiretapping of NYS Judges and Attorneys by “Ethics” Entities

Dear Senator,

On February 15, 2013, we formally requested that Governor Cuomo contact the Assistant U.S. Attorney handling a sensitive federal case wherein credible evidence, in the millions of documents currently under court seal, support the allegation of the widespread illegal wiretapping of New York State judges and attorneys over at least the last ten years. In addition, other individuals- unrelated to that sealed federal matter- allege the exact same illegal activity.

The illegal wiretapping is alleged to have been directed by named senior personnel (and NYS employees) at the Commission on Judicial Conduct (the “CJC”) and by at least two of the state’s 4 judicial departments’ attorney ethics committees.

We are, of course, confident that Governor Cuomo is taking decisive action regarding these troubling allegations, and we are now requesting that you, as a New York State Senator, begin a comprehensive review of the troubling issues.

As we are all aware, certain corrupt forces in New York have caused tremendous damage to the very soul of this great state. Now, the improper actions have accomplished the "ultimate corruption" - they have compromised and corrupted New York's so-called "ethics oversight" entities.

New York judges and lawyers, and obviously the public, deserve immediate action to address the widespread corruption in and about the state's so-called "ethics" oversight entities. (Additional information is available at www.Reform2013.com)

Accordingly, it is requested that you direct someone in your office to act as the liaison regarding this Ethics Corruption, and that he or she be in contact with us so that we may best communicate information to your office. Please have your designee contact us at their earliest convenience.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Reform2013

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 2013

FORMAL COMPLAINT FILED AGAINST NYS EMPLOYEES FOR ILLEGAL WIRETAPPING...THE WIDESPREAD ILLEGAL WIRETAPPING INCLUDED TARGETED NEW YORK STATE JUDGES AND ATTORNEYS.....

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2013/04/formal-complaint-filed-against-nys.html>

Reform2013.com
P.O. Box 3493
New York, New York 10163
202-374-3680 tel
202-827-9828 fax

April 3, 2013

Robert Moosy, Jr., Section Chief
Criminal Section, Civil Rights Division
US Department of Justice via facsimile # 202-514-6588
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20530

RE: Formal Complaint Against New York State Employees Involving
Constitutional Violations, including widespread illegal wiretapping

Dear Mr. Moosy,

In researching and reporting on various acts of corruption in and about the New York State Court System, specific reviewed evidence supports allegations that over a ten-year-plus period of time, certain NYS employees participated in the widespread practice of illegal wiretapping, inter alia. As these individuals were in supervisory positions at "ethics oversight" committees, the illegal wiretapping largely concerned attorneys and judges, but their actions also targeted other individuals who had some type of dealings with those judicial and attorney "ethics" committees.

The NY state-employed individuals herein complained of include New York State admitted attorneys Thomas Joseph Cahill, Alan Wayne Friedberg, Sherry Kruger Cohen, David Spokony and Naomi Freyda Goldstein.

At some point in time shortly after 9/11, and by methods not addressed here, these individuals improperly utilized access to, and devices of, the lawful operations of the Joint Terrorism Task Force (the "JTTF"). These individuals completely violated the

provisions of FISA, ECPA and the Patriot Act for their own personal and political agendas. Specifically, these NY state employees essentially commenced “black bag operations,” including illegal wiretapping, against whomever they chose- and without legitimate or lawful purpose.

To be clear, any lawful act involving the important work of the JTTF is to be applauded. The herein complaint simply addresses the unlawful access- and use- of JTTF related operations for the personal and political whims of those who improperly acted under the color of law. Indeed, illegally utilizing JTTF resources is not only illegal, it is a complete insult to those involved in such important work.

In fact, hard-working and good-intentioned prosecutors and investigators (federal and state) are also victims here, as they were guided and primed with knowingly false information.

Operations involving lawful activity- and especially as part of the important work of the JTTF and related agencies- are not at issue here. This complaint concerns the illegal use and abuse of such lawful operations for personal and political gain, and all such activity while acting under the color of law. This un-checked access to highly-skilled operatives found undeserving protection for some connected wrong-doers, and the complete destruction of others- on a whim, including the pre-prosecution priming of falsehoods (“set-ups”). The aftermath of such abuse for such an extended period of time is staggering.

It is believed that most of the 1.5 million-plus items in evidence now under seal in Federal District Court for the Eastern District of New York, case #09cr405 (EDNY) supports the fact, over a ten-year-plus period of time, of the illegal wiretapping of New York State judges, attorneys, and related targets, as directed by state employees.

To be sure, the defendant in #09cr405, Frederick Celani, is a felon who is now regarded by many as a conman. Notwithstanding the individual (Celani), the evidence is clear that Celani once supervised lawful “black bag operations,” and, further, that certain NYS employees illegally utilized access to such operations for their own illegal purposes. (Simple reference is made to another felon, the respected former Chief Judge of the New York State Court of Appeals, Sol Wachtler, who many believe was victimized by political pre-priming prosecution.)

In early February, 2013, I personally reviewed, by appropriate FOIL request to a NYS Court Administrative Agency, over 1000 documents related to the herein complaint. Those documents, and other evidence, fully support Celani’s claim of his once-lawful supervisory role in such JTTF operations, and his extended involvement with those herein named. (The names of specific targeted judges and attorneys are available.)

One sworn affidavit, by an attorney, confirms the various illegal activity of Manhattan’s attorney “ethics” committee, the Departmental Disciplinary Committee (the “DDC”),

which includes allowing cover law firm operations to engage in the practice of law without a law license. Specifically, evidence (attorney affidavits, etc.) supports the claim that Naomi Goldstein, and other DDC employees supervised the protection of the unlicensed practice of law. The evidence also shows that Ms. Goldstein knowingly permitted the unlicensed practice of law, over a five-year-plus period of time, for the purpose of gaining access to, and information from, hundreds of litigants.

Evidence also supports the widespread illegal use of “black bag operations” by the NYS employees for a wide-range of objectives: to target or protect a certain judge or attorney, to set-up anyone who had been deemed to be a target, or to simply achieve a certain goal. The illegal activity is believed to not only have involved attorneys and judges throughout all of the New York State, including all 4 court-designated ethics “departments,” but also in matters beyond the borders of New York.

Other evidence points to varying and widespread illegal activity, and knowledge of such activity, by these and other NYS employees - all of startling proportions. For example:

- The “set-up” of numerous individuals for an alleged plot to bomb a Riverdale, NY Synagogue. These individuals are currently incarcerated. The trial judge, U.S. District Court Judge Colleen McMahon, who publicly expressed concerns over the case, saying, “I have never heard anything like the facts of this case. I don’t think any other judge has ever heard anything like the facts of this case.” (2nd Circuit 11cr2763)
- The concerted effort to fix numerous cases where confirmed associates of organized crime had made physical threats upon litigants and/or witnesses, and/or had financial interests in the outcome of certain court cases.
- The judicial and attorney protection/operations, to gain control, of the \$250 million-plus Thomas Carvel estate matters, and the pre-prosecution priming of the \$150 million-plus Brooke Astor estate.
- The thwarting of new evidence involving a mid 1990’s “set-up” of an individual, who spent over 4 years in prison because he would not remain silent about evidence he had involving financial irregularities and child molestation by a CEO of a prominent Westchester, NY non-profit organization. (Hon. John F. Keenan)
- The wire-tapping and ISP capture, etc., of DDC attorney, Christine C. Anderson, who had filed a lawsuit after being assaulted by a supervisor, Sherry Cohen, and after complaining that certain evidence in ethics case files had been improperly destroyed. (See SDNY case #07cv9599 - Hon. Shira A. Scheindlin, U.S.D.J.)
- The eToys litigation and bankruptcy, and associates of Marc Dreier, involving over \$500 million and the protection by the DDC of certain attorneys, one who was found to have lied to a federal judge over 15 times.
- The “set-up” and “chilling” of effective legal counsel of a disabled woman by a powerful CEO and his law firms, resulting in her having no contact with her children for over 6 years.
- The wrongful detention for 4 years, prompted by influential NY law firms, of an early whistleblower of the massive Wall Street financial irregularities involving Bear

Sterns and where protected attorney-client conversations were recorded and distributed.

- The blocking of attorney accountability in the \$1.25 billion Swiss Bank Holocaust Survivor settlement where one involved NY admitted attorney was ultimately disbarred- in New Jersey. Only then, and after 10 years, did the DDC follow with disbarment. (Gizella Weisshaus v. Fagan)

Additional information will be posted on www.Reform2013.com

The allegations of widespread wiretapping by New York's so-called "ethics" committees were relayed to New York Governor Andrew M. Cuomo on February 15, 2013, and to the DDC Chairman Mr. Roy R. L. Reardon, Esq., who confirmed, on March 27, 2013, his knowledge of the allegations. (Previously, on March 25, 2013, I had written to DDC Deputy Chief Counsel Naomi Goldstein, copying Mr. Reardon, of my hope that she would simply tell the truth about the improper activity, inter alia.)

New York judges and lawyers, and obviously the public, deserve immediate action to address the widespread corruption in and about New York's so-called "ethics" oversight entities.

Please take immediate action regarding this troubling issue, and so as to continue the DOJ's efforts to help all New Yorkers restore their faith in their government.

cc:

U.S. Attorney Loretta E. Lynch via facsimile 718-254-6479 and 631-715-7922

U.S. DOJ Civil Rights Section via facsimile 202-307-1379, 202-514-0212

The Hon. Arthur D. Spatt, via facsimile 631-712-5626

The Hon. Colleen McMahon via facsimile 212-805-6326

Hon. Shira A. Scheindlin via facsimile 212-805-7920

Assistant U.S. Attorney Demetri Jones via facsimile 631-715-7922

Assistant U.S. Attorney Perry Carbone via facsimile 914-993-1980

Assistant U.S. Attorney Brendan McGuire via 212-637-2615 and 212-637-0016

FBI SSA Robert Hennigan via facsimile 212-384-4073 and 212-384-4074

Pending SEC Chair Mary Jo White via facsimile 212-909-6836

Posted by Corrupt Courts Administrator at 2:11 PM