

Via US Mail and Facsimile

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Honorable Shira A. Scheindlin
United States District Judge
Southern District of New York
500 Pearl Street
New York, New York 10007

**Re: Plaintiffs Opposition to Court Order Dated March 07, 2008
in Eliot I. Bernstein, et al. v. Appellate Division, First
Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee, et al.,
Docket No. 07 CV 11196 (SAS)**

Dear Judge Scheindlin:

In review of this Court's Order dated March 07, 2008, we ask that the Court reconsider several of its decision for the following reasons:

I. Attorney General Conflict

It appears that the Court's Order presumes that the Attorney General is not conflicted in these matters versus simply asking the Attorney General to run a formal conflicts check with the matters, the Defendants and the prior cases submitted to their offices then submitting the outcome of such conflict check to the Court and Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs also point to the fact that based on the new and revealing Anderson claims of public office corruptions at the First Department, that Plaintiffs have filed today a request for the Attorney General's Office to reinvestigate both the former complaints submitted to their offices by Plaintiffs, of almost identical claims of public office crimes as Anderson states, based on Anderson's revelations which appear criminal in nature. Plaintiffs also point to the fact that Eliot Spitzer retains Proskauer Rose LLP as legal counsel and this may have hindered the AG in their decisions to wholly avoid the initial complaints submitted to them under Spitzer's reign, as this conflict was never disclosed to Plaintiffs.

II. Conflict of Law Firms Proskauer Rose and Foley and Lardner

In the Order, this Court claims that Plaintiffs "have show no ground" to establish that the law firms are conflicted yet we did show grounds under a



disciplinary rule. We are unclear if that disciplinary rule was not sufficient or if the Court overlooked the cited rule, we therefore ask for clarification. We also submitted on March 10th 2008 another letter to this Court providing several more reasons why the law firms should be precluded from self representation under existing disciplinary rules and we ask this Court to explain with legal justification each and every rule cited in that letter, if continued representation of the conflicted law firms is allowed. It appears that this Court did not have that letter at the time of ruling in the Order and thus we await any Order regarding that. Plaintiffs are baffled by the Court's claim that we did not show grounds, as it is presumed that the Court is already in possession of information that Proskauer Rose the entire firm and all its partners and individually Steven Krane, Kenneth Rubenstein and Raymond Joao have been ordered by the First Department Justices to be investigated for conflicts of interest and the appearance of impropriety, after those Justice claimed to have preformed a thorough review of the cases at the First Department resulting in the cases being moved from the First Department and ordered for "immediate investigation". This prior ruling establishes great cause of possible conflicts in Proskauer's representation of themselves here before this Court and as this remains the underlying case in this matter that should prove sufficient to force them to seek non conflicted counsel.

It should also be noted that every lawyer of Proskauer is conflicted as the entire firm is being sued and Plaintiffs have no idea due to the nature of the conspiracy asserted which partners or associates were directly involved in the crimes alleged. Either way, every Proskauer employee and all partners due to the partnership, remain at personal risk in these matters thus appearing morbidly conflicted. Again, perhaps instead of this Court presuming and then opining that the law firms have no conflict, this Court should demand that both law firms run conflicts checks on representing themselves and provide the outcome of such to the Court and the Plaintiffs, as there may be hundreds of other reasons they are conflicted that neither this Court or Plaintiffs may know. It further seems unreasonable that Plaintiffs should have to investigate and find conflict, as we have done in the past, to expose those already under review in these matters for conflict, all which could be prevented with affirmed conflicts checks by all parties prior to representation.

Further, due to their prior conflicts in matters related to this case intimately, this conflict check should be required to be conducted by a third party non-conflicted party, as Plaintiffs will not rely on Proskauer's merely stating they are not conflicted when their entire firm and all their assets are at stake and where they have already proved to be insufficient in running conflicts checks as pointed to in the March 10, 2008 letter to this Court.

As the original Complaint filed by Defendants contains a conflict of interest disclosure that we asked this Court to have all parties sign, it would be considerate of the Court to rule that all parties, including the Court, now run a full conflict checks in addition to the one provided in the original Complaint and have all parties submit the results of such third party conflicts checks to both the Court



and the Plaintiffs. Why should Plaintiffs be forced to find the conflicts, especially where Anderson alleges that such behavior was commonplace.

This Court maintained that Fried could remain counsel until conflict is discovered, if ever, even though one may exist it may be well hidden as Proskauer's former conflicts were, making it harder or impossible to find. Again, Fried too should be compelled to have an independent third party run a formal conflict check and provide that to the Court and Plaintiffs instead of this Court waiting for Plaintiffs to find conflict by luck later in the case, as "an ounce of prevention..." Plaintiffs request that all of these conflicts checks on all parties further be affirmed and verified under oath by those directly involved submitting such if required by the Court.

III. Regarding Enjoining the United States and Foreign Entities in this Case

Plaintiffs request to know how and who to contact to enjoin the United States in these matters and Plaintiffs will then do so. We will be asking the DOJ, the DOJ OIG, the USPTO, the USPTO OED, the SBA, the SBA OIG and others to enjoin and we ask if there are separate persons to contact for these agencies or there is a way to notice one who then relegates the various other government bodies and if so Plaintiffs will immediately do so. We also ask the Court to determine, if possible, who to contact to enjoin the European Patent Office, the Institute of Professional Representatives before the European Patent Office (epi), the Japanese Patent Office and the Korean Patent Office and if these concerns being enjoined require any international treaties rules to be followed.

Finally, we ask the Court if based on Anderson's claims of public office crimes and corruptions, which appear to be of a criminal nature, if it is in this Court's power to enjoin criminal investigators for those matters, as they relate to all of our claims in this Complaint or if it is the obligation of Plaintiffs to do so. If it is our responsibility, we respectfully ask this Court what authorities to report these potential crimes to if this Court has not already done so. From our laymen reading of the disciplinary code and judicial conduct codes, it appears within this Court's power to notify all proper authorities of possible criminal misconduct of other lawyers and public officers and we assume that Anderson provides a basis for such obligation to be fulfilled by the Court. Either way, if this Court does not feel compelled, Plaintiffs will be happy to notify those criminal authorities that the crimes referenced in Anderson provide a basis to enjoin them in our suit. As we were considering calling in the AG to investigate, we now feel that the prior Order of this Court to allow them to maintain representation of the Defendants out of public office funds precludes them from being enjoined as Plaintiffs or how that works. If they are then conflicted from becoming Plaintiffs as they represent Defendants than we ask for this Court to provide who then to enjoin.

IV. Service Issues

Despite certain of the defendants acceptance of service and this Court granting such, we are still asking the Court to fully investigate how approximately



20 pounds of service papers were removed from a package sent to the US Marshal in this Federal Court proceeding. Some defendants, for example the Virginia Bar, are getting services with and without the Complaint per their letter to this Court and have not formally accepted the improper ones. Since the service is now improper to some if not all defendants and further may involve federal mail fraud we are asking that this Court notify all investigators of the possible crime that may exist here and to have them institute immediate formal federal investigations into the missing package contents and faulty service resulting there from.

Plaintiffs have already begun the steps we could but request this Court to use any powers within its means to notice either same or other investigators as the package technically was in the hands of federal postal authorities and the US Marshal and were what appears to be the property of this Court, as they were being delivered ultimately to the Court. This mail issue has already materially affected our case by delaying service for over a month to certain Defendants, all of who have not accepted the improper service and as this may effect the case and if found that tampering with Federal Court papers via federal mail has occurred, this could prove to materially affect certain parties and therefore must be investigated to completion before this case proceeds.

V. Conflict Checks by All Parties

Plaintiffs are asking that all parties legally participating in these matters, including this Court and all Defendant counsel run a full and formal conflicts check against not only the current Defendants but the soon to be added Defendants listed in the Draft Amended Complaint header section exhibited herein as Exhibit 1, before continuing further or before joining these matters. We are asking that such conflicts checks be done and the results distributed to the Plaintiffs and this Court. Failure to follow conflicts checks and conflicts occurring are again the basis for the case before this Court and the underlying case that now come center court in the RICO claim, of patent theft. When it is the obligation of counsel, court officials and public officers to disclose conflicts prior to handling matters and these matters now have multiple massive conflicts as the underlying claims whereby public officers have allegedly continued in a pattern of conflict to deny due process, the failures already should be grounds to establish ethics beyond a reasonable doubt, in fact mandating it. Since Anderson not only furthers the Plaintiffs claims of conflicts and public office violations but additionally provides all the grounds this Court should need to find at minimum conflict checking as a precaution, as Anderson exposes from the inside how conflicts were preventing due process through public office crimes, including conflicts and the overwhelming appearance of impropriety.


VI. Acceptance of Court Papers by Plaintiffs by Electronic Transfer



That due to the fact that US mail has already been tampered with in these matters and is under investigation we are asking that this Court allow some form of electronic transfer of the documents by and between this Court and Plaintiffs to assure that tampering has not occurred and that we are both looking at the same documents that were transmitted. The underlying case of patent theft in these matters has numerous examples of mail and wire fraud, whereby evidence of such has already been provided to federal and international authorities, including tampering with mail sent to the USPTO for patents.

As Pro Se counsel in these matters, we are asking that this Court allow Plaintiffs to use any electronic document service provided to any other counsel as a measure of safety, at least until the conclusion of the investigations by the US Postmaster and US Marshal concerning the service debacle are concluded. This may include any Court electronic services, facsimile machine or email, although tampering with email is also complained of to several investigators currently investigating these matters. With US Mail being wholly unreliable, even when express and certified is paid for, at minimum we would ask the Court to provide an electronic secondary source as backup.

Respectfully submitted,



Eliot I. Bernstein, Pro Se
and

P. Stephen Lamont, Pro Se

cc: Monica Connell (via US Mail and Facsimile)
Assistant Attorney General
Attorney for Defendants

Gregory Mashberg, Esq.
Joanna Smith, Esq.
Proskauer Rose LLP (via US Mail, Email and Facsimile)
Attorney for Defendants

Todd Norbitz, Esq.
Anne Sekel, Esq.
Foley and Lardner LLP (via US Mail, Email and Facsimile)
Attorney for Defendants

John W. Fried, Esq. (via US Mail, Email and Facsimile)
Fried & Epstein LLP
Attorneys for Defendants Joao

Exhibit 1 – Partial draft Amended Complaint

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

X

ELIOT I. BERNSTEIN, INDIVIDUALLY AND P. STEPHEN LAMONT AND ELIOT I. BERNSTEIN ON BEHALF OF SHAREHOLDERS OF IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC., IVIEWIT TECHNOLOGIES, INC., UVIEW.COM, INC., IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC., IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC., IVIEWIT.COM, INC., IVIEWIT.COM, INC., I.C., INC., IVIEWIT.COM LLC, IVIEWIT LLC, IVIEWIT CORPORATION, IVIEWIT, INC., IVIEWIT, INC., AND PATENT INTEREST HOLDERS ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT A PLAINTIFFS,

**DOCKET NO:
07-CV-11196 (SAS)**

-AGAINST-

- 1. PROSKAUER ROSE LLP,**
- 2. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") PROSKAUER PARTNER, AFFILIATE, COMPANY, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO PROSKAUER ROSE LLP PARTNERS, ASSOCIATES, OF COUNSEL, EMPLOYEES, CORPORATIONS, AFFILIATES AND ANY OTHER PROSKAUER RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.**
- 3. STEVEN C. KRANE IN HIS OFFICIAL, INDIVIDUAL AND PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY,**
- 4. KENNETH RUBENSTEIN BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,**
- 5. ESTATE OF STEPHEN KAYE IN HIS FORMER OFFICIAL, INDIVIDUAL AND PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY,**
- 6. ALAN S. JAFFE BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY, AMENDED COMPLAINT**
- 7. ROBERT KAFIN BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,**
- 8. CHRISTOPHER C. WHEELER IN HIS OFFICIAL, INDIVIDUAL AND PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY,**
- 9. MATTHEW TRIGGS IN HIS OFFICIAL, INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY AND PROFESSIONAL,**
- 10. ALBERT GORTZ BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,**
- 11. HON. JUDITH S. KAYE IN HER OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,**
- 12. MELTZER LIPPE GOLDSTEIN & BREISTONE LLP,**
- 13. MELTZER, LIPPE, GOLDSTEIN, WOLF & SCHLISSEL, P.C.,**
- 14. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") MELTZER, LIPPE, GOLDSTEIN, WOLF & SCHLISSEL, P.C. PARTNER, AFFILIATE, COMPANY, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO MELTZER, LIPPE, GOLDSTEIN, WOLF & SCHLISSEL, P.C.; PARTNERS, ASSOCIATES, OF COUNSEL, EMPLOYEES, CORPORATIONS, AFFILIATES AND ANY OTHER MELTZER, LIPPE, GOLDSTEIN, WOLF & SCHLISSEL, P.C. RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,**
- 15. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") MELTZER LIPPE GOLDSTEIN & BREISTONE LLP, PARTNER, AFFILIATE, COMPANY, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO MELTZER LIPPE GOLDSTEIN & BREISTONE LLP, PARTNERS, ASSOCIATES, OF COUNSEL, EMPLOYEES, CORPORATIONS, AFFILIATES AND ANY OTHER MELTZER LIPPE GOLDSTEIN & BREISTONE LLP, RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,**



Re: Plaintiffs Opposition to Court Order Dated March 07, 2008 in Eliot I. Bernstein, et al. v. Appellate Division, First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee, et al., Docket No. 07 CV 11196 (SAS)

16. LEWIS S. MELTZER BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
17. RAYMOND A. JOAO BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
18. FRANK MARTINEZ IN BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
19. FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP,
20. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") FOLEY & LARDNER PARTNERS, AFFILIATES, COMPANIES, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO FOLEY & LARDNER; PARTNERS, ASSOCIATES, OF COUNSEL, EMPLOYEES, CORPORATIONS, AFFILIATES AND ANY OTHER FOLEY & LARDNER RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.
21. MICHAEL C. GREBE BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
22. WILLIAM J. DICK BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
23. TODD C. NORBITZ, ESQ. BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
24. ANNE SEKEL, ESQ. BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
25. MPEGLA, LLC.,
26. MPEGLA LLC. LICENSORS
27. MPEGLA LLC. LICENSEES
- MPEG-9
- MPEG-2
- MPEG -2 SYSTEMS
- MPEG-4 VISUAL
- MPEG-4 SYSTEMS
- IEEE 1394 (FIREWIRE)
- AVC (H.264)
- DVB-T
- ATSC
- VC-1
28. DVD6C LICENSING GROUP
29. 6C DVD (1998)
30. 4C DVD (1997)
31. RFID COUNCIL LLC,
32. LAWRENCE HORN
33. INTEL CORP.,
34. REAL 3D, INC.,
35. SILICON GRAPHICS, INC.,
36. LOCKHEED MARTIN,
37. RYJO,
38. GERALD STANLEY,
39. RYAN HUISMAN,
40. LARRY PALLEY,
41. TIM CONNOLLY,
42. ROSALIE BIBONA,
43. BRIAN G. UTLEY BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
44. MICHAEL REALE BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
45. JUDGE JORGE LABARGA IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,
46. JOHN ANTHONY BOGGS IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,
47. THOMAS J. CAHILL, IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,
48. ALBERTO GONZALES, FORMER UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL, IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY.
49. JOHNNIE E. FRAZIER, FORMER UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE INSPECTOR GENERAL, IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY.
50. HOUSTON & SHADY, P.A.
51. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") HOUSTON & SHADY, P.A., AFFILIATES, COMPANIES, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED

TO HOUSTON & SHADY P.A. RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.

52. FURR & COHEN, P.A.

53. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") FURR & COHEN, P.A., AFFILIATES, COMPANIES, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO FURR & COHEN, P.A. RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.

54. SACHS SAXS & KLEIN, P.A.

55. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") SACHS SAXS & KLEIN P.A., AFFILIATES, COMPANIES, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO SACHS SAXS & KLEIN, PA RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.

56. EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE

57. ALAIN POMPIDOU, EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE, IN HIS OFFICIAL AND PERSONAL CAPACITY,

58. CHRISTOPHER PRUZASKI BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.

59. MARA LERNER ROBBINS BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.

60. DONALD "ROCKY" THOMPSON BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.

61. GAYLE COLEMAN BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

62. DAVID GEORGE BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

63. GEORGE A. PINCUS BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

64. GREGG REED BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

65. LEON GOLD BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

66. MARCY HAHN-SAPERSTEIN BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

67. KEVIN J. HEALY BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

68. STUART KAPP BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

69. RONALD F. STORETTE BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

70. CHRIS WOLF BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

71. JILL ZAMMAS BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

72. JON A. BAUMGARTEN BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

73. SCOTT P. COOPER BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

74. BRENDAN J. O'ROURKE BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

75. LAWRENCE I. WEINSTEIN BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

76. WILLIAM M. HART BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

77. DARYN A. GROSSMAN BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

78. JOSEPH A. CAPRARO JR. BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

79. JAMES H. SHALEK BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

80. GREGORY MASHBERG, ESQ., BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

81. JOANNA SMITH, ESQ., BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

82. THE CITY OF NEW YORK,

83. THE OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNIFIED COURT SYSTEM,

84. DOUGLAS A. BOEHM BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

85. STEVEN C. BECKER BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

86. RALF BOER BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

87. BARRY GROSSMAN BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

88. JIM CLARK BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

89. SCHIFFRIN & BARROWAY, LLP

90. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") SCHIFFRIN & BARROWAY, LLP PARTNERS, AFFILIATES, COMPANIES, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO SCHIFFRIN & BARROWAY, LLP; PARTNERS, ASSOCIATES, OF COUNSEL, EMPLOYEES, CORPORATIONS, AFFILIATES AND ANY OTHER SCHIFFRIN & BARROWAY, LLP RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.

91. RICHARD SCHIFFRIN INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

92. ANDREW BARROWAY INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
93. KRISHNA NARINE INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
94. BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP,
95. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP PARTNERS, AFFILIATES, COMPANIES, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP; PARTNERS, ASSOCIATES, OF COUNSEL, EMPLOYEES, CORPORATIONS, AFFILIATES AND ANY OTHER BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.
96. NORMAN ZAFMAN INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
97. THOMAS COESTER INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
98. FARZAD AHMINI INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
99. GEORGE HOOVER INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
100. WILDMAN, HARROLD, ALLEN & DIXON PARTNERS,
101. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") WILDMAN, HARROLD, ALLEN & DIXON LLP PARTNERS, AFFILIATES, COMPANIES, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO WILDMAN, HARROLD, ALLEN & DIXON LLP; PARTNERS, ASSOCIATES, OF COUNSEL, EMPLOYEES, CORPORATIONS, AFFILIATES AND ANY OTHER WILDMAN, HARROLD, ALLEN & DIXON LLP RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.
102. CHRISTOPHER & WEISBERG, P.A.
103. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") CHRISTOPHER & WEISBERG, P.A. PARTNERS, AFFILIATES, COMPANIES, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO CHRISTOPHER & WEISBERG, P.A.; PARTNERS, ASSOCIATES, OF COUNSEL, EMPLOYEES, CORPORATIONS, AFFILIATES AND ANY OTHER CHRISTOPHER & WEISBERG, P.A. RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.
104. ALAN M. WEISBERG INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

105. MARTYN W. MOLYNEAUX INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
106. MICHAEL DOCKTERMAN INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
107. YAMAKAWA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE,
108. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") YAMAKAWA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE PARTNERS, AFFILIATES, COMPANIES, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO YAMAKAWA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE; PARTNERS, ASSOCIATES, OF COUNSEL, EMPLOYEES, CORPORATIONS, AFFILIATES AND ANY OTHER YAMAKAWA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.
109. MASAKI YAMAKAWA INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
110. GOLDSTEIN LEWIN & CO.
111. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") GOLDSTEIN & LEWIN CO. PARTNERS, AFFILIATES, COMPANIES, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO GOLDSTEIN & LEWIN CO.; PARTNERS, ASSOCIATES, OF COUNSEL, EMPLOYEES, CORPORATIONS, AFFILIATES AND ANY OTHER GOLDSTEIN & LEWIN CO. RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.
112. DONALD J. GOLDSTEIN INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
113. GERALD R. LEWIN INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
114. ERIKA LEWIN INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
115. MARK R. GOLD INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
116. PAUL FEUERBERG INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
117. SALVATORE BOCHICCHIO INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
118. MARC H. LIST INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
119. DAVID A. KATZMAN INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
120. ROBERT H. GARICK INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,

121. ROBERT C. ZEIGEN INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
122. LAWRENCE A. ROSENBLUM INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
123. BRAD N. MCIVER INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
124. ROBERT CINI INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
125. STEVE COCHRAN INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
126. DAVID BOLTON INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
127. CONNIE MARTIN INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
128. RICHARD GENTNER INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
129. STEVEN A. BEHRENS INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
130. MATT JOHANNSEN INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
131. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") INTEL, REAL 3D, INC. (SILICON GRAPHICS, INC., LOCKHEED MARTIN & INTEL) & RYJO PARTNERS, AFFILIATES, COMPANIES, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO INTEL, REAL 3D, INC. (SILICON GRAPHICS, INC., LOCKHEED MARTIN & INTEL) & RYJO; EMPLOYEES, CORPORATIONS, AFFILIATES AND ANY OTHER INTEL, REAL 3D, INC. (SILICON GRAPHICS, INC., LOCKHEED MARTIN & INTEL) & RYJO RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.
132. TIEDEMANN INVESTMENT GROUP
133. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") TIEDEMANN INVESTMENT GROUP PARTNERS, AFFILIATES, COMPANIES, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO TIEDEMANN INVESTMENT GROUP AND ANY OTHER TIEDEMANN INVESTMENT GROUP RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.
134. BRUCE T. PROLOW INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
135. CARL TIEDEMANN INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
136. ANDREW PHILIP CHESLER INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
137. CRAIG L. SMITH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
138. CROSSBOW VENTURES,
139. ALPINE PARTNERS,
140. STEPHEN J. WARNER INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
141. RENE P. EICHENBERGER INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
142. H. HICKMAN "HANK" POWELL INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
143. MAURICE BUCHSBAUM INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
144. ERIC CHEN INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
145. AVI HERSH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
146. MATTHEW SHAW INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
147. BRUCE W. SHEWMAKER INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
148. RAVI M. UGALE INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
149. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") CROSSBOW VENTURES, ALPINE PARTNERS PARTNERS, AFFILIATES, COMPANIES, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO CROSSBOW VENTURES / ALPINE PARTNERS AND ANY OTHER CROSSBOW VENTURES / ALPINE PARTNERS RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.
150. BROAD & CASSEL,
151. JAMES J. WHEELER INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
152. KELLY OVERSTREET JOHNSON IN HER OFFICIAL, INDIVIDUAL AND PROFESSIONAL CAPACITIES,
153. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") BROAD & CASSELL PARTNERS, AFFILIATES, COMPANIES, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO BROAD & CASSELL AND ANY OTHER BROAD & CASSELL RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.
154. RAYMOND HERSH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY,
155. THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK APPELLATE DIVISION: FIRST JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT,

156. THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK APPELLATE DIVISION: FIRST JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT, DEPARTMENTAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE

157. THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK APPELLATE DIVISION: SECOND JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT, DEPARTMENTAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE

158. THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK APPELLATE DIVISION: SECOND JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT,

159. THE FLORIDA BAR,

160. LORRAINE CHRISTINE HOFFMAN IN HER OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITIES,

161. ERIC TURNER IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITIES,

162. KENNETH MARVIN IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITIES,

163. JOY A. BARTMON IN HER OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITIES,

164. JERALD BEER IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITIES,

165. CATHERINE O'HAGEN WOLFE IN HER OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,

166. PAUL CURRAN IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,

167. MARTIN R. GOLD IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,

168. LAWRENCE DIGIOVANNA IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,

169. DIANA MAXFIELD KEARSE IN HER OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,

170. JAMES E. PELTZER IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,

171. HON. A. GAIL PRUDENTI IN HER OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,

173. THOMAS HALL IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,

174. DEBORAH YARBOROUGH IN HER OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,

175. VIRGINIA STATE BAR,

176. ANDREW H. GOODMAN IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,

177. NOEL SENDEL IN HER OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,

178. MARY W. MARTELINO IN HER OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,

179. LIZBETH L. MILLER, IN HER OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,

180. DETECTIVE ROBERT FLECHAUS IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY,

181. CHIEF OF POLICE ANDREW SCOTT IN HIS OFFICIAL AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY

182. HARRISON GOODARD FOOTE INCORPORATING BREWER & SON

183. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") HARRISON GOODARD FOOTE (INCORPORATING BREWER & SON) PARTNERS, AFFILIATES, COMPANIES, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO HARRISON GOODARD GOOTE INCORPORATING BREWER & SON AND ANY OTHER RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.

184. MOSKOWITZ, MANDELL, SALIM & SIMOWITZ, P.A.,

185. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") MOSKOWITZ, MANDELL, SALIM & SIMOWITZ, P.A., AFFILIATES, COMPANIES, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO MOSKOWITZ, MANDELL, SALIM & SIMOWITZ, P.A. RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.

186. HUIZENGA HOLDINGS INCORPORATED

187. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE ("JOHN DOE") HUIZENGA HOLDINGS INCORPORATED AFFILIATES, COMPANIES, KNOWN OR NOT KNOWN AT THIS TIME; INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO HUIZENGA HOLDINGS INCORPORATED RELATED OR AFFILIATED ENTITIES BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND PROFESSIONALLY.

188. WIM VAN DER EIJK, EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE, IN HIS OFFICIAL AND PERSONAL CAPACITY,

189. LISE DYBDAHL, EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE, IN HER OFFICIAL AND PERSONAL CAPACITY,

190. UVIEW.COM, INC. – DL[1]

191. IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC. – DL

192. IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC. – DL

Re: Plaintiffs Opposition to Court Order Dated March 07, 2008 in Elliot I. Bernstein, et al. v. Appellate Division, First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee, et al., Docket No. 07 CV 11196 (SAS)

- 193. IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC. – FL
- 194. IVIEWIT.COM, INC. – FL
- 195. IVIEWIT.COM, INC. – DL
- 196. I.C., INC. – FL
- 197. IVIEWIT.COM LLC – DL
- 198. IVIEWIT LLC – DL
- 199. IVIEWIT CORPORATION – FL
- 200. IVIEWIT, INC. – FL
- 201. IVIEWIT, INC. – DEL
- 202. ANY OTHER JOHN DOE,
- 203. ANY OTHER JANE DOE

Defendants

X

**JURY TRIAL
DEMANDED**

IVIEWIT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC.
ELIOT I. BERNSTEIN, FOUNDER & INVENTOR

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET


TO:	The Honorable Shira A. Scheindlin	FROM:	Eliot I. Bernstein
COMPANY:	United States District Court ~ Southern District of New York	DATE:	Thursday, March 13, 2008 14:23:35PST
FAX NUMBER:	(212) 805-7920	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:	13
PHONE NUMBER:	(212) 805-0246 chambers	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER:	2358
RE:	Re: Plaintiffs Opposition to Court Order Dated March 07, 2008 in Eliot I. Bernstein, et al. v. Appellate Division, First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee, et al., Docket No. 07 CV 11196 (SAS)	YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER:	2358 WC

URGENT FOR REVIEW PLEASE COMMENT PLEASE REPLY PLEASE RECYCLE

NOTES/COMMENTS:

Please deliver the following fax to Judge Scheindlin ASAP.

Thank you


Eliot I. Bernstein
Founder & Inventor
Iviewit Technologies, Inc.
Iviewit Holdings, Inc.
39 Little Ave
Red Bluff, California 96080-3519
(530) 529-4110
(530) 526-5750 (c)
iviewit@iviewit.tv
www.iviewit.tv

THIS MESSAGE AND ITS EMBEDDED FILES INCORPORATED HEREIN CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PROPRIETARY AND CONFIDENTIAL PRIVILEGED INFORMATION. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE PROHIBITED FROM READING, OPENING, PRINTING, COPYING, FORWARDING, OR SAVING THIS MAIL AND ITS ATTACHMENTS. PLEASE DELETE THE MESSAGE AND ITS EMBEDDED FILES WITHOUT READING, OPENING, PRINTING, COPYING, FORWARDING, OR SAVING THEM, AND NOTIFY THE SENDER IMMEDIATELY AT (530) 529-4110. IF YOU ARE THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE PROHIBITED FROM FORWARDING THEM OR OTHERWISE DISCLOSING THESE CONTENTS TO OTHERS, UNLESS EXPRESSLY DESIGNATED BY THE SENDER. THANK YOU!

*** TRANSMISSION REPORT ***

MAR 13, 2008 14:31 Model # 4200 Series 530-529-4110

START TIME	SENT TO	PAGES	RESULT
14:27	12128057920	13	OK