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**Founder & Inventor  
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Sunday, February 14, 2010

Roy L. Reardon  
Chairman  
New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Judicial Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee  
61 Broadway  
New York, NY 10006  
(212) 401-0800

and

Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP  
Partner  
425 Lexington Avenue  
New York, NY 10017-3954

**Re: CRIMINAL COMPLAINTS FILED AGAINST ROY L. REARDON and ALAN FRIEDBERG;**

**RE-FILING OF DISCIPLINARY COMPLAINTS AGAINST ROY L. REARDON AND ALAN FRIEDBERG;**

**FORMAL NOTICE OF CITIZEN’S ARREST[[1]](#footnote-1) BY ELIOT BERNSTEIN ON ROY L. REARDON AND ALAN W. FRIEDBERG.**

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE FORM – PLEASE READ AND ACCEPT PRIOR TO FURTHER HANDLING OF THIS COMPLAINT. THE FORM IS EXHIBIT 1. FAILURE TO COMPLY MAY RESULT IN FURTHER FEDERAL AND STATE CRIMINAL AND CIVIL CHARGES FILED AGAINST YOU!**

Dear Mr. Reardon,

1. Response to Your Self-Incriminatory and Evidentiary of Felony Acts Letter Dated December 07, 2009 in reply to Formal Complaints against you and Alan W. Friedberg (“Friedberg”)

<http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20091207%20Suicide%20Note%20Roy%20Reardon%20Take%202%20First%20Department.pdf> [[2]](#footnote-2)

Your continued audacity in handling complaints against yourself and partner, wholly acting with Multiple Conflicts of Interest in violation of your Department’s rules and LAW, bemuses me and allow me to retort to you and Mr. Alan W. Friedberg’s (“Friedberg”) insanity and again put forth some basic realities regarding your misconduct and the criminal acts they constitute. Nice to see that after again reviewing your own complaints you and Friedberg still find no merit in the complaints against you but now we shall see what non-conflicted parties think of your actions including the handling of your own complaints.

First, my seventy-eight page complaint that you reference in your letter of December 07, 2009, as against Mr. Friedberg and others, is in fact also a complaint against you, if you had read it, instead of concealed it since February 2009, you would have seen your name as a COMPLAINED OF PARTY REPEATEDLY.

February 09, 2009 FORMAL COMPLAINT FILED AGAINST REARDON AND FRIEDBERG – RE-FILED ON DECEMBER 03, 2009 DUE TO CRIMINAL CONCEALMENT BY YOURSELF AND MR. FRIEDBERG @

<http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20091203%20Alan%20Friedberg%20First%20Department%20Complaint%20Redo%20FINAL%20SIGNED%20FAX%20COPY.pdf>

In your earlier attempt to dismiss your own complaints dated October 07, 2009 you have admitted and incriminated yourself by acknowledging that you received the FORMAL COMPLAINT back in February but did not think it was a FORMAL COMPLAINT and therefore you just buried it.

<http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20091007%20First%20Department%20Response%20to%20Judiciary%20Committee%20Request.pdf>

You failed to do anything with the Formal Complaint against yourself and Friedberg until requested by the New York Senate Judiciary Committee almost 8 months later during the course of their investigation of your department. A brief history of your attempts to bury not only the complaints against you and Friedberg but against other named Defendants in my Federal RICO and ANTITRUST lawsuit, the same lawsuit your department is a named Defendant in, will aid investigators in understanding the timeline of events. The timeline will attempt to detangle the web of confusion you attempt to throw on the matters to hide your illegal acts.

**TIMELINE OF FIRST DEPARTMENT COMPLAINTS**

***Original Complaints Filed Against Proskauer Rose, Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolfe & Schlissel, Kenneth Rubenstein and Raymond A. Joao***

* Disciplinary Complaints Filed Against Proskauer Rose, Meltzer Lippe Goldstein, Wolfe & Schlissel, Raymond Joao and Kenneth Rubenstein
  + February 25, 2003 Complaint Filed against Raymond Anthony Joao with the 9th Department where he is licensed, which mysteriously transfers to the First Dept DDC, against Department Rules.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2003%2002%2025%20Joao%209th%20district%20original%20complaint.pdf>

* + February 26, 2003 Complaint Filed against Kenneth Rubenstein and Proskauer Rose.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2003%2002%2026%20Original%20Rubenstein%20Bar%20Action.pdf>

***Complaints and Motion to First Dept Filed Against Proskauer Rose Partner and First Department Officers Steven C. Krane and Chief Counsel Thomas Cahill***

* Disciplinary Complaints Filed Against First Department Proskauer Partner Steven C. Krane caught violating Public Offices
  + May 20, 2004 Complaint Filed Against Steven C. Krane
* July 08, 2004 First Department Motion filed for Conflicts of Interest and the Appearance of Impropriety against Thomas Cahill, Steven C. Krane, Proskauer, Meltzer, Joao and Rubenstein. Motion filed on the advice and information provided by Catherine O’Hagan Wolfe confirming that Krane was a First Dept Officer while handling his firm and partners complaints, which he and Cahill concealed and further lied upon direct questioning of their conflicts dispelled directly by Wolfe.
  + <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2004%2007%2008%20RUBENSTEIN%20KRANE%20JOAO%20MOTION%20FINAL%20BOOKMARKED.pdf>
* June 09, 2004 Complaint Filed against Thomas J. Cahill, Chief Counsel of the First Department, transferred per Department rules to Martin Gold for Special Inquiry.
  + <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2004%2006%2023%20cahill%20complaint%20fax%20to%20curran%20second%20send%20direct.pdf>

Page 4-36

* August 11, 2004 First Dept Order for Immediate Investigations of Thomas Cahill, Steven C. Krane, Proskauer, Meltzer, Joao & Rubenstein granted by Unanimous Consent of Five Justices of the First Department.
  + <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2004%2008%2011%20new%20york%20first%20department%20orders%20investigation%20Krane%20Rubenstein%20Joao.pdf>

***Federal Whistleblower Lawsuit of Former First Dept DDC Lawyer Christine C. Anderson and Legally “Related” Iviewit & Eliot Bernstein Federal RICO and ANTITRUST 12 Count 12 Trillion Dollar Lawsuit Both Naming the First Department, First Dept DDC and Cahill as Defendants.***

* October 28, 2007 Christine C. Anderson Whistleblower Lawsuit
  + <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/anderson/20071028%20Anderson%20Original%20Filing.pdf>

Iviewit Mentioned Directly in Anderson’s Original Lawsuit filing and I quote,

96. Upon information and belief, Plaintiffs termination was unlawfully instituted to discriminate against her, retaliate against her and deprive Plaintiff of her rights under the Court's Union Bargaining Contract; these actions deprived Plaintiff of her right to due process of law. Upon information and belief, sources within the DDC stated that Plaintiff posed a threat of further disclosures, since Cahill and Cohen knew that Plaintiff was aware of other misconduct on their part.

97. Upon information and belief, defendants also state that the timing of the Plaintiffs abrupt firing was connected to the newly circulated revelations concerning Cahill's status as an individually named defendant in a lawsuit entitled **In the Matter of Complaints Against Attorneys and Counselors At-Law; Kenneth Rubenstein-Docket 2003.0531; Raymond Joao-Docket 2003.0532; Steven C. Krane - Docket Pending Review By Paul J. Curran, Esq. - Thomas J. Cahill - Docket Pending By Special Counsel Martin R. Gold On Advisement of Paul J. Curran (Separate Motion Attached); and the Law Firm of Proskauer Rose, LLP; Eliot I. Bernstein, Pro Se and P. Stephen Lamont Both Individually and On Behalf of Shareholders of Iviewit Corporation, et al, Petitioner.**”

* Iviewit and Eliot Bernstein Federal RICO and ANTITRUST lawsuit legally marked “related” by Judge Shira Scheindlin to Anderson’s Whistleblower.
  + December 12, 2007 Iviewit and Eliot Bernstein Original Filing, Federal RICO and ANTITRUST lawsuit marked legally “related” to Anderson by Federal Judge Shira A. Scheindlin. Note the First Department and the First Department DDC are named Defendants

<http://iviewit.tv/20071215usdcsnycomplaint.pdf>

May 09, 2008 Iviewit Amended Complaint

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

* Complaints against Proskauer Rose, Foley & Lardner, Gregg Mashberg, Joanna Smith, Todd Norbitz and Anne Sekel for Conflicts of Interest and the Appearance of Impropriety regarding their self-representation in the US District Court in my Federal RICO and ANTITRUST lawsuit.
  + March 09, 2008 First Department Complaints Against Foley & Lardner, Proskauer Rose, Greg Mashberg, Joanna Smith, Anne Sekel & Todd Norbitz.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080305%20Final%20Plaintiff%20Opposition%20to%20Proskauer%20letter%20as%20counsel.pdf>

Pages 25-27 Contain the Filed Complaints

* January 12, 2009 First Department Response to Complaints Filed March 09, 2008 against Foley & Lardner, Proskauer Rose, Greg Mashberg, Joanna Smith, Anne Sekel & Todd Norbitz.
  + <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/2009%2001%2012%20First%20Department%20Letter%20Response%20to%20Attorney%20Complaints.pdf>
* February 09, 2009 Complaints against Roy L. Reardon and Allen Friedberg for handling complaints against Defendants in my Federal RICO and ANTITRUST lawsuit, while also Defendants in the same lawsuit.

RE-FILED ON DECEMBER 03, 2009 DUE TO CRIMINAL CONCEALMENT BY REARDON AND FRIEDBERG

* + <http://www.iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20091203%20Alan%20Friedberg%20First%20Department%20Complaint%20Redo%20FINAL%20SIGNED%20FAX%20COPY.pdf>

***Roy Reardon and P. Stephen Lamont Letters regarding prior disciplinary complaints***

* January 27, 2009 Roy Reardon Letter to P. Stephen Lamont referencing complaints filed on July 08, 2004 and one by P. Stephen Lamont solely on September 29, 2008
  + <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090127%20First%20Department%20Letter%20Reardon%20Dismissing%20Complaint%20against%20Cahill%20and%20Friedberg.pdf>
  + July 08, 2004 Complaint referenced by Reardon
  + September 29, 2009 P. Stephen Lamont letter to Roy Reardon regarding the Cahill Special Inquiry.
* October 06, 2008 Roy Reardon Letter to P. Stephen Lamont regarding the Cahill inquiry
  + <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20081006%20Cahill%20Complaint%20First%20Department%20Reardon%20Response.pdf>
* November 07, 2008 P. Stephen Lamont Letter to Roy Reardon responding to October 06, 2008 Letter
  + <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20081107%20First%20Department%20Disciplinary%20Letter%20Lamont%20to%20Reardon%20Part%202%20.pdf>
* Roy R. Reardon / Alan Friedberg / P. Stephen Lamont
* attempting to dismiss disciplinary complaints against Defendants in my RICO and ANTITRUST lawsuit, including those of Reardon and Friedberg, watch the bouncing ball as they try to mix up the cases, lump them together, despite specific requests to individually docket and reply to each complaint. Note that P. Stephen Lamont is illegally acting as Chief Executive Officer of Iviewit of Armonk, New York, which does not exist. Note that P. Stephen Lamont has no legal basis to act as Plaintiff in my Federal RICO and ANTITRUST lawsuit, as he sued on behalf of others and not individually. Where P. Stephen Lamont is not an attorney, as he never passed the bar, he cannot act as counsel on others behalf and therefore this too is a violation of Attorney Conduct Codes.
  + **Therefore, this letter shall also serve as an Official Complaint with the First Dept DDC against P. Stephen Lamont for illegal legal representation by an unregistered person impersonating a lawyer in a Federal court case. Please docket a formal complaint against P. Stephen Lamont and follow all First Dept DDC procedures in so doing. Please note, that on information and belief, P. Stephen Lamont represents Shareholders and Iviewit Companies with no authorization from any party at an unregistered business address of Iviewit Technologies, Inc. of Armonk New York.**
* June 18, 2009 Complaints filed against P. Stephen Lamont with Andrew Cuomo, NY Attorney General.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090618%20FINAL%20NYAG%20Steven%20Cohen%20Letter%20Re%20Lamont%20Signed.pdf>

* Judiciary Committee Requests Friedberg to turn over information relating to complaints filed against him and Reardon at September 24, 2009 Public Hearing: Standing Committee On The Judiciary New York Senate Judiciary Committee John L. Sampson Chairman PUBLIC HEARING

“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.

The Appellate Division of the Supreme Court is the entity that is legally responsible for enforcing the Rules of Professional Conduct governing the conduct of attorneys in New York State. The Appellate Division Departments have created grievance committees that are charged with the investigation of complaints against attorneys. Within the First Judicial Department the Departmental Disciplinary Committee of the Appellate Division investigates complaints against attorneys. The New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct was created by the State Constitution and is charged with investigating complaints against Judges and Justices of the Unified Court System.

According to the 2009 Report of the Commission on Judicial Conduct, there were 1,923 complaints filed in 2008. Yet of these complaints only 262 were investigated and of those, 173 were dismissed. This hearing will examine the processes and procedures that are followed by the various agencies charged with the responsibility of enforcing the rules and regulations that must be followed by the Judiciary and the Bar in the State of New York. It will also evaluate public satisfaction with the disciplinary process.”

Testimony of Eliot Bernstein @ Three Hours, 38 Minutes in the hearing video, for unknown reasons the timeline start points on this video appear to change, so the exact point may be different.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=knQLll5hmjs&feature=player_embedded>

* Reardon Letter 1
* Iviewit and Eliot Bernstein response to Reardon Letter 1
* Reardon Letter 2
* Iviewit and Eliot Bernstein response to Reardon Letter 2
* February 12, 2010 Iviewit Complaint to SEC, outlining several alleged crimes of P. Stephen Lamont
  + Online Interactive Version with Exhibit Links

<http://iviewit.tv/wordpress/?p=274>

* + Signed Color Copy of SEC Complaint non interactive

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

Your conflicts would have forced you to turn the letters and this letter over to non-conflicted parties. Instead, your handling your own complaints is in fact criminal behavior, as they are violations of your public office and LAW and act as obstructions of justice and obstruction in both state and federal proceedings. This letter shall serve as a third and a bit more severe FORMAL COMPLAINT, as this complaint will serve as basis to those criminal investigators summoned herein to arrest you for FEDERAL AND STATE OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE IN OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS, INCLUDING CONCEALMENT AND MORE.

Your letter while mentioning the Honorable Senator John L. Sampson (“Sampson”) and the entire Judiciary Committee, fails to disclose that it was the Judiciary Committee that requested you respond to them directly regarding the MISSING AND CONCEALED Formal Complaints against yourself and Friedberg. You know, the CONCEALED complaint that Senator Sampson, Chairman of the NEW YORK STATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE at a HEARING REGARDING CORRUPTIONS AT YOUR DEPARTMENT, on September 24, 2009, requested your department provide information regarding the missing complaints to his Committee. Senator Sampson requested that Mr. Friedberg and your Department provide information regarding the CONCEALED complaints directly to the COMMITTEE, not me.

Nevertheless, as if delusional, you again responded to me regarding your complaints and then tried to dismiss complaints against yourself and your partner in crime, Mr. Friedberg, while knowing your department is in an ongoing LAWSUIT with me. I remind you that that in my Federal RICO and ANTITRUST lawsuit and many other state and federal investigations, your Department is a named Defendant. Further, your department has representative, albeit ILLEGALLY retained counsel, the New York Attorney General. Yet you continue to HARASS me directly, writing me ridiculous and self-serving, self-generated, self-incriminating dismissal letters, all the while continuing ILLEGALLY to handle your own complaints while trying to avoid the Judiciary Committee and paper your department’s file.

Let me dissect your letters errors one by one before I begin my further FORMAL COMPLAINT against you in addition to the ones you have buried for months and now try to dismiss:

1. First, you state, “Your 78 page fax dated December 3, 2009 labeled as a complaint against Chief Counsel Alan W. Friedberg has been referred to me.” The problem in this statement is that you fail to see that the 78 Page Fax Complaint, is a re-filing of the complaint you have admitted to concealing since February 2009 against both YOU and Mr. Friedberg. The FORMAL COMPLAINT is actually against you and Mr. Friedberg, so had you really read the Complaint, you would see it would be impossible for it to be referred to you, as you are a COMPLAINED OF PARTY in the Complaint. I resubmitted that complaint due ONLY to your prior CONCEALMENT of OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS. I have attached herein, that same complaint but have individually broke it out for you with your very own cover page. By the by, your conflicted letter that defies ethics has NO FORMAL DOCKETING number for the Friedberg case, so I wonder how to appeal it or if it has been CONCEALED again from formal processes.
2. Next, you claim laughably, “Among other things, the document contains copies of letters from you to State Senator John L. Sampson of the New York Senate Judiciary Committee alleging that the DDC has engaged in conflicts of interest, corruption and other wrongful acts. We find no merit in those accusations.” The silliness of your statement here, although criminal in nature, is very telling of your cognizance of the allegations contained in the FORMAL COMPLAINT that was CONCEALED. Your acknowledgement of the FORMAL COMPLAINT will further stand as ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF YOUR CONTINUED CRIMINAL CONDUCT in trying to dismiss complaints you and your whole department are conflicted with and criminally concealing official State court documents that directly relate to a Federal Lawsuit.

Remember the Whistleblower, Anderson, testifies before a Federal Court under oath and to the Judiciary Committee that there is Whitewashing of Complaints, Document Destruction, “Cleaners”, named Naomi Goldstein, cleaning complaints for US Attorney’s, DA’s, etc., all occurring at the same time as my allegations of same. Yet, you beg the reader of your letter to trust that you have found no wrongdoing after evaluating solely (soullessly) the complaint against yourself and other defendants.

Now it becomes a bit dicier for you, as you’re very own rules you regulate and the RULES AND REGULATIONS OF YOUR DEPARTMENT CLAIM;

§ 605.6 Investigations and Informal Proceedings

(g) Preliminary Screening of Complaints. Any complaint received by the Office of Chief Counsel against a member of the Committee or Staff counsel involving alleged misconduct shall be transmitted forthwith to the Committee Chairperson, who shall assign it either to the Office of Chief Counsel or to special counsel who shall conduct or direct the appropriate investigation, and give a written recommendation as to the disposition of the Complaint to the Committee Chairperson, who shall determine the appropriate disposition of the Complaint. **Any such Complaint which relates to the Committee Chairperson shall, in the first instance, be transmitted to a Hearing Panel Chairperson, who shall conduct the appropriate investigation and determine the appropriate disposition of the Complaint.**

My complaint Mr. Reardon is a twofold problem for you as the FORMAL COMPLAINTS YOU HAVE CONCEALED SINCE FEBRUARY 2009, are against YOU, acting as the Chair of the DDC and your partner in crime, Mr. Friedberg, acting as Chief Counsel. It is clever how in your SELF DISMISSING LETTER which defies ethics, you try and CONCEAL that Friedberg’s complaint has been transferred to you, which according to your own rules would be a violation, as the COMPLAINT is also against YOU. Thus, you are AGAIN violating your OWN rules by trying to hide that you also are knowingly COMPLAINED of FORMALLY in the complaint, and by way of the Sampson Letters you reference which were included with the complaint, you have admitted receipt of the documents and thus have absolute knowledge. Yet, nice try at dodging the bullet, though, I guess you figured nobody would notice that you are handling your own complaint if you deny it and conceal it. The problem now is everyone knows. Ah, “desperate men…”

Your use of the term “we” as in “**We** find no merit in those accusations” Begets the question of if you are also suffering dementia or delirium that has you believing others are involved in your decision. Who is the “WE” Mr. Reardon, as I have repeatedly asked you disclose any other persons involved in allowing you to dismiss your own complaint, in other words, whom are your accomplices so that we may formally file charges against the WE too. Therefore, now that you have identified there is a WE, please properly disclose to the Judiciary Committee who else is involved in these CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES you are conducting, who else finds no merit other than you and Mr. Friedberg who are the people complained about.

1. Amazingly, your letter continues, “In any event, your new "complaint" against Mr. Friedberg provides no basis on which the Committee should pursue action.” First, there is NO NEW COMPLAINT, this is merely a re-filing of the ORIGINAL COMPLAINT you have ILLEGALLY CONCEALED in violation of LAW against both you and Mr. Friedberg. Now your trying to make it as a new complaint which is both ridiculous and further criminal and will so be reported to ALL appropriate oversight authorities and criminal investigators as evidence of your continued illegal activity and further attempt at CRIMINAL CONCEALMENT and more.

Second, since you should not be handling complaints against yourself, or your partner in crime Mr. Friedberg, it defies logic and law how you claim there is no basis in a complaint against yourself. You should have already turned these matters over, per your rules, to a Hearing Panel Chair, which obviously you fail to do in regard to the FORMAL COMPLAINT AGAINST YOU AND MR. FRIEDBERG. Again, your actions appear criminal as you are attempting to deny proper procedure of your department in handling complaints to deny my due process rights, by concealing the complaints are against you, while admitting receipt of the complaint against yourself, again this further serves as prima facie evidence of your CONTINUED CRIMINAL CONDUCT.

1. The next statement truly shows your detachment from both reality and the rules and regulations that define ETHICS. I quote your insanity, “Indeed, you appear to be arguing that anyone associated with the Committee is precluded from considering the merits of your complaint.” Yes indeed Mr. Reardon I do make the claim that NOBODY in your department can handle these complaints and for several factual reasons. First, your department is a DEFENDANT in a 12-COUNT, 12-TRILLION dollar LAWSUIT, which I am certain you are not concealing from state auditors! Well, I am not sure that you are not concealing that but perhaps you could clarify that for me and the Judiciary Committee in writing, as I am sure you are reporting the liability on the states books, liabilities directly related to your CRIMINAL CONDUCT and CONTINUED CRIMINAL CONDUCT.

As DEFENDANTS in the ongoing FEDERAL RICO LEGAL ACTION, the whole First Department is factually and legally PRECLUDED from involvement due to CONFLICTS OF INTEREST and THE APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY this creates. Next, the continued violation of CONFLICT RULES which creates the APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY also act together to create CRIMINAL OBSTRUCTION OF OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS. These CRIMINAL acts also will be reported to your oversight, the Judiciary Committee and CRIMINAL INVESTIGATORS.

As the First Department DDC is a DEFENDANT in the LAWSUIT, the DDC also has representative, albeit ILLEGALLY retained counsel, the New York Attorney General and Monica Connell and again you contacting me other than through your counsel is HIGHLY SUSPECT and UNETHICAL.

Upon filing the complaints against other DEFENDANTS in the same LAWSUIT, Ms. Connell advised me as YOUR COUNSEL to file the complaints with your offices against the Proskauer Rose and Foley & Lardner attorneys and law firms. However, Connell stated that the complaints would be moved instantly to a NON CONFLICTED THIRD PARTY to avoid the OBVIOUS CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND APPEARANCES OF IMPROPRIETY your departments and any members of the department handling of the complaints creates.

Yet, somehow, you sneaky dog, you and your partner in crime, Mr. Friedberg, interceded those complaints that were to be transferred, in opposition to what your counsel had arranged with me and brazenly or insanely, attempted to DISMISS COMPLAINTS AGAINST OTHER DEFENDANTS IN THE LAWSUIT YOUR DEPARTMENT IS A NAMED DEFENDANT IN. Again, these CONFLICTS act to OBSTRUCT JUSTICE and will be noted to all oversight of the DDC, the Judiciary Committee and CRIMINAL INVESTIGATORS. Your actions earned you and Mr. Friedberg disciplinary complaints for your misconducts, separate and distinct complaints, although you keep lumping them together and failing to provide separate case numbers for each.

Therefore, your question asks if I think anyone in your department can handle these complaints, the answer is NO THEY CANNOT, and I advise YOU, Mr. Friedberg and any other department official that act on these complaints that each act will result in further FORMAL COMPLAINTS to your oversight, the Judiciary Committee investigating your Department and CRIMINAL INVESTIGATORS.

1. Your letter continues deeper into insanity, I quote, “On October 7, 2009 I wrote to you advising that your previous complaints against Mr. Friedberg and other attorneys have been closed.” Now here your sneakiness is better than a proverbial “snake in the grass” as you attempt to state that my previous complaints filed against Mr. Friedberg and other DEFENDANTS are closed. This looks like you are attempting to mix apples and oranges while hiding the beef.

Let us keep it straight for the Judiciary Committee whom I am requesting handling this matter going forward (as well as other criminal investigators this complaint is addressed too) and institute oversight over your extremely illegal activities. To get things straight, there are two sets of complaints, one against Proskauer and Foley attorneys for their conflicts in the US District Court and then there are complaints against you (Roy Reardon) and Mr. Friedberg, which are separate and came much later.

On October 07, 2009, you could not be telling me the complaint against Mr. Friedberg was dismissed as your letter contends, for in that letter you claimed that you did not know of complaints against you and Mr. Friedberg. You claimed the Formal Complaints I filed did not look like complaints, despite the fact that the documents clearly points out that they are FORMAL COMPLAINTS, several times. Certainly, it becomes apparent that you cannot keep your lies straight at this time but perhaps you can better explain this to the Judiciary Committee.

Your October 07, 2009 attempts to combine the earlier complaints against attorneys from Proskauer Rose and Foley & Lardner with the complaints against you and Mr. Friedberg, while hiding your involvement. Love how you refer to “other attorneys” in a third person voice “other”, versus identifying that YOU Mr. Reardon, are one of the “other” attorneys you reference. Do you often refer to yourself in the third person “other”; this is a very symbolic sign of pathological behavior indicating delusion. Perhaps you could have written more accurately, something like – your complaints against Mr. Friedberg, MYSELF and other attorneys but that would have exposed you so I see your need for further Concealing such a material fact in layers of BS.

Again, you CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS, which creates further CRIMINAL CONDUCT. Finally, I am not sure how the FORMAL COMPLAINTS could now close when they are not yet opened formally through proper procedure. No complaint numbers are issued for SIX complaints for me to even respond to each separately, complaint numbers which I have demanded in each of my complaints since filing and which are supposed to be issued as part of the RULES and REGULATIONS of your department for each complaint. Yes, the very Rules and Regulations that you psychotically continue to ignore that regulate your department.

1. This my favorite quote from your factually illegal letter, I quote, “You may wish to consider consulting with counsel regarding the matters raised in your submissions.” To be clear, I have consulted counsel, YOUR COUNSEL the New York Attorney General and it was determined that you are conflicted and cannot handle complaints against other Defendants, nor yourself and Mr. Friedberg, per your own departmental Rules and Regulation Part 600, per the Attorney Code of Conduct and Law. The result of my talk with YOUR COUNSEL THE NY AG was to have the complaints moved to a NON CONFLICTED THIRD PARTY. I advise you therefore to consider consulting with YOUR COUNSEL regarding the matters raised against you CRIMINALLY and the CIVIL charges against you and your department in the civil complaint and further consult on turning yourself in at this point.

I advise you to consult your counsel as to further pestering me directly, where as you know, I represent myself Pro Se, so it is highly unethical and against the Attorney Conduct Code for you, an attorney, to be contacting me directly when you have representative counsel. I find teaching you ethics at this point to be an utter waste of my time at this point, as you seem not be able to discern realistically what your own ethical obligations are, nor what the Rules you are charged with over sight of state or your procedures and finally are in flagrant violation of the Law. I therefore highly recommend that you discontinue with contacting me directly and have your attorney handle these matters going forward.

Of course, your attorney, the New York Attorney General, is also a DEFENDANT in my LAWSUIT and his representation is therefore suspect as aiding and abetting illegally your department through CONFLICTED representation that VIOLATES the NYAG Rules Public Office Rule 17. This ILLEGAL REPRESENTATION compounds the problems and further causes Obstruction of Justice, as the Conflict precludes the NYAG from doing his public duty of investigating dirty rotten Public Officials, like yourself and Mr. Friedberg. As my LAWSUIT has been marked legally “RELATED” by Federal Judge Shira Scheindlin to that of the First Department DDC Whistleblower case of Christine C. Anderson, we see that Anderson similarly is complaining that the NYAG illegal representation of State Defendants from your offices, is a Violation of the NYAG Rules and Regulations and Law, whereby you can get a gander for her position at the following URL, incorporated by reference in entirety herein @ <http://www.frankbrady.org/TammanyHall/Documents_files/Anderson%20111609%20Filing.pdf>

Yet, while your letter attempts to claim no conflicts and no foul play, almost, you simultaneously failed to sign and return the CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE FORM attached to the COMPLAINT. This failure serves as further evidence of your CRIMINAL OBSTRUCTION through CONFLICT OF INTEREST, which now all will be formulated as a FORMAL CRIMINAL COMPLAINT AGAINST YOU. Under the laws of NEW YORK and the UNITED STATES, in the interim until authorities can arrest you for your felonious acts, I place you under immediate CITIZENS ARREST as a witness with evidence of your state and federal felonies. I subsequently advise you not only to seek independent counsel but also to turn yourself in to the proper authorities for processing for FELONY charges both state and federal.

I remind you that I have sent the JUDICIARY COMMITTEE OF NEW YORK and FEDERAL AUTHORITIES information regarding your involvement in RICO related crimes, along with many in your department. If you are so confident in your meritorious good work on behalf of the Good People of New York, you should welcome a NON CONFLICTED THIRD PARTY review of your handling of these cases, as certainly you have nothing to hide but the complaints, etc.

Note that we are attaching copy of a SWORN CRIMINAL COMPLAINT to all of the following, including but not limited to,

* The New York Judiciary Committee
* Attorney General of the United States, Eric Holder
* The Hon. Representative John Conyers, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee
* The Hon. Senator Dianne Feinstein, Senate Judiciary Committee
* The New York Attorney General in order for their offices to turn the matters over to non conflicted investigators.
* The New York State Inspector Generals

Conclusion

According to Whistleblower Christine Anderson under sworn oath in a Federal Court and many others who have come forth to expose the ongoing Whitewashing of Complaints your offices are alleged to be involved in, exhibiting criminal obstruction of official proceedings, including threatening federal witnesses in Anderson that are also employees of your department, makes your department worthy of investigations. Nice reputation for an ETHICS department but we will get to that in a moment. Not only are your offices accused by Anderson of obstructing state proceedings that now affect Federal proceedings in order to protect “Favored Law Firms and Lawyers” which demands investigation by non conflicted parties but further that criminal Whitewashing of Complaints for the US Attorney, District Attorney and Assistant District Attorney by the “Cleaner” also demand immediate investigations of the named parties. The “Cleaner” aka Naomi Goldstein of your offices, so named by your former Staff Attorney, Whistleblower Christine C. Anderson should be under not only internal investigation but external criminal investigations, I presume you are conducting these now that this information has been exposed. Again, solid reasons for you and your entire department’s recusal from further involvement in these matters, other than turning yourself in and getting non-conflicted counsel to represent you.

Finally, and most importantly, your failure to regulate the misconducts of the lawyers in your department according to well established rules and regulations of your department, have led you to have failed the People of the Great State of New York and the People of this Great Nation as a direct result of your criminal disregard for regulations. For example, had you done your job investigating Proskauer Rose when I first complained of them to the First Department, your department could have saved many people’s losses in the Sir Allan Stanford PONZI scheme. Where Proskauer Rose and Partner Thomas Sjoblom ( a former SEC Enforcement Employee ) were involved in teaching employees how to lie to Federal Authorities in a Miami Airport Hanger and have been subsequently sued for the entire amount of the Ponzi in a Global Class Action lawsuit. My recommendation will be for any unrecoverable losses that those VICTIMS suffer, to sue you and your department for failure to regulate and possible conspiratorial roles in the cover up of the crimes.

Further, had you investigated Proskauer when I first informed you of their misconducts and crimes, you also could have prevented many people over those 7 seven years from losing their lives savings in the Bernard Madoff affair and saved the hundreds of charities destroyed by Madoff and lives ruined. Yes, you are the oversight that could have prevented these calamities and are responsible for your failures to the victims. In fact, since Proskauer appears to have senior partners basically running the First Department and the Ethics Departments from Steven C. Krane, a Proskauer partner caught handling his own and his firms complaints while an officer of the First Department DDC and former New York State Bar President, who as a result was ordered for investigation for conflict and the appearance of impropriety in these matters, to recently deceased DDC officer Stephen Rakowe Kaye, a Proskauer partner and married to former Chief Judge Judith Kaye, who had ultimate control over the department with her husband and Krane (her former clerk), no wonder complaints bounced off Proskauer into your trash can.

Yet and personally more tragic, is the fact that had you done your job regulating your “favored law firms and lawyers” most likely a BOMB would not have been placed in my family minivan ( images at [www.iviewit.tv](http://www.iviewit.tv) ) allowing someone to ATTEMPT to MURDER my wife and children. It is strange to note how the timing of the bombing coincided with discovery that STEVEN C. KRANE of Proskauer was a First Department Officer and he and Thomas Cahill ( former Chief Counsel of the DDC ) where found violating First Department DDC Rules and Regulations, Attorney Conduct Codes and Law. These findings of violations of the rules, confirmed by former Clerk of the Court Catherine O’Hagan Wolfe, led to the First Department Court, in unanimous consent, transferring the complaints against Krane of PROSKAUER, Krane’s Proskauer partners he was representing ILLEGALLY in complaints while a DDC OFFICER and even Krane’s representation of himself in the Krane complaint for CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND THE APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY . Thomas Cahill also was transferred for Special Inquiry at that time and your recent handling of that complaint with Mr. Stephen Lamont and attempting to dismiss that complaint with no authority to do so, again, while clever, will be further evidence of your CRIMINAL ACTS to be filed as further prima facie evidence to CRIMINAL AUTHORITIES.

Let us not forget to remind those judging your actions of the fact that your department is supposed to regulate Wall Street lawyers and we can all see what your lax regulations have produced in that regard. I also remind you that your department appears to be the regulator for several fine attorneys in the Justice Department and Office of Legal Counsel, who are being accused of war crimes for their violations of ethics and law. Violations that have allowed the torture and murder of innocent untried people, quite similar to Nazi Extermination Camps where habeas rights similarly were removed by dirty rotten lawyers, politicians and judges who were actually criminals with legal degrees who attempted to and succeeded at making concentration camps and murder legal for undesirables. I remind you of the Judges Trial, where in the end they got theirs, so that today while you feel elevated above the law, enough so to first conceal and then attempt to dismiss complaints against yourself, in drunken and high delusions of grandeur, that one day you will be tried for these crimes. Justice will again be restored for your tyrannous grip and even the Nazi lawyers and judges had their day in the infamous Judges Trial at the Nuremberg Trials. I wait hearing your defenses from behind the glass.

Truly, and I mean this FIGURATIVELY, not LITERALLY, I hope this letter feels like a bomb in your car and you may live with your family in similar trepidation that one day your world will end, when your scam ends and you are tried in a fair and impartial court, free of conflict. Hopefully, you will then serve the remainder of your life behind bars contemplating the magnanimity of the damage you have done to my family, my shareholders, those you have embroiled in your crimes like Ms. Anderson, those federal witnesses like Nicole Carrado that you threaten as they go to testify, those victims of your crimes that appear lining up at each new Judiciary Committee, all those who have lost homes or 401k’s from lawyers schemes in an unregulated environment, free to commit financial crimes against so many People, as you the REGULATOR, YOU was naught more than a criminal in on the crimes a fox guarding the chicken coop.

Most DisRespectfully Yours,



\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  
Eliot I. Bernstein  
Founder & Inventor  
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1. New York State Consolidated Laws hold that: Any person may arrest another person (a) for a felony when the latter has in fact committed such felony, and (b) for any offense when the latter has in fact committed such offense in his presence. (N.Y.C.L. 140.30). In New York, A person may arrest another person for an offense at any hour of any day or night. 2. Such person must inform the person whom he is arresting of the reason for such arrest unless he encounters physical resistance, flight or other factors rendering such procedure impractical. 3. In order to effect such an arrest, such person may use such physical force as is justifiable pursuant to subdivision four of section 35.30 of the penal law. (N.Y.C.L. 140.35). In New York, a citizen must also act without unnecessary delay to deliver a suspect to an officer of the law. (N.Y.C.L. 140).

   Mr. Reardon and Mr. Friedberg take this COMPLAINT as FORMAL NOTICE OF YOUR ARREST and SURRENDER to LOCAL, STATE and FEDERAL AUTHORITIES HEREIN SUMMONED AND COPIED. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. All URL’s and EXHIBITS referred to herein, are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety herein. Due to allegations by a First Department Whistleblower, Christine C. Anderson, of document destruction of complaint documents, please print all documents and their exhibits referenced herein (several thousand pages) and maintain the files for a period of no less than twenty years. Record retention in these matters is of utmost importance due to not only Anderson’s claims of document destruction but also as these records are part of RICO and ANTITRUST lawsuit and Patent Office investigations, which may need these files for the twenty year life of the patent litigations that will follow. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)