No.__________

In the

Supreme Court of the United States

In the Matter of Leon R. Koziol,
a Suspended Attorney

Petitioner

vs

Attorney Grievance Committee
of the
Third Judicial Department

Respondent,

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
to the New York State Court of Appeals

APPENDIX

LEON R. KOZIOL, Petitioner
Office of Leon R. Koziol, J.D.
1336 Graffenburg Road
New Hartford, New York 13413
(315) 796-4000

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

State of New York
Court of Appeals

Decided and Entered on the
twelfth day of October, 2017

Present, hon. Janet DiFiore, Chief Judge, ***presiding.***

SSD 50
In the Matter of Leon R. Koziol,
a Suspended Attorney.

Leon Koziol,
Appellant;
Attoney Grievence Committee for
the Third Judicial Department,
Respondent.

Appellant having appealed to the Court of Appeals in the above title;

Upon the papers filed and due deliberation, it is

ORDERED, that the appeal is dismissed without costs, by the Court sua sponte, upon the ground that the order appealed from does not finally determine the proceeding within the meaning of the constitituion.
Judges Stein and Faehy took no part.

John P. Asiello
Clerk of the Court

STATE OF NEW YORK   COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of LEON R. KOZIOL
A Suspended Attorney

PRELIMINARY APPEAL STATEMENT

(Attorney Registration No. 2075455)   Third Department Docket No D-54-17

2. Appellate Division Third Department, Albany County

3. Original Docket No. D-54-17

4 Appellate Division Docket No. D-54-17

5. Jurisdictional Basis is CPLR 5601 (b) (1) and (2)

6. This appeal is taken by Notice of Appeal dated April 30, 2017 and acknowledged for filing by letter of Third Department clerk of the Court on May 2, 2017

7. The appellant was served by mail with a copy of order of the Third Department dated April 13, 2017 by Notice of Entry received on or about April 13, 2017.

8. Appellant pro se
Leon R. Koziol
1336 Graffenburg Road
New Hartford, New York 13413

Appellee State of New York Supreme Court
Third Department Attorney Grievance Committee
286 Washington Ave Extension; Suite 200
Albany, New York 12203-6320

9. Lawyers for appellee are Chief Attorney Monica Duffy and Deputy Counsel Michael Gaynor.

10. Self represented appellant is provided above.

11. No presently related motions.

12. Non-Binding Points of Law:

POINT ONE: Appellant is entitled to public dispositions in his longstanding attorney disciplinary matters which state his basic claims for transparency purposes as opposed to the deceptive one below which simply denied all relief "in its entirety" even a request to remove confidentiality and secrecy, thereby making it a final order for this appeal.

POINT TWO: A substandard level of proof for suspending a lawyer in retaliation for his criticisms of our judicial branch of government together with a heightened standard of proof for reinstatement has created a structurally unlawful and permanent disbarment.

POINT THREE: A substandard level of proof for suspending a lawyer in retaliation for his judicial whistleblowing activity together with a heightened standard of proof for reinstatement constitutes a violation of free speech, due process and equal protection.

POINT FOUR: Ethics Rules 8(c)(d) and (h) of the New York Attorney Rules of Professional Conduct are unconstitutional on their face or as applied here based on vagueness, overbroad use and their exploitation to suppress appellant's conscientious stand against his profession in violation of our federal and state constitutions.

POINT FIVE: The interacting disciplinary and domestic processes imposed upon the attorney-parent in this matter has resulted in the unlawful seizure of his children, assets, livelihood, home and unblemished reputation as a civil rights advocate for more than two decades in violation of federal, state and human rights of a free and civilized society.

POINT SIX: Appellant is entitled to an order lifting confidentiality of attorney disciplinary proceedings under Section 90(10) of the Judiciary Law for purposes of transparency and genuine public protection.

POINT SEVEN: Appellant is entitled to an order restraining the bad faith conduct of attorney disciplinary agents of the Third Department including a frivolous "Chief Attorney's Complaint" dated January 18, 2017 from an anonymous source due to an illicit design for keeping their public critic in a punitive state of "non-final" limbo.

POINT EIGHT: Appellant is entitled to an order vacating a one year suspension order of September 23, 2010 and a long completed six month suspension order of June 6, 2013 together with immediate reinstatement to the practice of civil rights law for good cause shown based on, inter alia, a never-ending series of vague conditions imposed below.

POINT NINE: Appellant is entitled to extraordinary relief in order to maintain "the integrity and honor of the profession, the protection of the public and the interest of justice" after more than seven (7) years of suspension on an eighteen (18) month total term completed in 2013 in retaliation for speech which exposed judicial corruption.

POINT TEN: Appellant is entitled to extraordinary relief in order to maintain "the proper balance of federal and state interests under "Our Federalism" which was abused beyond concience in retaliation for necessary recourse sought in both judicial systems.

POINT ELEVEN: Appellant is entitled to an order referring this case to the Justice Department, New York State Attorney General and Inspector General, or other relevant authorities as may be proper due to grave misconduct of disciplinary agents and others in a longstanding effort to suppress whistleblowing activity regarding our judicial branch including 2013 testimony before the Moreland Commission on Public Corruption.

POINT TWELVE: Appellant is entitled to an order reconciling split treatment of his disciplinary and domestic proceedings between two irreconcilably prejudiced appellate departments as evidenced by disqualification of the Fourth Department on April 28, 2010 and peculiar treatment in the Third Department since then to punish reform activity.

POINT THIRTEEN: Appellant is entitled to an order removing a prior restraint and censorship of his pending book entitled, *Killing Courts: Corruption and Carnage in America's Divorce Industry* which exposes the fictitious justice of family court and the abuse of lawyer disciplinary rules to suppress free speech and press.

POINT FOURTEEN: Appellant is entitled to a conversion of his application for reinstatement to a declaratory judgment action in accord with Maron v Silver, 14 NY3d 230 (2010) with referral to the Legislature for a waiver of sovereign immunity or special appropriations bill to compensate this litigant-father-attorney for the irreparable damage caused by unprecedented violations of human rights over a ten year period.

13. Appellant requests that this appeal be considered for resolution by alternative procedure where it could result in expeditious reinstatement to the practice of law while harm is continuing.

14. No statute is being challenged. Rules relating to unfitness, dishonesty and administration of justice are being challenged along with standards of proof that implicate ethics counsel appointed by state Supreme Court, Appellate Division as opposed to the state Attorney General. This issue is otherwise governed by Executive Law Section 71 for notice purposes.

15. Copies of filed appeal and proof of service are attached.

Copy of lower court decision and order is attached.

DATE: May 9, 2017

Submitted by:

Leon R. Koziol, pro se
1336 Graffenburg Road
New Hartford, New York 13413
315) 796-4000

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
APPELLATE DIVISION THIRD DEPARTMENT D-54-17
****

In the Matter of Leon R. Koziol,
a suspended attorney NOTICE OF APPEAL

(Attorney Registration No. 2075455)

****

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE, that the above named party, Leon R. Koziol, hereby appeals to the New York Court of Appeals from an order entered in the Appellate Division, Third Department on April 13, 2017 in an attorney disciplinary reinstatement matter.

Dated: April 30, 2017

Leon R. Koziol
1336 Graffenburg Road
New Hartford, New York 13413
(315) 796-4000

To: Michael Gaynor
Third Department Attorney Committee

State of New York
Supreme Court, Appellate Division
Third Judicial Department

Decided and Entered: April 13, 2017 D-54-17

In the Matter of LEON R. KOZIOL,
a Suspended Attorney.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
OF MOTION

(Attorney Registration No. 2075455)

Calendar Date: March 13, 2017

Before: McCarthy, J.P., Egan Jr., Lynch, rose and Devine, JJ.

Monica A. Duffy, Attorney Grievance Committee for the Third Judicial Department, Albany (Michael G. Gaynor of counsel), for Attorney Grievance Committee for the Third Judicial Department.

Leon R. Koziol, New Hartford, respondent pro se.

Per Curiam.

Motion by respondent for an order setting aside the suspension orders issued by this Court dated September 23, 2010 and June 6, 2013 (107 AD3d 1137 [2013], appeal dismissed and lv denied 21 NY3d 1056 [2013], cert denied ___ US ___, 134 S Ct 1038 [2014]; 76 AD3d 1136 [2010], lv dismissed 15 NY3d 943 [2010], lv denied 16 NY3d 853 [2011], cert denied 565 US ___, 132 S Ct 455 [2011], and other incidental relief.

Upon the papers filed in support of the motion and the papers filed in opposition thereto, and due deliberation having been had thereon, we deny the motion, but without prejudice to the filing of an application for reinstatement in compliance with the requirements of Rules of the Appellate Division, Third Department (22 NYCRR) § 806.16 (a) and Uniform Rules for Attorney Disciplinary Matters (22 NY-CRR) § 1240.16.

McCarthy, J.P., Egan Jr., Lynch, Rose and Devine, JJ., concur.

ORDERED that respondent's motion is denied in its entirety.

ENTER:

Robert D. Mayberger

Robert D. Mayberger
Clerk of the Court

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
APPELLATE DIVISION THIRD JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT
****

Leon R. Koziol,

Petitioner,

- vs -

NOTICE OF MOTION

Third Judicial Department
Attorney Grievance Committee,

Respondent

****

<u>Motion Made By</u>: Petitioner Leon R. Koziol

<u>Date, Time & Place</u> March 13, 2017 on submission
Appellate Division,
Third Department
P.O. Box 7288
Capitol Station
Albany, New York 12224-0288

Affidavit of Leon R. Koziol with exhibits, and prior filings;

<u>Relief Requested</u>:

a) An order lifting confidentiality of attorney disciplinary proceedings under Section 90 of the Judiciary Law for purposes of transparency and genuine public protection;

b) An order restraining the bad faith conduct of attorney disciplinary agents against petitioner including a "Chief Attorney's Complaint" dated January 18, 2017 due to an illicit design for keeping their public critic in a punitive and permanent state of limbo;

c) An order setting aside suspension and reinstating civil rights attorney Leon Koziol to the practice of law pursuant to Judiciary Law 90(f) for good cause shown in order to maintain "the integrity and honor of the profession, the protection of the public and the interest of justice" after more than seven (7) years of suspension on an eighteen (18) month term completed in 2013 in retaliation for speech critical of the judiciary;

d) An order referring this case to the U.S. Justice Department, New York State Attorney General and Inspector General, or other relevant authorities as may be proper due to grave misconduct of disciplinary agents and others in a longstanding effort to suppress petitioner's whistleblowing activity directed to our judicial branch of government
including his 2013 testimony before the Moreland Commission on Public Corruption;

e) An order declaring Rules 8(c)(d) and (h) of the New York Attorney Rules of Professional Conduct unconstitutional on their face or as applied here based on vagueness, overbroad use and their exploitation to suppress petitioner's conscientious stand against his profession in violation of First Amendment and related human rights;

f) An order reconciling split treatment of petitioner's disciplinary and domestic proceedings between two irreconcilably prejudiced appellate departments evidenced by disqualification of the Fourth Department on April 28, 2010 and peculiar treatment in this Department since then to punish reform and judicial whistle blowing activity;

g) An order voiding suspension orders entered by this court on September 23, 2010 and June 6, 2013 due to recent events, ongoing selective mistreatment of petitioner and his crime victim status in addition to the foregoing constitutional violations;

h) An order referring lawyer William Koslosky to independent authorities based on clear perjury, fraud and serious misconduct committed before the Appellate Division and ignored as part of its selectivity during a family court appeal transferred here in 2011;

i) An order in accord with federal Younger abstention doctrine converting this petition to a declaratory action with discovery and scheduling order to finally hear and decide long neglected or undermined constitutional issues pursuant to Koziol v Hood, 92 AD3d 1161 (3rd Dept 2012); Nichols v BDS Landscaping, 79 AD3d 1690 (4th Dept 2010);

j) An order clearing from scrutiny and censorship petitioner's pending publication of a book entitled, *Killing Courts: Corruption and Carnage in America's Divorce Industry* which exposes the fictitious justice of family court and this court's disciplinary agents;

k) An order in accord with Maron v Silver, 14 NY3d 230 (2010) referring this matter to the Legislature with recommendation for a waiver of sovereign immunity and special appropriations bill to compensate this litigant-father-attorney for the severe and irreparable damage caused by unprecedented violations of human rights;

DATED: February 27, 2017

LEON R. KOZIOL
1336 Graffenburg Road
New Hartford, NY 13413
(315) 736-4000

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
APPELLATE DIVISION THIRD JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT

****

Leon R. Koziol,

Petitioner,

AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

\- vs -

Third Judicial Department
Attorney Grievance Committee,

Respondent

****

STATE OF NEW YORK)
COUNTY OF ONEIDA) SS:

LEON R. KOZIOL, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1) I am the petitioner in this extraordinary matter, a father of two teen girls, and a successful, unblemished, civil rights attorney for more than 23 years until the judicial retributions which will be detailed in this affidavit. The requests enumerated in my motion will be treated in order.

Preliminary Statement

2) This is a case unprecedented in American judicial history. It features one of the most ethical attorneys in this state vilified due to a conscientious stand taken against his profession for the harm it routinely inflicts upon unsuspecting parents and children in divorce and family court.

3) It raises the question of whether our third judicial branch of government can exempt itself from scrutiny unlike the other two. Can its limited powers be abused discreetly

through internal court processes to censor highly qualified speech necessary for genuine judicial accountability?

4) What began as a simple uncontested divorce between two cooperating parents during a campaign for Congress in 2006 has exploded into kangaroo court processes crafted systemically by public servants to suppress my free speech, parenting liberties and related human rights.

5) That conclusion is now beyond rational dispute. It is further corroborated by the latest concoction found in a "Chief Attorney's Complaint" dated January 18, 2017 as authorized by a committee of this court. I have been asked to respond to a most bizarre allegation (explained shortly) in a ten year ordeal more familiar to the Third Reich than our Third Department.

6) My children have been seized by the state together with my property, licenses, livelihood and professional reputation developed over a half century strictly due to my exposure of court corruption. The lawyers and judges responsible for this will not readily admit their complicity in these constitutional violations but I will prove it with direct and circumstantial evidence.

7) There is a ready demarcation date of January 9, 2008 to corroborate the unlawful censorship. On that day, I first exposed rampant ethics violations by an ethics lawyer in our divorce and family courts before the Appellate Division (attorney disciplinary court). They were contained in a motion for stay during my joined divorce and family court

appeals, creating a conflict with the same court's recent appointment of this lawyer to its ethics committee.

8) Prior to this date, I enjoyed an unblemished and highly successful law practice for over two decades. After this date, I was suddenly a villain and systematically destroyed. It was bad enough that my life's accomplishments were targeted for extinction, but the exploitation of my offspring to avenge the feelings that were hurt by my criticisms was inexcusable and horrific. Reduced to unemployed or underemployed status for the past seven years due to the license suspensions here, the retributions have jointly harmed my capacity for supporting my children.

9) On the same day as my motion, instead of a judge referral of the ethics lawyer for investigation in accordance with duties under the judicial code, a first-time ethics prosecution was initiated against me, the whistle blower, based on a collection of stale, withdrawn or unknown grievances going back eight years. I was vindicated separately on nearly every one.

10) I could not have anticipated the witch hunt that would follow. Over the next ten years in both domestic and disciplinary courts of this state, due process and equal protection guarantees under the American Constitution were tortured or suspended to achieve the unlawful censorship. Decisions were contaminated by defamatory depictions of my complaints and calculated to deceive the public; to defame the whistleblower, his reputation and therefore his message.

11) According to our nation's high court, free speech is an indispensable attribute of a self governing nation. It should be "robust" and free from undue suppression, Snyder v Phelps, 562 US ___ (2011). Unlawful suppression is typically the case when the public message is most offensive, thereby inciting retaliation. This is exactly such a case. However, because the violators are court officers held to the highest expectations for safeguarding our constitutional rights, the retaliation has been executed in discreet and deceptive fashion reaching the level of persecution.

12) The judicial branch is not immune from the reach of free speech or press directed at its operations, Supreme Court of Virginia v Consumers Union, 446 US 719 (1980). The regulation of attorneys is similarly subject to First Amendment protections whether in the conduct of proceedings, Garrison v Louisiana, 379 US 64 (1964) or in disciplinary rules which infringe upon this right, Erdmann v Stevens, 458 F.2d 1205 (2nd Cir. 1972)(attorney depictions of New York Appellate Division Justices as "madams" and "whores" in magazine article subject to protection in state court with ultimate dismissal of disciplinary charges in that case).

13) The Supreme Court has afforded great deference to our state courts to protect the First Amendment rights of attorneys subject to regulation or discipline unless those processes are brought in bad faith or the rights are otherwise made functionally unavailable, Middlesex v

Garden State Bar Association, 457 US 423 (1982). Once again, this is such an exceptional case.

14) The high court has also emphasized that the licensing of attorneys is a powerful tool for unlawfully suppressing free speech, Konigsberg v State Bar of California, 353 US 252, 273 (1957)(importance to society that attorneys are free to think and speak). Where, as here, a "prior restraint" is effectively imposed upon public forums and book publications, the burden upon the state to justify it is a very high one, Koziol v Hanna, 107 F. Supp. 2d 170 (NDNY 2000).

15) In the latter case I successfully challenged a "gag order" placed upon me as corporation counsel by a city mayor. In the case before this court, there are no vulgar references as in Erdmann, no funeral protest of a gay veteran as in Snyder, or profit interest of lawyers in free speech advertising as in Consumers Union and Middlesex. The First Amendment issues here go to our core public interest in a judiciary which does not abuse families and children for profit.

Jurisdiction and Procedure

16) As this court is aware, I have sought relief for the violations of my constitutional rights on appeal, through mandamus, and in civil rights actions in federal court. As will be shown, a systemic prejudice among judicial colleagues and complicit lawyers has resulted in decisions which cast my public message in an incompetent light. Serial rulings which selectively exclude favorable case law

in both federal and state courts comprise added proof of systemic prejudice.

17) Attorney proceedings are treated as an arm of the court where they are initiated, and family court matters are accorded additional deference. As a result, these processes have been described as "constitution-free zones" because of their unique connection to state courts and local interests. The joint impacts upon my rights have therefore been rendered insurmountable.

18) In my pursuit of justice, I have shown how such deference is unjustified in my case. The many obstacles to accountability have been exploited to violate my constitutional rights with impunity. Indeed the rules of this court provide no means for raising and properly vindicating federal or state constitutional rights. In all the decisions to date, not a single mention of my constitutional rights has been made, primarily a rubber stamp of committee ethics charges.

19) Unlike other forms of litigation, discovery is not allowed, the prosecutor is employed by the court, rendering the process devoid of a properly detached decision maker, and the standard of proof is substandard in comparison to other jurisdictions. It is a process coupled with vague and overbroad rules that can easily be exploited to advance an illicit agenda of censorship without detection by media, the public or our other branches of goverrnment.

20) Due to these and other inadequacies, a civil rights victim should not have to await the purposefully protracted

processes of the respondent which harms only the victim. The current complaint was anonymously submitted in June, 2016 with a 60-day deadline of disclosure to me under the rules for a reply. This complaint was submitted more than six months later as yet another means of punishing free speech directed to our third judicial branch of government.

21) Under this court's rules, 22 NYCRR 1240.8(c) and Local Rule 806.7(c), a victim of abusive procedure can apply for relief by way of motion for a protection order or presumably a constitutional challenge. This complaint has now created a pending proceeding which can be "piggy-backed" with each new "deception" concocted from endless anonymous complaints and abused subject matter. Accordingly, this motion and procedure for recourse are proper.

Motion to Remove Confidentiality

22) We all know that the best way to discredit a public critic, in this case an able and conscientious civil rights attorney, is by making him out as a "fraud" or "deceptive" in his professional work. And the most convincing way of doing this is by coercing an "admission."

23) Should this fail, the perpetrators can exploit judicial office through fabrication, all of it beyond public incredulity given the high esteem with which such office is held. In my public statements and reports to oversight authorities, I have debunked that myth through a chronicling of corrupt judges that "reads like a docket sheet in any criminal court" (my Moreland testimony).

24) Domestic and disciplinary proceedings are highly protected from public scrutiny under the guise of child and lawyer protection (from unwarranted complaints). However, when a public critic of this magnitude comes along, those confidentiality protections are twisted against him.

25) To verify how this worked here, and therefore the need to lift confidentiality under the Judiciary Law, Section 90, we need go no further than this court's last six month suspension order. On June 6, 2013, I was found "guilty" of "neglecting a client matter" on grounds that I "admitted to the factual specifications set forth in a petition of charges."

26) Nowhere in that decision is the public advised that this so-called neglect was caused by an ex-secretary influenced by political adversaries to tamper with mail and office calendars. While I was in court on client matters and defending concocted family court petitions, she was busy undermining my office in response to my earliest offensive public forums in 2008.

27) How could I "neglect" something I was prevented from knowing about due to the crimes of a sociopath. Upon discovery of her internal scheme, I terminated her in November, 2009 and proceeded to investigate along with another lawyer in my office similarly victimized. We soon discovered that she was conducting her own law practice without license or education.

28) I could not know the extent of these crimes while preoccupied with "custody wars" and fabricated family court findings. Hence the cause for ethics charges could not be

disclosed due to “discrepancies” and other scrutiny of my submissions. Ultimately, with my assistance, this woman was prosecuted in another county in 2013 for representing a “client” in court.

29) This event was actually predicted in my 2012 internal report rejected by local authorities due to my prior successful civil rights litigation against them. She was again arrested in another state, convicted here and sent to prison in 2016 on forgery charges. I met with a District Attorney investigator in December, 2013 after my complaints were reopened to learn of additional crimes.

30) The internal scheme and crime victim status were fully explained in my answer and opposition papers filed with this court in defense of that petition of charges. But because these filings and processes were confidential, and the decision which followed made no mention of it, the public was led to believe that there was a serious neglect of something which I could logistically control. Truth and logic dictated that I could not. The public or a jury would agree.

31) No attorney by my research has been held to such an impossible standard of conduct. The extreme and even bizarre mistreatment of me provides all the circumstantial proof of unlawful targeting contrary to any genuine public benefit. Evidently the absurd argument against me now is that I somehow brought all this upon myself and the chaos alone is conveniently enough to prevent a return to my professional livelihood. An accurate position finds that

anyone who has survived such an onslaught of abuse is the ideal civil rights lawyer who has earned reinstatement.

32) Among the abuses, I could not express the "remorse" which at least one judge of this court required because of the insanity of regretting a sociopathic secretary devoid of a father figure who committed crimes against me. She even secreted file material needed for my defense to the earliest ethics charges leading to this court's 2010 one-year suspension.

33) I went so far as to provide the committee and this court with an affidavit from this woman's subsequent fiancé when he discovered my law office files in his cellar and garage after she committed crimes against him as well. All of this was callously ignored in a witch hunt geared to egos and self-interests and not genuine public protection.

34) The "extant" suspension order of June 6, 2013 was a deceit of monumental proportion because I was a crime victim treated as a criminal unlike any other lawyer (including an ethics committee chairman who was similarly victimized when he hired this same secretary after my discharge of her: Attorney Larry Golden). He was not similarly found guilty of ethics violations when similarly reporting her crimes. Even then, her conviction was based on information I obtained with nothing reported in the media in contrast with other white collar criminals.

35) There was no supervision specification among the charges, hence that will not be a fall-back explanation. The 2013 decision remains the basis for my overtime suspension

nearly four years later. The opposition reports to this court include one in 2012 over which I was given no access. The 2014 report was provided for my review but in no case was a definitive means for reinstatement ever stated. Instead it remains elusive into a fifth try should I decide to take and pass yet another professional responsibility exam with endless conditions for reinstatement. Copies of the 2013 decision, charges and (unmentioned) defense are found at exhibit A.

Restraint of Unlawful Witch Hunt

36) The foregoing facts and circumstances support my next petition for relief and they will not be repeated but incorporated here. With each public forum I sponsored, website post I published or media interview I gave to reform abuses in our divorce and family courts, there arose a corresponding adverse event which led to my first excessive one-year suspension by this court on September 23, 2010.

37) Under civil rights law applied in other contexts, adverse action by government agents taken proximate to offensive speech, whistleblowing complaints or formal filings is sufficient proof of unlawful retaliation even if there is no merit to the complaints, Beechwood Restorative v Leeds, 436 F.3d 147 (2nd Cir. 2006)(nitpicking and regulatory abuse against care facility sufficient to comprise unlawful retaliation).

38) This rule of law operates on the logic that no perpetrator is going to admit to retaliation while possessing superior means for wearing out the victim and covering up

the misconduct. In this case, the circumstantial proof is overwhelming but it is supplemented by direct evidence to leave no room for dispute regarding unlawful retaliation. During closed arguments before this court on May 22, 2013 on that petition of charges, respondent ethics lawyer Steven Zayas stated (in reply to a question from the bench regarding conditions for reinstatement) that I would continue to be opposed as long as my public criticisms and complaints continued.

39) The Zayas statement in the presence of then chief counsel Peter Torncello was unexpected but certainly dispositive. There was no record but that statement has never been denied. I have produced a witness affidavit in further support of it in the record time and again. Yet nowhere in the June 6, 2013 suspension decision is this admission stated publicly.

40) Several weeks later, Mr. Zayas was allowed to resign after an Inspector General discovered falsified time sheets. Time spend on my witch hunt was similarly in a category of abuse regarding public resources. The current chief counsel, Monica Duffy, was the committee chairwoman at the time who was not held to any supervision ethics violations. In other contexts, prosecutorial misconduct is gounds for dismissing serious criminal charges even where guilt is clear. How do we reconcile all this with my select mistreatment here?

41) The 2010 suspension occurred after an order disqualifying the Fourth Department on April 28, 2010 with

transfer of all disciplinary processes here. A one-year suspension term was imposed notwithstanding proof of a material fabricated finding by the court appointed hearing referee. Had I known that vindicating file material had been removed by the ex-secretary, a different outcome would have been all but guaranteed before a truly neutral referee.

42) My domestic matters were similarly transferred to this court until December 13, 2013 when a stay order was entered in the Fourth Department against a "structurally flawed" family court process tailored to retaliate for my testimony before the Moreland Commission on Public Corruption. Other than abuse, there is no logic to this split treatment in my disciplinary and domestic matters between two different appellate departments.

43) In the Moreland testimony, I exposed fictional college degrees used by a support magistrate and newly assigned family judge to artificially elevate my child support obligations beyond a manageable level for illicit and punitive incarceration purposes. My inability to satisfy those obligations were caused by the witch hunt and license suspensions in this court.

44) I have been suspended from practice now for a period exceeding seven (7) years, greater than a felony disbarment period, without even an accusation of any crime, based on orchestrated misconduct and so-called "discrepancies" in my submissions.

45) While this persecution against a judicial whistleblower continues in perpetuity, other lawyers are

committing felonious acts (William Koslosky), admitting to misappropriation of six figures in client funds (John Petrone), serving a jail sentence for tax evasion on $2 million in unreported income (Robert Sossen), and falsifying time sheets while employed as ethics lawyers by this very court (Torncello, Zayas, Devane), all without any disruption to their law licenses.

46) Even if we assume that all this was fair and conceived in good faith, a combined 18 month penalty term was long completed in 2013. But in the same year, I testified at the Moreland Commission on Public Corruption regarding the widespread misconduct in these courts.

47) Within days of premature dissolution of that Commission, a report was generated by the respondent committee opposing my fourth reinstatement application, citing my website postings and Commission testimony as grounds. Seven postings were appended to that report including a mere dedication to my departed mother evidently for sadistic reasons and no explanation, prosecution or claim of inaccuracy to date. I have been left in a state of purgatory reserved for judicial whistleblowers and like-minded scoundrels. This court has the report in its record.

48) In short, I continue to be stigmatized as a crime victim treated as a criminal, an argument placed before this court in June, 2015. It was sufficient to dismiss the last petition and forestall the committee's illicit goal of disbarment but insufficient on ego grounds alone to end the

witch hunt. Instead, the absurdities continue as I am now called to task for protecting client funds to the best of my (undermined) ability after the state's out-of-control child support collection agency seized funds properly held by me in my duly created client trust account nearly ten years ago.

49) I am accused of deceit by creating a back-up office "operating account" under another identification number to protect against such government thefts. This abused standard of "deceit" quickly glosses over lawyers who establish partnership accounts or professional corporations similarly removed from creditor seizure in order to cover basic office expenses so that revenue can be generated to pay those creditors.

50) This latest concoction also ignores the fact that another lawyer was using the same office. Therefore, it was a necessary business decision to protect his needs. There is nothing alleged to be illegal or improper in this decision to set up a distinct "law office operating account." Remarkably it is all well explained in the foreclosure transcript cited in the charges, making this all the more incomprehensible in terms of a proper use of court appointed lawyers and public resources. A copy of the latest charge with cited transcript is attached at exhibit B.

51) What this committee has done is set a double standard of boundless proportion that can be employed to target the most ethical member of any bar. I am confident that none could endure the abuse I have with a witch hunt expanded to include family court operatives, the state tax

department, support collection agents (operating in "confidential" headquarters in Albany) and law enforcement officers wrongfully duped into believing they are serving some common good other than lawyer enrichment at the expense of innocent children and unsuspecting parents.

52) In literal terms, it was a felony committed by this support collection agency since it had stolen monies that did not belong to me, something that should have been evident before being forced to restore those funds. What sort of society would we have if thieves could be exonerated if they returned their ill-begotten automobiles, cash and groceries only if they got caught? But our state is no longer a servant of its people, it is above the law and immune from criminal liability. I proved that in my Moreland Commission testimony and civil actions dutifully taken to remedy government abuses dismissed in both federal and state courts with an anti-filing order.

53) Obviously there is something else going on here, more than merely sinister, a severe dysfunction in our judiciary, a highly concealed agenda to punish an effective public critic. The concealment is being achieved through published decisions which notoriously omit my First Amendment issues and reports of verified misconduct.

54) These decisions are calculated to defame my previously stellar reputation and therefore my complaints as meritless, rambling, chaotic, incomprehensible and other convincing terms plucked from a thesaurus to "deceive" media and independent oversight authorities into believing

that there is nothing here worth investigating. Nothing could be further from the truth as this application shockingly demonstrates.

55) Discrediting the reputation of a whistleblower is a familiar tactic used by dictators and oppressive regimes to suppress dissent and human rights violations in remote places that our military is sent to risk their lives in the name of freedom and democracy. Power is preserved and consolidated through such tactics. In similar fashion, the judicial branch of government here is able to deflect from the corruption which is truly at large in our disciplinary and domestic courts.

56) There is no point in wasting our time on this inept complaint. It defeats itself by its own terms where it is explained why such an office account was created. In the cited transcript pages, it is stated that, faced with an irreconcilable circumstance, the account was opened to ***prevent*** ethics violations in the event client funds are not restored by government thieves. But because the very word ethics was employed, the respondent here blindly seized upon the incident.

57) Significantly the complaint is derived from an "anonymous" source which is likely one of two lawyers defeated in my foreclosure action. I was successful on two successive bank motions for summary judgment with their underlying goal of avoiding trial exposure of a fraud known to exist when that action was filed in 2012. The bank thereafter agreed to walk away from a $220,000 claim on my

home based on collusion between my ex-secretary, the bank's ex-branch manager and perhaps even my ex-spouse in 2008.

58) Two lawyers are the principal suspects behind this complaint with 90% certainty that it is one most recently retained by my ex-spouse. In either case, the anonymous nature of their handiwork is explained by a desire to avoid a conflict with their own clients since this ethics complaint has now undermined a pending settlement where I was asked to waive my rights to file civil or criminal complaints.

59) That makes the complaint itself far more deceitful than my candidly disclosed office account and clearly a violation of ethical rules. But like the last anonymous lawyer complainant defeated in the only malpractice action ever litigated against me (after the witch hunt became public), she was exposed, brought in as a witness and defeated again by the results of the last ethics complaint. Yet to this day, no ethics charges have been brought against her.

60) The foreclosure was commenced in June, 2012 with full knowledge of a sham refinance transaction that no competent bank lawyer would have approved. The very filing included service upon my ex-spouse as a party to the closing with disclosure documents and bank conceding her absence. The original bank law firm and presiding judge have since been discharged and disqualified respectively without explanation. Their replacements since 2014 have

continued with the foreclosure despite greater knowledge of the fraud to the present day.

61) No one outside of the anonymous complainant and respondent here saw a reason to report any ethics issue during this six year foreclosure proceeding which is their duty under our professional rules of conduct. They included lawyers and judges who reviewed the same 2013 deposition transcript appended to the complaint regarding my candid disclosure. While I could go on and on, the true purpose of the latest complaint is to finish off what remains of my court reform efforts and judicial whistleblowing. The greater purpose of this motion is to finally end the witch hunt by this court's agents through a higher wisdom entrusted to its justices.

Motion for Immediate Reinstatement

61) The Judiciary Law contains a provision authorizing this court to set aside a law license suspension for good cause, public benefit, dignity of our courts and interests of justice. Such a showing has been overwhelmingly made here. The public relies on qualified whistleblowers and reformists, as do our courts, to improve the administration and delivery of justice.

62) This especially the case when our Judicial Conduct Commission investigates less than 10% of complaints submitted by aggrieved members of the public. It cannot hope to properly examine so many complaints as a single body statewide. In my Moreland testimony, I urged

dissolution of that Commission like so many others which have proven impotent over the years.

63) Reinstatement is further supported by the practical foreclosure of my petition rights through an abuse of ethics rules and anonymous complaints. I have a right to know my accusers in a process which carries such grave consequences. "Deception," especially of the context of this complaint, can be employed to censor every facet of my public criticisms of our courts, from routine lectures to literary work where the target of my criticism disagrees with my message. In his or her mind I am deceiving the public, and if that is not an easy subject for prosecution, we simply wait for another "anonymous" complaint until something more palpable can be contrived as a pretext for censorship.

64) These lawyer committees were ostensibly created at taxpayer expense to protect the public. Instead, in one of the greatest acts of deception in modern times, this committee has been harming the public. Countless victims of government abuse have remained unable to access my valuable services, some in waiting mode even to this day, seven years later. Copies of news articles showing victims unable to find counsel in controversial cases are annexed at exhibit C.

65) The committee's overriding mission, using every means possible, is to orchestrate an environment which discredits its public critic; to kill a highly qualified advocate of good government, to degrade a model citizen committed to

exposing corruption beyond the first and second branches, to punish an office holder in all three branches locally who developed an unassailable record of protecting victims of government abuse.

Order of Referral to Independent Oversight Authorities

66) The focus of my domestic and disciplinary proceedings to date has not included a genuine concern for children or the public. It has remained a focus on censorship of a vital public message which is gaining recognition through social and secondary media. My known, discreet and anonymous adversaries are seeking to cover up an epidemic in our nation's divorce and family courts, to deflect in every manner possible, legally or unlawfully, crucial awareness of how lawyers and judges work together to kill parent-child relationships for profit and revenues, to censor every means of self-governance which interferes with its lucrative gold mine.

67) This is a highly offensive but supported public message which this court cannot hope to comprehend in terms of the sheer magnitude of persecution which followed. It was achieved by state agents clothed with judicial authority recklessly or even maliciously acting in concerted fashion to destroy its public critic. It is the power of the state once again pitted against the rights of the individual in a war I concededly cannot win.

68) I gave no guns or an infinite supply of tax dollars at my disposal to keep this domestic and disciplinary war

going whereas my adversaries can wait many months since this latest anonymous complaint was submitted before asking for my response to an already authorized prosecution. To recognize what is truly occurring here, a comprehensive understanding of my complete ten year record is essential. Otherwise questions will emerge with offensive responses for every ethics issue isolated out of context for protracted treatment by this committee.

69) Such a complete background is available to satisfy full and open disclose and judicial economy. It can be provided on request and may be too detailed for purposes of this application. Respectful of the time constraints of a busy court, I will provide only summary features which prove or corroborate the illicit nature of respondent's conduct:

a) Thirty-eight (38) assigned trial jurists among various upstate courts with thirty-five (35) disqualified by self-recusal or motion for misconduct, collusion or incompetence. No case has been found with a number of disqualifications anywhere close to this one.

b) A custody judge (Bryan Hedges), one of those 35 disqualified judges, permanently removed from family court one year later by the high court of this state after admitting to sexual abuse of his handicapped five year old niece, Hedges, 20 NY3d 677 (2013).

c) Chief ethics counsel and deputy lawyers appointed by this court, engaged in the witch hunt against me, who were allowed to resign without public charges for falsifying time sheets. They targeted my law license based on orchestrated family proceedings, television interviews, public forums and website postings without to the present time;

d) A chief administrative judge (James Tormey) who appointed the 38 trial judges to my domestic matters since 2006, including several out of proper order or case familiarity which unlawfully caused my first license suspension for alleged support violation in 2010 along with indefinite suspension of rational child contact since 2013;

e) Among the 38 assignments was Judge Bryan Hedges in 2011, Judge Tormey's co-defendant at the time in a federal civil rights case. It was filed by a chief family court clerk who refused to comply with their directives to conduct "political espionage" on a since deceased, handicapped judge candidate. She ultimately recovered $600,000 due to judicial retaliation which, like this case, featured punitive assignments to remote courts such as one in Lewis County, Morin v Tormey, 626 F.3d 40 (2nd Cir. 2010);

f) My custody and support matters incurred exactly such a transfer to the same remote court featuring a newly seated family judge unfamiliar with our case. This occurred in July, 2013 and directly led to the loss of my children for a period of three years (over 1,000 days) and counting without any history or finding of parental unfitness and no involvement of any child protection agency. A veteran family judge already familiar with our case had completed a trial and 2012 custody order without recusal while a state Supreme Court judge in our home county with general jurisdiction of over our pending child support and dependent marital home foreclosure cases.

g) The newly seated judge, Daniel King, was judge #35. Within days of his assignment, he fabricated or excused college degrees I never earned (nowhere in any record) to cause unmanageable support obligations for punitive incarceration before imposing absurd and conflicting parenting orders for the same reason of censorship.

h) The fabricated college degrees were raised in my September 17, 2013 testimony before the Moreland Commission on Public Corruption at Pace University (published on its website and mine worldwide and at the top page of Google searches of "Judge Daniel King"). The scheme to seize my children and destroy my public credibility through one-sided forensic orders began with an untimely and poorly drafted cross motion on October 9, 2013 and was consummated only two months later;

i) Judge King's child suspension and forensic orders were based on a "mini-hearing" without proper notice or opportunity to produce witnesses or proofs (a first appearance on a violation petition relating to a wedding). He cited a "prohibited alcohol related gesture" concerning to a wedding toast in my teen daughters' presence when no other reliable proof could be obtained to execute on his ulterior goal of censorship at this defective and unrecorded hearing (as we later learned when trying to perfect a futile appeal). He did all this despite no prior history of alcohol abuse or even an accusation of alcohol related misconduct as a higher court judge found when putting a temporary stay order on that bizarre, abusive and vague finding and parenting standard.

j) Judge King imposed a gag order on my website on November 25, 2016 and kept it in place despite its bizarre, vague and overbroad terms, and despite my challenges until May 3, 2016 when I was forced to obtain a show cause order against him on First Amendment grounds. It was signed by a state Supreme Court justice. Days later he cancelled a trial at the last minute on that gag order and followed with a dismissal on the face of the original petition jointly filed by the "custodial parent" and child lawyer.

k) Judge King disqualified himself without explanation or court order served on the parties in

June, 2016 after I publicly exposed him for his alcohol consumption at a tavern near the courthouse with his children present. This caused a dismissal of my mandamus action on mootness grounds, thereby avoiding a protest against him set to occur at the Oneida County Courthouse on June 22, 2016. His degrees, gestures and bizarre findings have remained the "law of the case." Systemic prejudice embraced by his replacement judge, James Eby, in a further remote county of Oswego, New York, has produced abuse and alienation to where I will never see my daughters again;

l) Based on these and other judge cases, in addition to my extensive experience as a lawyer, parent and office holder in all three branches of local government, I publicly advocated for reforms to include a litigant right to request psychiatric examinations of family judges prior to cross-examination of their young children in private chambers (to decide parent preferences). In my case, I moved to prevent my young daughters from being ordered into such a session without the parents present (Lincoln hearing). I was opposed by lawyers condemning my motion due to a reputation of Judge Hedges "beyond reproach." Fortunately I took that bold step because my motion was granted to avoid an "appearance of impropriety" prior to his pedophile admissions;

m) Twelve (12) years of protracted proceedings designed to maximize child lawyer fees at taxpayer expense while bankrupting the parents and two innocent girls due to lawyer greed and a custody gold mine protected by former lawyers on the bench;

n) Literally hundreds of abusive court orders to replace superior parental discretion in separated households subject to ever elusive standards of mandatory and permissive appeals that would confound any sane person for the benefit of lawyer profits;

o) Irreconcilable judge directives producing a condition of contempt by ambush of a public critic to be executed for coercion, intimidation and unlawful incarceration;

p) Un-remedied crime victim status at the hands of an ex-office secretary, convicted and jailed in 2016, who was influenced to manufacture ethics violations through mail
tampering, theft of bank accounts, forgery, fraud, a separate unlicensed law practice
discovered after discharge, initial prosecutorial immunity and sociopathic crimes;

70) The foregoing summary requires a referral to an independent body for investigation and relief. I have neither the resources nor the official capacity to do this especially after being denied discovery in every forum to date. If a court can convert and refer matters under the judicial code and declaratory rulings, it has the moral if not legal authority to do so here.

<u>Order Declaring Rules 8(c)(d) and (h) Facially Unconstitutional or As Applied</u>

71) Supplementing the foregoing, it can be seen how Rule 8 and its standards for deceit, fraud and conduct impairing administration of justice can implicate every aspect of my life. These rules are vague, overbroad and easily abused as our harassment laws typically are to abuse First Amendment rights and other constitutionally protected activity. They can be exploited for endless

violations that few humans could survive. It is a witch hunt that can be extended for the balance of my life while I remain unemployed in my profession.

Order Reconciling Irrational Split Treatment Among Courts

72) This particular petition for relief has already been addressed. I am not in a position to know why I continue to be split between appellate departments. If a disqualifying event caused the 2010-2013 transfers to this court, it cannot be waived, abandoned or rehabilitated. Yet the Fourth Department has now acted on my domestic matters while leaving the disciplinary aspects with this court for no logical reason except brazen targeting of my public criticisms.

Order Voiding Prior Suspensions

73) This court is now in possession of new information which was not available to me at the time of my earlier defenses to charges and the suspension orders which resulted in 2010 and 2013. The support violation suspension was lifted in January, 2012 by the Fourth Department upon receipt of a letter and order of support by stipulation which pledged the proceeds of home sale for future support satisfaction. Although state collection agents have violated that order, it continues to be raised in the ongoing foreclosure process. Accordingly an order voiding the prior suspension orders by reason of the speech persecution and/or crime victim status detailed in this submission would be in the interests of justice.

Order Referring William Koslosky for Ethics Prosecution

74) Attorney William Koslosky was appointed lawyer for my children in December, 2007. One month later my public reform efforts began as summarized above. Upon learning of it, he abused his entrusted office by concocting facts at taxpayer expense designed to impair my licensing interests contrary to the support needs and reputation of his so-called "clients." As relevant here, he endeavored to defraud the Appellate Division into believing that I had sought reinstatement of my law license in family court.

75) William Koslosky had a material and illicit goal of making me out to be incompetent. After my relevant appeal was transferred to this court, he filed a motion to dismiss it. His sworn affirmation transferred here gave a fabricated factual statement which satisfies all the elements of felony perjury, to wit:

> Penal Law Section 240.10: A person is guilty of perjury in the second degree (a Class E felony) when he swears falsely and when his false statement is (a) made in a subscribed written instrument for which an oath is required by law, and (b) made with intent to deceive a public servant in the performance of his official functions, and (c) material to the action, proceeding or matter involved.

76) Appended under exhibit D are copies of a sworn statement executed by William Koslosky stating alleged facts material to his motion that I had filed a cross-motion before Judge Pirro-Bailey on March 3, 2011 seeking not only to have my law license reinstated in Family Court but to

"revoke" this Court's exclusive authority over such matters. Also appended is my entire cross-motion which itemizes thirteen (13) distinct requests for relief, none of them remotely supporting Koslosky's sworn statements before this Court. Finally I have added his submissions before this court to draw upon its duty to refer Koslosky for proper accountability. The respondent has reached back to 2009 to craft a complaint here. Hence the more recent and serious misconduct of William Koslosky becomes highly relevant on equal protection grounds.

77) Having further reviewed my supporting papers, I could find nothing to repair this clearly concocted and maliciously directed court document submitted to a court of record in retaliation for my public criticisms. It was submitted by a lawyer boasting 30 years of practice on a September 24, 2015 record before a state Supreme Court justice while being compensated for his crimes by our taxpayers.

78) None of this can be deemed beneficial to my daughters but it illustrates how corrupt our justice system has become. While ethics counsel in Albany and Syracuse are exploiting "discrepancies," withdrawn grievances, anonymous complaints and protective office practices against their public critic, William Koslosky is perjuring away without accountability before the very courts he is overtly deceiving, justices who are dutifully public servants.

79) The same attorney's affirmation was filed with the Third Department when my appeal was transferred even

after opposition was provided showing the falsity of these sworn statements. Equally damning for purposes of removing him as child attorney, William Koslosky is acting with the same sense of immunity and sociopathic character as my ex-secretary. This is a quintessential case of projection, a man with a serious mental disorder deflecting on his victim.

80) The foregoing grounds were made a part of my motion for Koslosky's removal from a support hearing assigned to the 26th trial jurist, James Gorman. On November 19, 2012, Judge Gorman issued a letter decision granting my motion and removing William Koslosky as attorney for my children because to continue the appointment "would only do further further damage by way of potential settlement of the pending support matter." .

81) From the time of first child conception in 2001 to the day of earliest state intervention in 2006, I enjoyed a productive, loving, safe and promising father-child relationship with my two daughters. I observed them in sonograms, watched them enter the world, sheltered them in a wonderful suburban home, nursed them with baby bottles, changed their diapers, clothed them, transported to day care, preschool and primary school, flew them without the mother to Disney World, and exchanged hugs and kisses through every child exchange during two years of separation. As a former ski instructor, I gave them their first lessons without injury of any kind.

Order of Conversion

82) My public and court challenges to Title IV-D of the Social Security Act (Child Support Standards Act) included its mandatory custody classifications and federal funding incentives for state judges to manufacture the largest number and amounts of child support orders, thereby creating inherent decisional bias. Fathers were most affected as verified by the Census Bureau which continues to report that nearly 85% of all parents paying child support are men.

83) There has yet to be a final ruling on the merits of this ongoing challenge. My public message cannot be deemed extreme or untenable. It is supported by veteran family jurists such as Albany Judge Dennis Duggan who condemned use of the terms "visitation and "custody" because it brought the worst out of parents when children needed their best. He even rebelled against "the law" by refusing to employ those terms in his decision, Webster v Ryan, 189 Misc. 2d 86 (Fam Ct 2001) at fn 1.

84) Not surprisingly, his decision was promptly reversed by this court on other grounds but his views were later adopted in a Matrimonial Commission Report to our Chief Justice in 2006. Nevertheless the stigmatizing, antiquated terms have survived in lieu of more progressive shared parenting presumptions under our Constitution due to the lucrative nature of "custody wars."

85) The authority supporting a conversion of this action is already provided in my jurisdictional statement as

supplemented throughout this submission. It is respectfully urged that this application cannot adequately resolve the foregoing expansive issues. In Koziol v Hood, 92 AD3d 1161 (3rd Dept 2012), this court declined an invitation to convert a mandamus action to a declaratory action. However it also emphasized that extraordinary relief is proper where alternatives are inadequate or unavailing.

86) That is certainly the case here if there ever was one. The Court also noted that such conversion or relief where there is compelling evidence of an "impairment of fundamental rights, a violation of State law or a violation of public policy," citing Essenberg v Kresky, 265 AD2d 664, 677 (1999).

87) This Court made a similar but narrower observation in Koziol v Walsh-Hood, 72 AD3d 1634 (4th Dept 2010). How much more persecution must a public critic of our courts be subjected to before a conclusion is reached that enough is enough. The appellate track has been undermined for the past eight years in my case through circumstances outside my control.

Order Clearing Scrutiny of Pending Book

88) Prior to receipt of the latest ethics complaint last month, I was nearing completion of a book which chronicles my ordeal in these courts. It is also based on the ordeals of divorce and family court victims across the country ranging from needless suicides, violence and premature deaths. The standards now being applied as part of this witch hunt

effectively establishes a prior restraint upon any risky publication of this book.

89) Accordingly I am seeking intervention and guidance from this court or from a qualified appointed agent so that I do not involuntarily come in violation of any ethics rule or suspension order. For example, I provide public awareness assistance, lawyer referrals and lawyer placement services for law firms across the country. Use of the word "lawyer" in my title may be risky, albeit proper as I see it. The book itself is a treasure trove for deception as it has been abused by respondent here.

Order of Referral to State Legislature

90) In Maron v Silver, 14 NY3d 230 (2010), a declaratory action was brought by our state's chief judge and other judges in a trilogy of filings intended to influence the Legislature to budget for judicial pay raises. Clearly the judiciary had no constitutional authority to direct a legislative process and the court was inherently biased to decide any such case in any event.

91) Regardless of the jurisdictional limitations and novel extremes, this trilogy of actions proceeded to a successful decision for the plaintiffs and ultimately paved the way for the budgeting which was demanded. Based on this precedent, I am seeking a similar outcome to compensate me for my injuries. A father in the state of Connecticut was successful in a comparably abusive court process to get his legislature to waive sovereign immunity on his $55 million claim.