



I-VIEW-IT HOLDINGS, INC.
I-VIEW-IT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

Eliot I. Bernstein
Founder & Inventor
Direct Dial: (561) 245-8588 (o)
(561) 886-7628 (c)

Monday, October 05, 2009

The Honorable Senator John L. Sampson
Chairman of the New York State Standing Committee On The Judiciary
New York State Senate
NYS Senate Judiciary Committee

District Office
1222 96th Street
Brooklyn, NY 11236
Tel: (718) 649-7653
Fax: (718) 649-7661

Albany Office
409 Legislative Office Building
Albany, NY 12247
Tel: (518) 455-2788
Fax: (518) 426-6806

Re: SUBMISSION OF PREPARED STATEMENT REGARDING TESTIMONY OF ELIOT I. BERNSTEIN AT SEPTEMBER 24, 2009 PUBLIC HEARING, FOR INCLUSION IN THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE HEARINGS REGARDING 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

Dear Honorable Senator John L. Sampson,

Thank you for your courage in conducting the first Hearing on June 08, 2009 and the second Hearing of the NYS Senate Judiciary Committee on September 24, 2009 regarding the NY Judicial and Attorney Disciplinary processes.

Re: Submission of Prepared Statement Regarding Testimony of Eliot I. Bernstein at September 24, 2009 Public Hearing, For Inclusion in The Public Record for the Hearings Regarding 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

Enclosed please find a Written copy of the Prepared Statement and Exhibits that accompanies my testimony for the NYS Senate Judiciary Committee for inclusion in the public records of the hearings. As you may recall, I flew to Albany on June 8, 2009 from Boca Raton, Florida to provide testimony yet denied the opportunity to testify that day because of the now infamous Senate Coup in Albany that took place in the Capital Building, shutting down the hearings immediately prior to my testifying. Again, on September 24, 2009, I appeared at the second hearing in Manhattan at 250 Broadway in New York and testified but was unable to finish my testimony before the Committee, yet I am most thankful for even the limited time I had, as already it yielded the Committees interest and intervention in certain matters. As you may recall, interruptions occurred through parts of my Testimony while you discussed issues with William Galison who was videotaping Mr. Alan Friedberg, current head of the First Department Appellate Discipline Committee and Mr. Alan Tembeckjian, Chief Counsel of the current NYS Commission on Judicial Conduct. Several minutes of my testimony interrupted as Friedberg and Tembeckjian became very uncomfortable with videotaping at a Public Hearing, which I found highly unusual for Public Officials.

In the event that a third hearing is scheduled, if the Committee would be so kind and has available time resources, as I know many victims lined the room hoping to testify at the last hearing, I request additional time for further testimony to be publically entered into the record. I hereby request that my Prepared Statement be accepted for the Record of these Judiciary Hearings before the NY State Senate, as I was promised by both Timothy Spotts and Lisa Lashley that the Prepared Statement and all exhibits would be submitted to the entire Committee and for inclusion into the record. I therefore respectfully request an Acknowledgement notice from your Office as current Chair of the

Re: Submission of Prepared Statement Regarding Testimony of Eliot I. Bernstein at September 24, 2009 Public Hearing, For Inclusion in The Public Record for the Hearings Regarding 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

Committee that this letter and the attached Prepared Statement were docketed officially in the record.

As captured in the live testimony provided on September 24, 2009¹, I asked the Committee to determine the status and location of my complaints against Alan Friedberg, current Chief Counsel of the First Department Appellate Division Discipline Committee and Roy L. Reardon Partner at Simpson Thacher appointed to a three-year term as Chairman of the Appellate Division, First Department Disciplinary Committee, the complaints now falling far outside the procedural response time. May the Committee also take formal notice that the complaints against Friedberg and Reardon arose from their handling complaints filed against Lawyers in Conflict in my Federal Lawsuit and where the First Department and First Department Disciplinary Committee are both Defendants in the same Lawsuit, again conflict beyond belief.

Arrangements were made with Monica Connell of the New York Attorney General's Office who is representing the First Department Defendants, to have the complaints moved prior to any action by the First Department, to a Non-Conflicted Third Party prior to even reviewing them. Instead, the First Department ignored the requests and decision of their representative counsel, the NYAG and moved to Dismiss the Complaints against other Defendants in the Lawsuit that they are Defendants in as well.

¹September 24, 2009 Judiciary Committee Hearing Linkage my Testimony Begins at 4.02.08 in this video @ http://www.livestream.com/nysenate/ondemand/pla_cce9d795-b7f2-4996-8fbd-a4c848aba2bd?initthumburl=http://mogulus-user-files.s3.amazonaws.com/chnyenate/2009/09/24/3ccbb0fd-f73d-4733-9ae52aac6d59f1ac_8530.jpg&playeraspectwidth=4&playeraspectheight=3

And

June 08, 2009 Judiciary Committee Hearing with Anderson Testifying Second Part 1 @ http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HR8OX8uuAbw&feature=player_embedded
Part 2 @ http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=28afajRkDwY&feature=player_embedded

Re: Submission of Prepared Statement Regarding Testimony of Eliot I. Bernstein at September 24, 2009 Public Hearing, For Inclusion in The Public Record for the Hearings Regarding 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

Defendants, dismissing complaints against other Defendants, complaints directly related to the Lawsuit they are Defendants in, creating overwhelming Appearance of Impropriety through violations of Title 18 and State Obstruction Laws, Violations of Attorney Conduct Codes and Violations of the Rules and Regulation of the First Department Disciplinary itself.

The Dismissals instantly appealed, yet again, we have still heard nothing back from the First Department or their counsel the NYAG and certain procedural rules appear broken. At the same time the appeal was timely filed, formal written complaints were lodged against Friedberg and Reardon, again requesting, no demanding, the complaints be moved to a Non-Conflicted third party by the NYAG from the First Department. Complications also arise since the NYAG is also a Defendant in the Lawsuit and thus calls then were made to the NYAG's office whereby Steven M. Cohen², Andrew Cuomo's Chief of Staff, claimed that neither he nor Andrew Cuomo was aware of the situation unfolding and that he would personally look into the matters. The original call to the NYAG's office prior to Cohen's involvement was made to ascertain whom to file Title 18 Obstruction charges with against the NYAG and First Department. I await the formal response from the NYAG and again urge this Committee to intercede and find out exactly who will be investigating the matters and complaints in a situation where it appears almost everyone involved or who is supposed to be protecting citizen's rights have Conflicts of Interest in New York concerning these matters.

2

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090613%20FINAL%20NYAG%20Steven%20Cohen%20Letter%20signed%20low.pdf>

and

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

Re: Submission of Prepared Statement Regarding Testimony of Eliot I. Bernstein at September 24, 2009 Public Hearing, For Inclusion in The Public Record for the Hearings Regarding 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

It should be noted that similar to the Whistleblower Anderson, central to this Committee's investigation, the NYAG is representing the State Defendants against the Plaintiff, not vice versa. Especially twisted in this scenario is there is a Whistleblower exposing Public Office Corruption, which should legally obligate the NYAG to represent the Whistleblower through its Public Integrity Division responsible for investigating corruption by Public Officials, therefore the NYAG should be representing the Whistleblower, the Legally "Related" Lawsuits and the Public Interest and not the accused Public Officials. Yet we find the NYAG representing the accused Public Officials they should be investigating in the Anderson Whistleblower lawsuit and the lawsuits Legally "Related" by Federal Judge Shira Scheindlin, despite the fact that Scheindlin has referred the related cases to the NYAG. This leaves the question of just who is representing the People and are the People paying for the defenses of the accused Public Officials on the Public Dime and finally does this not put the NYAG in a Conflict of Interest that acts to Obstruct Justice by preventing Prosecution.

The NYAG's Conflict of Interest is more insipid, as it also acts to Obstruct Justice as the conflicted representation makes it impossible for the NYAG to investigate and prosecute those they are representing, representing on STATE TAXPAYERS money. Absolutely obscene and as the citizens of New York discover that the NYAG is representing, not prosecuting Public Officials in allegations of Public Office Crimes by Whistleblowers, which they are charged with investigating, the Public will Lose Faith in the Public Offices designed to protect them. It will make them sick when they find that this illegal representation is on Public Finances and there will be hell to pay for those involved who have created this nifty shield from prosecution. I remind this Committee of New York Penal Code §195.00 that states:

Re: Submission of Prepared Statement Regarding Testimony of Eliot I. Bernstein at September 24, 2009 Public Hearing, For Inclusion in The Public Record for the Hearings Regarding 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

A public servant is guilty of official misconduct when, with intent to obtain a benefit or deprive another person of a benefit: 2. He knowingly refrains from performing a duty which is imposed upon him by law or is clearly inherent in the nature of his office.

As the video tapes of the hearings reveal, upon request for the Committee intervention, you Senator Sampson asked Mr. Friedberg to look into where the missing complaints were and inform the Committee of the Status and Mr. Friedberg claimed he would look into them. Not that his representative counsel in my Lawsuit against the First Department would look into them but that he personally would look into them, which again would violate entirely rules regarding Conflicts, yet it was very revealing of how things operate now at the First Department. Respectfully, I await the Committee's determination as to the location and status of these Complaints and what non conflicted third party the complaints should transfer too. The complaints against Reardon and Friedberg and the others footnoted herein³.

³ February 09, 2009 New York State Office of Attorney General Public Integrity Complaint RE:

I. Roy L. Reardon letter dated January 27, 2009

II. Alan W. Friedberg letter dated January 12, 2009

III. Complaints

A. "New Complaints"

1. Roy L. Reardon, Esq. – Waiting Docket #

2. Alan W. Friedberg, Esq. – Waiting Docket #

B. "2008 Complaints" Matters of Attorney Complaints Docket #2008-0756, appears to attempt to merge multiple complaints into one, waiting formal individual docket #'s from NYAG.

3. Proskauer Rose, LLP – First Dep. Failed to formally docket

4. Foley & Lardner - First Dep. Failed to formally docket

5. Gregg M. Mashberg, Esq. - First Dep. Failed to formally docket

6. Joanna F. Smith, Esq. - First Dep. Failed to formally docket

7. Todd C. Norbitz, Esq. - First Dep. Failed to formally docket

8. Anne B. Sekel, Esq. - First Dep. Failed to formally docket

C. "Old Complaints" (Transferred by Unpublished Orders M3198 - Steven C. Krane / M2820 Kenneth Rubenstein and M3212 Raymond A. Joao on Unanimous Consent of First Dept Justices for Conflict of

Re: Submission of Prepared Statement Regarding Testimony of Eliot I. Bernstein at September 24, 2009 Public Hearing, For Inclusion in The Public Record for the Hearings Regarding 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

As a final matter, I look forward to timely receiving a signed copy of my Conflicts of Interest Disclosure Form, attached to the Prepared Statement from yourself and the other members of the Committee or any other person this Committee may join to investigate the matters further. I also respectfully request that all information and testimony I have rendered the Committee be turned over to the Task Force the Committee is starting as stated in the hearings for immediate review and investigation.

Interest and the Appearance of Impropriety to Second Department. Second Department failed to conduct formal investigations ordered by First Dept.)

9. Thomas Cahill Special Inquiry No. 2004.1122 (former 1st Dept Chief Counsel) – Ongoing investigation by Martin Gold.

10. Steven C. Krane docket #2004.1883 (1st Dept Officer, former NYSBA President & Proskauer partner)

11. Kenneth Rubenstein docket #2003.0531 (Proskauer partner)

12. Raymond A. Joao docket #2003-0352

13. Proskauer Rose, LLP - First Dep. Failed to formally docket

14. Meltzer Lippe Goldstein & Schlissel - First Dep. Failed to formally docket

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090209%20NYAG%20PUBLIC%20INTEGRITY%20COMPLAINT%20SIGNED.pdf>

and

March 09, 2009 Plaintiff's First Dept DDC Complaints Proskauer and Foley ~ See pages 24-27 @ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080305%20Final%20Plaintiff%20Opposition%20to%20Proskauer%20letter%20as%20counsel.pdf>

Re: Submission of Prepared Statement Regarding Testimony of Eliot I. Bernstein at September 24, 2009 Public Hearing, For Inclusion in The Public Record for the Hearings Regarding 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

I again thank you for your courageous efforts in the face of Corruption and more respect you for your upfront disclosure in the hearing that you previously worked for the main accused in my allegations, the Proskauer Rose law firm.

Respectfully Yours,



Eliot Ivan Bernstein Digitally signed by Eliot Ivan Bernstein
DN: cn=Eliot Ivan Bernstein, o=I-View-It Technologies,
Inc., ou=Invention, email=iviewit@iviewit.tv, c=US
Date: 2009.10.05 21:09:27 -0400

Eliot I. Bernstein
Founder & Inventor

Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – DL
Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – DL
Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – FL
Iviewit Technologies, Inc. – DL
Uview.com, Inc. – DL
Iviewit.com, Inc. – FL
Iviewit.com, Inc. – DL
I.C., Inc. – FL
Iviewit.com LLC – DL
Iviewit LLC – DL
Iviewit Corporation – FL
Iviewit, Inc. – FL
Iviewit, Inc. – DL
Iviewit Corporation

cc/ec:

Re: Submission of Prepared Statement Regarding Testimony of Eliot I. Bernstein at September 24, 2009 Public Hearing, For Inclusion in The Public Record for the Hearings Regarding 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

Enclosure(s)/Attachment(s) – Prepared Statement for Inclusion Into Judiciary Committee Hearing Public Record

Uniform Resource Locator(s)

All Uniform Resource Locators (URL's) incorporated in entirety by reference herein

cmb/eib

ec & cc ~ Electronic and Carbon Copy(ies)

The Honorable Barack Hussein Obama II, President of the United States

New York Senate Judiciary Committee Members

The Honorable John Conyers Jr. - Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee

The Honorable Dianne Feinstein, United States Senator, Senate Judiciary Committee

The Honorable Eric H. Holder Jr., United States Attorney General ~ US Department of Justice

The Honorable Elena Kagan, Solicitor General ~ US Department of Justice

The Honorable Glenn Fine, Inspector General ~ US Department of Justice

Robert S. Mueller, III, Director ~ Federal Bureau of Investigation

Candice M. Will – Assistant Director, Office of Professional Responsibility ~ Federal Bureau of Investigation

The Honorable Harry I. Moatz, Director, Office of Enrollment & Discipline ~ United States Patent & Trademark Office

Todd J. Zinser, Inspector General ~ United States Department of Commerce

David Kappos, Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office

John J. Doll, Commissioner for Patents ~ United States Patent and Trademark Office

Re: Submission of Prepared Statement Regarding Testimony of Eliot I. Bernstein at September 24, 2009 Public Hearing, For Inclusion in The Public Record for the Hearings Regarding 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

David L. Gouvaia, Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration

Mary L. Schapiro, Chairperson ~ United States Securities and Exchange Commission

Peter L. McClintock, Acting Inspector General ~ Small Business Administration

Chris P. Mercer, President ~ Institute of Professional Representatives before the European Patent Office (epi)

Steven Michael Cohen, Counselor and Chief of Staff for Andrew Cuomo ~ New York Office of the Attorney General

Iviewit Shareholders, Investors and Patent Interest Holders

Select Press 1897 Final

| | |
|---|----|
| INTRODUCTION: | 3 |
| HISTORY RELEVANT TO THE FIRST DEPARTMENT APPELLATE DIVISION, THE NYS COURTS SYSTEM AND STATE OF NEW YORK: | 7 |
| ENTER THE LAW FIRM PROSKAUER: | 11 |
| ENTER FOLEY TO REPLACE JOAO..... | 16 |
| THE ARTHUR ANDERSEN AUDIT, THE ENRON BROADBAND ATTEMPTED TECHNOLOGY TRANSFERS, THE COLLAPSE OF BOTH ENRON AND ARTHUR ANDERSEN AND THE TIES TO THE IVIEWIT INVENTIONS:..... | 19 |
| THE COVER-UP CRIMES..... | 21 |
| New York Ethics Complaints Filed in 2003 and Dismissed Without Investigation; The Commissioner of Patents for the US Patent Office and Harry I. Moatz, Director of OED of the US Patent Office lead Federal Investigation of Same Attorneys State Bars and Disciplinary Agencies Dismissed without Investigation; West Palm Beach FBI Joins Patent Fraud Investigation Regarding Fraud Directly Upon the USPTO..... | 28 |
| July 16 2007 DOJ Widens Patentgate Inquiry:..... | 32 |
| The Fox and the Hen House..... | 32 |
| The Damning Whistleblower Case of Christine C. Anderson –Allegations of Coercion, Assault, Title 18 and State Obstruction of Justice via Official Supreme Court Document Destruction Inside the First Department by Public Officials, for “Favored Law Firms” | 32 |
| Proskauer’s Control of The Courts and First Department or How a Criminal Enterprise Cloaked as a Law Firm Controls the NY Courts and Disciplinary..... | 35 |
| A Bit of NY History Regarding Proskauer | 35 |
| How To Block Court Ordered Investigations – Corruption Top Down | 37 |
| CONTINUED CULTURE OF CONFLICT AND CORRUPTION OF ETHICS RULES AND LAW APPEARING IN A SOTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK BANKRUPTCY COURT WITH MAJOR LAW FIRM DAVIS POLK WARDELL AND OTHERS | 45 |
| MADOFF, DREIER AND ALLEN STANFORD PONZI LINKS TO THE IVIEWIT AFFAIRS WITH PROSKAUER ALL AROUND | 50 |
| The Sir Allen Stanford Financial Fraud and Ties to Proskauer | 51 |
| The Bernard Madoff Financial Fraud and Ties to Proskauer | 52 |
| The Marc S. Dreier Financial Fraud and Ties to the Proskauer Law Firm..... | 54 |
| NOTICE OF CONFLICT FILINGS AT THE US SECOND CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS | 55 |
| SUGGESTED ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: | 62 |
| Exhibits & Linkage | 68 |
| Federal Patent Bar and US Patent Office Complaints | 68 |
| State Disciplinary Complaints, Bar Complaints & More | 68 |
| New York First Department..... | 68 |
| Steven C. Krane – Proskauer Partner, Multiple First Department Roles and Former President of the New York State Bar Association | 68 |
| Kenneth Rubenstein – Proskauer and Meltzer Partner and MPEGLA Counsel..... | 70 |
| Raymond Anthony Joao – Misrepresented Proskauer Partner and Convicted Felon | |
| Marc Dreier Partner | 71 |
| Thomas Cahill – Former Chief Counsel of the Disciplinary Committee, Appellate Division, First Department..... | 72 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Alan W. Friedberg Esq. ~ Chief Counsel of the Disciplinary Committee, Appellate Division, First Department..... | 74 |
| Roy L. Reardon ~ Chairman of the Disciplinary Committee, Appellate Division, First Department and a Special Master in the Appellate Division, First Department | 74 |
| Second Department Disciplinary Committee & Second Department Complaints | 74 |
| Diana Maxfield Kearse, James Pelzer, Lawrence DiGiovanna & A. Gail Prudenti. | 74 |
| Florida Bar Complaints for Conflicts | 75 |
| Christopher Clarke Wheeler | 75 |
| Matthew Triggs..... | 76 |
| New York Attorney General Complaints for Conflicts & Title 18 Obstruction..... | 76 |
| Virginia Bar & Virginia Attorney General Complaints..... | 76 |
| US District Court Complaints for Conflicts and Title 18 Obstruction | 77 |
| US Second Circuit Court of Appeals Complaints for Conflicts and Title 18 Obstruction Charge..... | 77 |
| US Bankruptcy Court Southern District of New York | 77 |
| CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE FORM..... | 80 |

INTRODUCTION:

Hello and let me thank all of you for the opportunity to tell my most compelling story that involves a widespread corruption in the New York Courts and New York investigatory bodies that have utterly failed in their civic duties to protect my rights and in fact have become the actual Nemesis' that block my rights. My name is Eliot I. Bernstein and I reside in Boca Raton Florida and flew here to NY for the first hearings on June 8, 2009, and was prepared to address the Committee until the sudden Coup cancelled the remainder of the calendar prior to me speaking. I have traveled here while under a medical treatment program to tell you about the saga of my companies I-View-It in what has earned the moniker "PatentGate" and its relation to the Whistleblower case of Christine C. Anderson involving the Courts of New York and more. I remind all of you of the Conflict of Interest disclosure forms I have sent to this Committee and request that any/all conflicts be appropriately disclosed during these hearings or immediately hereafter.

I am 12 years husband to my lovely wife Candice, father of 3 beautiful sons, Joshua Ennio Zander, Jacob Noah Archie & Daniel Elijsha Abe Ottomo and an Inventor of the "Iviewit" Technologies involving video and image compression commonly referred to as mathematical scaling formulas, now used on virtually all digital imaging and video devices. Examples of the uses:

- The Hubble Space Telescope (providing views into the universe and time like never before seen, my fav!!!),
- All Internet Service providers hosting video,
- All computers and televisions playing video, DVD's HDDVD's, etc.
- All graphics chips

- All Digital Television & Cable Service Providers,
- Digital Video Hardware – Televisions, camera's, etc.
- Mass of Defense Applications such as space and flight simulators, missile and drone guidance systems, etc.
- Medical Imaging devices,
- GPS Mapping Programs, such as Google used for zooming from space to locations on earth with crystal clarity
- YouTube, Hulu, etc.
- Microsoft Media, Real Video, QuickTime Video

My technologies are the subject of a Multi-Count (12) Multi-Trillion Dollar, Yes, Twelve Trillion Dollar Federal RICO Lawsuit¹ in Federal Court here in New York State. The Lawsuit results from Theft, Fraud, and other Wrongful actions committed against my companies, shareholders and investors, including Death Threats and an Attempted Murder by my formerly trusted accountants and attorneys. Yes, Death Threats by Utley to shut up about what was discovered or else, emphasizing the powerful Law Firms ability to destroy me. YES, an Attempted Murder against my family by way of a Car Bombing of our family MiniVan in Boynton Beach Florida, not in Iraq, as my lovely wife Candice and I were preparing papers to file in court against the perpetrators.

Thus, please note the Seriousness of the claims here, as Attempted Murder is a very serious charge. Full pictorial evidence of the Car Bombing that was strong enough to take out three others cars next to mine found @ www.iviewit.tv .

¹ 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>



After a Car Bombing, you may think the safety of my family and children is my number one concern, but it is not, stopping the Disgusting Corruption plaguing the Courts and the Country before it harms more people is my priority, as leaving this fight to our children and future inventors by burying my head in the sand IS NOT AN OPTION. Paving the way for their future is dependent on our successes at fighting the corruption within our own legal system that stands as one the greatest threats to their futures.

Take note that behind almost all of the crimes committed in the United States of late, whether War, Torture or Fraudulent Financial Market Manipulations there have been no Regulations, Regulators or Laws Protecting the Citizens. The crimes have been committed and allowed by those in the legal profession, whom were entrusted with protecting the People through laws, whom now think they are above the law and act outside law. This lawlessness has tarnished our world reputation, killed innocent soldiers, created a mass of war casualties and have caused a worldwide economic terrorist attack on home loans, banks, insurance companies, investment banks and more by those running our financial markets and those regulating them, mostly attorneys, all who were to be guarding the henhouse.

The crimes to steal my Inventions were similarly committed by my trusted lawyers and accountants, retained to protect my inventions and who instead fraudulently

filed my inventions in others names, including the patent attorneys, one patent attorney from Yonkers, Raymond Anthony Joao, putting 90+ patents into his own name². Joao, placing the Patents in his name while retained by my companies and after employ by my companies. Yes, a patent attorney patenting his client's inventions in his own name, who it appears became more inventive than Thomas Edison after meeting me. In fact, I reference an Iviewit filing of Joao's, back in the 1900's³ for my companies inventions as the fax header provided on the official patent office filing is dated both in the 1900's and 2020's and I submit the Certified Copy from the Patent Office to this body, in the Exhibit & Linkage Section provided in my Prepared Statement submitted to this body herein.

It should also be noted here, that information surfaced from another Florida Businessman, one of Florida's Leading Business individuals, Monte Friedkin, that these very same criminals disguised as attorneys from Proskauer Rose LLP (Proskauer) and Foley & Lardner LLP (Foley), had in fact pulled a similar attempted heist of his intellectual properties. The attempted theft from Friedkin occurring immediately prior to these same attorneys preying upon my companies, exhibiting an alleged criminal enterprise cloaked as law firms and lawyers. This was the basis for filing a RICO against the entities comprising the criminal enterprise as it was learned that several law firms, lawyers and others involved in the Friedkin attempted theft and my own were working together to commit these crimes.

Learning later that these powerfully connected law firms and lawyers penetrated deep within the United States Patent Office and other government agencies and that part of the criminal enterprise operates to block due process of any victims that may challenge

² April 22, 2002 <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/Joao%20Article%20-%20ninety%20patents.pdf>

³ Joao Patent Application with 1900 and 2020 on fax headers on Official Patent Document @ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/PATENT%20APP%20DATED%20in%201900%20and%202020.pdf>

them. Being that they have legal degrees, these attorneys can infiltrate courts and investigatory agencies to block complaints against them. Infiltration similar to what the Whistleblower, Christine Anderson has previously testified to this Committee about regarding Obstruction of Justice for “favored lawyers and law firms” within the First Department, Document Destruction, Coercion and Physical Assault on those insiders not willing to go along with the crimes within the New York Supreme Courts. In fact, Anderson in her original Lawsuit mentions the Iviewit Companies as one of the reasons, due to complaints filed against the Chief Counsel and others leading to physical abuse and other crimes against her. New Whistleblowers from within the same department have surfaced and have been deposed in Anderson, confirming allegations of corruption in the New York Supreme Court.

In fact, my federal Twelve Trillion Dollar Lawsuit was marked Legally “Related” by Federal District Court Judge Shira Scheindlin to the federal Whistleblower case of NYS Court Insider Christine C. Anderson who worked as a Principal Attorney at the Department Discipline Committee in the NYS First Department Appellate Division. As you should be aware, the Anderson Whistleblower case now slated for a public trial currently scheduled for Oct. 13, 2009.

HISTORY RELEVANT TO THE FIRST DEPARTMENT APPELLATE DIVISION, THE NYS COURTS SYSTEM AND STATE OF NEW YORK:

Multiple attorneys regulated by the Courts of New York and specifically the NYS First Department have been involved in the Iviewit matters for nearly 10 or more years going back to 1998 when my Technologies were first being tested, used and in the

process of securing Patents and related Intellectual Property rights to protect the technologies.

The Technologies were tested and used at the Real3d Inc labs located on Lockheed Martin property in Orlando Florida. Real3d at the time owned by Lockheed, the Intel Corporation and Silicon Graphics Inc. Real3d's history in the graphics industry goes back to the Apollo Lunar space projects and whereby they own most of the essential intellectual properties relating to 3D imaging and video since that time. Leading Engineers at Real3d, Intel and Lockheed who tested and used my technologies deemed them as "Priceless", of course all of these actions were under Non-Disclosure and other Strategic Alliance and Licensing Agreements. Hassan Miah, an industry expert who headed the Creative Arts Agency (CAA) / Intel Multimedia Lab, which is accredited for taking the Internet from a text based medium to one with multimedia for the public Internet, upon first learning of the technologies, opined on them calling them "Holy Grail" of the Digital Imaging and Video world, favorable comments came from hundred of companies, many Fortune 500's later under NDA, etc. Real 3d, then became the first strategic alliance partner of the Iviewit companies.

At the time, in the late 90's rich media for the Internet consisted of simple banner ads and very small grainy images due to the bandwidth limitations even on high speeds, that playing video was like trying to suck and elephant thru a straw. Internet Video was so bad due to bandwidth constraints that there was no practical or commercial use for it at the time. In fact, Microsoft's Bill Gates, prior to learning of my inventions, was so aghast with the video quality (postage sized, grainy, low frame-rate, herky-jerky and out of synch with the audio) that he did not want it even associated with his operating

system, so that he gave Robert Glazer who headed his media department at the time, all of the media technologies to take and start his own company, Real Media which started with the Real Media Player that had limited use but to Geeks was definitely cool. The search for, full screen, full frame-rate, low bandwidth quality video and imaging was deemed the search for the “Holy Grail” as all prior attempts by leading engineers and institutions worldwide had failed and given up due to the mathematical impossibilities.

Thus, my Inventions are “Backbone” in nature to the Internet and All Forms of Digital Imaging and Video today, providing the mathematical scaling formulae that permit scaling and compression of video and solving for pixel distortion on images. The technologies reduced the amount of bandwidth necessary to create digital video, to process video, to transmit the video, to store the video and to display the video by an unprecedented 75% Percent savings over past technologies in all of these areas that now make up the digital imaging and video that is part of your everyday lives. Now please just think of what this meant 10 years ago at the time of discovery, as today the technologies are so prevalent in everyday life as to make one think they have been here forever. Due to the ability to transmit video in 75% smaller packages using the technologies, much lower bandwidths became viable for video, therefore the technologies opened the door for brand new markets such as Cell Phone Video, Internet Video and Video Conferencing through the Internet, all previously thought to be impossible 10 years ago, all non-existent then.

The effect the technologies had on Video for Television distribution due to the bandwidth savings over the prior method of interlacing video, used since the invention of Television, essentially permitted 75% More Channels on Television, Yes your cable

channels increased at the time by a WHOPPING 75%. The channel increase yielding more; Cub and Yankees games, Mets games, Soccer games, City Festival shows, Educational programs, Nature programs, Children programs, whatever the imagination and market desired and paving the way for ON DEMAND & HD cable television. In the higher bandwidth markets, DVD, HDDVD, Gaming, Simulators, etc. the technologies paved the way for these super high end video creations, as the technologies simultaneously yielded a corresponding 75% increase in processing power for video encoding, which allowed games and simulators to become almost lifelike in animations and found today on every gameboy, WII, Sony Playstation and X-box.

The Technologies applications for Digital Imaging changed virtually every digital display device! For example, most of you have digital camera's that now utilize zoom and pan features with no image pixilation as you zoom. Incredible zoom on low-resolution images on and off the camera, as most of you have zoomed from satellites to aerial images of your homes with clarity never before imagined prior to the inventions. Conversely, those satellites turned to space from your house provide a zoom capability that delves deep into space, further than we ever imagined, resulting in astonishing images of the universe, one of my most prized uses of the technologies. In medical imaging again the uses of zooming on x-rays, mri's and other imaging devices has provided the medical industry a new view of the human body, translating to far better treatments.

Again, keep in mind that the technologies for Digital TV, Internet Video and Video on Demand, which you find today as part of your life, were non-existent back in 1997-1999 when Iviewit began. Markets for all of these products wholly dependent on

the technologies, created from the technologies and where royalties for over a decade have been converted illegally by my former Lawyers and Law Firms who were hired to protect the inventions for their retained client inventors.

ENTER THE LAW FIRM PROSKAUER:

First on the scene of these Historical Inventions in Boca Raton, Florida, Christopher Clarke Wheeler of Proskauer, Proskauer was then retained for protecting the Intellectual Properties, including protecting them worldwide via Patents, Trademarks, Trade-Secrets and Copyrights. For example, Wheeler misrepresented to the Iviewit companies that attorney Kenneth Rubenstein was a Partner at Proskauer when introducing him⁴. Yet, to the contrary, investors found Rubenstein was instead at the law firm of Meltzer, Lippe, Goldstein, Wolfe & Schlissel (Meltzer) on Long Island at the time, Rubenstein, now one of the many named Defendants in my Twelve Trillion dollar RICO and Anti-Trust suit “legally related” to Anderson. Why would Proskauer misrepresent that Rubenstein was a partner who would protect the properties when in fact he was with another firm? The answer revolves around the fact that Proskauer at the time of learning of the inventions had NO Patent or Intellectual Property Department and was mainly a real estate law firm. If they were planning from the start to steal the “Holy Grail” technologies, they would need a patent department to monetize the royalties for themselves.

Turns out that Kenneth Rubenstein, an attorney admitted and regulated by the NYS First Dept, while at Meltzer, simultaneously was involved with the MPEGLA Patent Pool that he was in house counsel for and one of the founders of the MPEGLA

⁴ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/1999%2001%2028%20LETTER%20TO%20GORTZ%20-%20WHY%20IS%20RUBENSTEIN%20NOT%20AT%20PROSKAU.pdf>

pooling scheme. Proskauer then set about to find for their benefit, not their clients benefit, Rubenstein, to apply the technologies to the MPEGLA patent pools and more for themselves. After finding Rubenstein, Proskauer introduced him as Proskauer's Partner for the Oversight and Protection of the Inventions and the main IP Litigator who would get the IP protected and then placed in the MPEGLA pools for royalties to the Iviewit investors⁵. Misrepresented Proskauer partner Joao was retained to complete the Intellectual Property filing work in the US and every country around the world for IP protections. Rubenstein and Joao thought initially to be Proskauer partners in New York working to protect the Iviewit Inventions took invention disclosures from the inventors, opined on the technologies under Proskauer's retainer for services at the time, while they were actually working on the MPEGLA Patent Pools at Meltzer and were not with Proskauer at all.

Once investors discovered Proskauer's misrepresentation of Rubenstein and Joao as Proskauer partners, when instead with the law firm Meltzer, Rubenstein quickly switched firms to Proskauer. Wheeler claiming that Proskauer was in the process of acquiring Rubenstein and virtually overnight Rubenstein jumped ship with almost the entire Meltzer IP group to Proskauer. Details of Rubenstein's transfer were not clear to Rubenstein or Wheeler in their depositions related to these matters; in fact, Rubenstein was even unclear as to the terms of his partnership deal. The net result of these fraudulent misrepresentations was that it now gave Proskauer, **Iviewit Patent Counsel**, control of the MPEGLA patent pooling schemes, putting Proskauer in direct competition with Iviewit via control of MPEGLA. MPEGLA now the largest infringer of the Iviewit

⁵ Shareholder Statements
<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/SHAREHOLDER%20STATEMENTS%20BOOKMARKED.pdf>

technologies through this massive **Conflict of Interest** created by Violations of Virtually All Attorney Conduct Codes and Law by the Attorneys. A **Conflict of Interest** almost surreal in nature since attorneys are typically retained as “trusted” advisors considering there are supposed to be very strict federal Patent Bar and State Bar Association rules that presumably prevent lawyers and law firms from these type of conflicts with their trusting clients.

Raymond Joao on the other hand, also misrepresented as Rubenstein’s Proskauer Partner and filing lackey was also instead working with Rubenstein at the Meltzer firm but he did not transfer from Meltzer to Proskauer with Rubenstein and the rest of the Meltzer team. Joao was to transfer to Proskauer after cleaning up loose ends at Meltzer according to Wheeler. Yet, Joao never made it that far, as within the first year of his work on the IP, it became learned that Joao might have been patenting inventions in his own name, inventions learned under disclosure and retainer with Iviewit and the Inventors.

Proskauer and Wheeler confronted with the initial rumors that Joao, their operate, was filing patents wrongly on behalf of the Inventors and perhaps the right ones for himself instead. Wheeler of Proskauer volunteered to investigate Joao and was then further retained and billed for investigating the initial allegations that Joao was missing filings for Iviewit while busy patenting them in his name. Joao the attorney Proskauer referred and retained for Iviewit whom they had misrepresented to Investors and Board Members initially as a Proskauer partner, never made the conversion to Proskauer, terminated by Proskauer from Iviewit and then Joao left Meltzer and took a new position with now recently **Convicted Felon Marc S. Dreier** (Dreier). Dreier convicted in a

Ponzi scheme second only to that of Bernard Madoff (Madoff) and Sir Robert Allen Stanford (Stanford).

While advising the Iviewit companies on the Intellectual Properties, which posed a competitive threat to MPEGLA, including possible extinction of the MPEGLA pool without a license from Iviewit; Rubenstein, Proskauer and Meltzer then failed to put up a China Wall to protect the Inventions from this **MASSIVE** Conflict of Interest between Proskauer, Rubenstein and Proskauer's new client MPEGLA & Iviewit. Instead, they did the exact opposite and allowed MPEGLA to use the IP for their benefit while using Anti-Competitive Monopolistic practices to eliminate the Inventors and the Iviewit Companies and Shareholders. Perhaps, Joao's 90+ patents were to be included in the MPEGLA patent pooling scheme by Rubenstein, so that royalties could then be shared **disproportionately** with other inventors in the pool, 90+ patents giving a large share of the divided license royalties from the pool.

With Rubenstein as Patent Counsel and the sole Patent Gatekeeper to the MPEGLA IP pools, it would be a no brainer, if Joao had not happened to get caught and a snowball of other crimes began surfacing at about the same time which led to uncovering evidence of a massive criminal enterprise operating within and controlling certain government agencies, law enforcement agencies and courts. No wonder the Justice Department has historically broken up patent pooling schemes using Anti-Trust regulations, as this form of pooling works to deny ma and pa inventors of their Article 1, Sec 8, Clause 8, inventor rights. Intellectual Property Rights protected at the top of the Constitution, I quote,

United States Constitution Article 1, Sec 8, Clause 8

14-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

The Congress shall have power To...Promote the Progress
of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to
Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their
respective Writings and Discoveries.

These Inventor Protections are the cornerstone of Free Commerce in the United States.
In the past, allegations of pooling schemes actually in the business of murdering
inventors to steal their inventions or other such heinous crimes discovered have led to the
breakup of patent pools like RCA's and Singer Sewing's in order to protect inventors.
Typically Inventors need Constitutional Protection, the only civil job protected explicitly
by the Constitution, is due to corporations attempting to deny royalties through heavy
handed methods not ones lawyers trying to steal their clients inventions.

It should be noted here to this Committee that if invention theft by ones attorneys is not
STOPPED, it could lead to the loss of inventors confidence in the US Patent Office
which provides the bulk of revenue to this Great Country and therefore is why the
Founders placed these protections even higher in the Constitution than Congresses power
to create the lower courts and more. That is why this Committee must intervene with all
of its powers to prevent this cancer in the legal system which could Halt the Engine that
Drives our Economy, imagine inventors afraid to patent in the US the next Greatest
Energy Technology and instead seek protection elsewhere. The revenues lost to this
country on just one invention, like electricity or in my situation like digital electricity, the
loss of revenues and growth opportunities to our country could be catastrophic, I quote *A
Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court Complete ~ Chapter IX The Tournament* by
Mark Twain,

15-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

That reminds me to remark, in passing, that the very first official thing I did, in my administration -- and it was on the very first day of it, too -- was to start a patent office; for I knew that a country without a patent office and good patent laws was just a crab, and couldn't travel any way but sideways or backwards.

ENTER FOLEY TO REPLACE JOAO

Once Joao was under "investigation" by Proskauer he was then terminated from service by them, Proskauer instantly found an old friend of Christopher Wheeler's, a one William Dick of Foley and Wheeler vouched for his friend Dick to the Board of Directors. Dick, according to Wheeler was IBM's Patent Counsel for IBM's far eastern patent pool. Dick was also friends and former coworker at IBM and then again with Friedkin with another of Wheeler's referrals to the Iviewit companies, Brian G. Utley, who was appointed President of the Iviewit companies whereby Wheeler had presented a falsified resume for Utley to the Board, Shareholders and Investors, a falsified resume in several key ways.

First, the resume presented to the Board by Wheeler and Proskauer claimed Utley was a college graduate, in deposition Utley utterly denies ever graduating. The most important fraud on the resume though was on the point of his past employment whereby it stated that due to Utley's innovations for the company, Diamond Turf Equipment, owned by Monte Friedkin had grown to be one of the best and largest companies of its kind due to Utley's running that company. Per Friedkin, it was more like ruining the company, as when Friedkin found Utley, Dick and Wheeler stealing Inventions from him, he fired Utley and closed the shop entirely down taking a several million dollar loss. Major misrepresentation of Utley by Proskauer's Wheeler but even more astonishing is that the same crew of Utley, Wheeler and Dick were involved in the Friedkin frauds.

Many perjured statements regarding these events were submitted to official investigatory bodies and courts and evidence of these perjurious statements have been included in the Exhibit and Linkage Section under the individuals names.

Prior to learning of their seedy past, which had been misrepresented to the Board, Investors and Shareholders, as neither Dick nor Wheeler disclosed their past history together at Friedkin's with Utley, nor did they share the information of the failed invention theft with anyone else. Of course, if they did disclose the attempted theft, nobody would have retained them; everyone was in the dark as they handed out falsified resumes and financials to Investment Bankers, Iviewit Investors, Iviewit Shareholders, including the SBA and more. Foley entered the scene under similar false pretenses with Wheeler vouching for Dick's integrity and again failing to notify anyone of their prior failed invention theft.

Instantly, Foley identified a mass of problems with Joao's filing but claimed they could correct everything, such as missing assignments, missing inventors, missing patent disclosure information, etc. Again, I myself and the Iviewit Board and Shareholders trusted yet another large law firm in the IP field referred again by Proskauer and this time Foley assured Investors, Investment Banks and Shareholders that they could and would fix the problems with Joao's filing and so they were retained, again, Proskauer's Rubenstein as oversight.

After several months, Utley came to me and asked me to sign blank patent applications for filings the inventors had not reviewed, Utley claiming they needed to be filed that day, which again was false, as they were not due for several days, Utley persisting that the Inventors had no time for review and that he did not have the IP filing

applications to review before signing and could not get them. Noticing several large patent binders on his desk I went to pick them up with another founder and inventor of the Iviewit technologies, James Frazier Armstrong, and what was discovered inside them was both astonishing and criminal.

Inside the binders were intellectual property filings with now Utley as sole inventor of technologies including for example an application titled “Zoom and Pan on a Digital Camera” and another “Zoom Image Design Applet” both inventions of which Utley was not even employed at the time of invention. Further, Utley replaced original inventors on original patent filings, those filed incorrectly by Joao, Foley fraudulently replacing inventors Zakirul Shirajee and Jude Rosario with Utley on filings, again Utley was nowhere near the scene of invention. Foley now found continuing the Joao fraud it appeared although at the time hard for almost anyone to believe. Further, there were now two or more sets of patents, which almost were identical but were wholly different, as one set missed the inventions entirely and was fraught with bad math and major errors, the others with Utley’s name seemed to be the broader and more correct filings. In fact, some of the IP found in the binders taken from Utley were for Intellectual Properties already filed at US Patent Office without anyone’s knowledge, including the Inventors, Shareholders or the Board of Directors, patents that were solely (or soullessly) in Utley’s name, being sent to his home address, not Iviewit’s and more. Almost identical to the Friedkin theft whereby Dick wrote Friedkin’s inventions into Utley’s name and filed them into a corporation incorporated by Proskauer and Wheeler, outside Friedkin’s employ and without Friedkin’s knowledge or consent.

These fraudulent applications led to immediate taped meetings regarding the fraudulent IP with Foley and Proskauer Partners, Board Members and Shareholders where it was further learned that assignments were missing, inventors were wrong and the patent applications remained filled with errors, I submit to the Committee under the Exhibits and Linkage section of the prepared statement a sample of the IP errors, contained in William Dick's Virginia Bar Complaint Rebuttal⁶. Foley was to correct everything in time for the filings, the inventors then corrected the patents, and yet Foley still filed the fraudulent patents with the bad math and other fraudulent information, discarding the inventors' changes and continuing the fraud. The cat was almost out of the bag at that time, yet it was almost impossible to believe that these were crimes and not some type of mistakes versus part of an organized criminal syndicate of lawyers and law firms attempting to steal inventions, which only later and still today are being unraveled. At the same time, other information indicating fraud began to surface.

THE ARTHUR ANDERSEN AUDIT, THE ENRON BROADBAND ATTEMPTED TECHNOLOGY TRANSFERS, THE COLLAPSE OF BOTH ENRON AND ARTHUR ANDERSEN AND THE TIES TO THE IVIEWIT INVENTIONS:

Another hidden and fraudulent set of events within the Iviewit companies links to Enron Broadband discovered at the same time that Arthur Andersen began a required Audit of the Iviewit Companies performed on behalf of Crossbow Ventures and their corresponding interests of the SBA on their SBIC loans. Andersen's Audit discovered identically and similarly named Corporate Shell companies and other misdeeds, as

⁶ William J. Dick Virginia Bar Complaint Rebuttal by Iviewit @ <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/William%20Dick%20Virginia%20Bar%20Complaint.pdf>

Iviewit also became aware of unauthorized technology transfers taking place by Utley, Dick and Wheeler that included one with Enron Broadband and Blockbuster Video.

Enron Broadband had booked Hundreds of Millions of Dollars in revenue on a future deal with Blockbuster Video to stream full screen full frame video over the Internet, that once the crimes at Iviewit were beginning to be discovered, fell apart overnight. Many of those who fully understand the Enron fraud understand that the Broadband division's fraud was the "straw that broke the camels back." As soon as no technology was to transfer in backdoor secret deals to stream or download the videos due to the investigations, and the scandal was unraveling quickly from the audits findings, everything Enron Broadband and Enron had done had to become extinct overnight. Problem, they already had booked the revenue having forgotten the age-old proverb, "Don't count your chickens before they are hatched", as greed often blinds the best and brightest too.

I note as an aside that the founder of Blockbuster, Wayne Huizenga and his Son, were the seed investors in the Iviewit companies brought to Iviewit by Proskauer and now named Defendants in my Federal Lawsuit. Instantly, almost overnight, with discovery of the Iviewit fraud, both Andersen who was in the midst of the Iviewit audit that was revealing fraud and Enron vanished in scandal, in a trail of criminal document shredding to cover their tracks. Seeing the danger they were in from the exposure of the crimes, our trusted advisors, our retained lawyers and accountants, then began a document shredding of the Iviewit files to rid the evidence of the illegal technology transfers and other evidence revealing their criminal acts. Similar to what Anderson now describes taking place in the First Department regarding the Cover-Up crimes alleged.

According to Iviewit Employees stolen briefcases of cash of investor monies, including the SBA's money, then used to bribe and attempt to bribe employees to steal proprietary equipment and trade secrets as indicated in one employees written statement contained in the referenced link in my Prepared Statement Submitted to this Committee @ <http://Iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/SHAREHOLDER%20STATEMENTS%20BOOKMARKED.pdf>

Witness testimony on page 10 or found on the Iviewit Homepage under Evidence Link 784.

THE COVER-UP CRIMES

The Twelve Trillion Dollar, Federal RICO Lawsuit "Legally Related" by Federal Judge Shira Scheindlin to the Whistleblower Anderson Lawsuit, exposes the original violations of federal, state, and international law committed to steal the technologies and additionally exposes a series of ongoing and continuous Cover-Up Crimes. Cover-up Crimes designed to block due process through violations of Judicial Cannons, Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Office Rules and Regulations and Law, through Conflicts of Interest that act to Obstruct Justice, similar to that claimed by Anderson and committed by the many of the same Public Officials of the New York Supreme Court that Anderson fingers. Wherever Iviewit and I filed complaints at the state bars or disciplinary agencies under State Supreme Court aegis' in New York, Florida and Virginia, each was later found to have MAJOR CONFLICTS OF INTEREST THROUGH VIOLATIONS OF JUDICIAL CANNONS, ATTORNEY CONDUCT CODES, PUBLIC OFFICE RULES AND REGULATIONS AND LAW, CREATING THE APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY BY PUBLIC OFFICIALS. Mind blowing conflicts, so outrageous as to

find Steven C. Krane, former President of the New York Bar Association, Official at the First Department DDC and one, if not thee, leading ethics lawyer in New York and Nationally, found representing complaints against his Proskauer Partners and Himself in First Department complaints, while having an Official Role at the First Department DDC where the complaints were being investigated. How unethical but true and we will return to this matter further in a moment.

Fraudulent Patent applications and Patents fraudulently issued into the names of others are crimes directly against the United States and Foreign Agencies as there are sworn oaths on the US Patent Office applications by the inventors, so filing fraudulent patents in others names is a Fraud Directly Upon the United States Patent Office and Worldwide Patent Authorities. Crimes committed by the attorneys directly against government agencies and in violation of Federal Patent Bar Rules, State Attorney Conduct Codes and Law.

The crimes also involve not only the creation of fraudulent shell patent filings but fraudulent shell companies for the fraudulent patents to walk out the back door in, all formed by Proskauer and others not properly authorized to create such similarly named entities by the Board of Directors, Investors or management. All these corporate crimes were violations of hosts of state and federal securities regulations and state incorporation laws, more crimes of fraud against government agencies, again committed in violation of Attorney Conduct Codes and Law.

Further, the scheme involved a false and fraudulent Billing fraud using a Florida Civil Court (ruled by recently elected Florida Supreme Court Judge Jorge Labarga and a Defendant in the Iviewit Lawsuit), which was filed by Proskauer to the tune of \$500,000

plus in Wrongful Fraudulent bills, bills designed to create false debt to the fraudulent companies they created, which contained the fraudulent patent filings. Using this complex legal scheme which is a Fraud on a Federal Bankruptcy Court, the fraudulent companies were then to be bankrupted, after being sued for the fraudulent bills whereby the law firm and lawyers would become the largest creditors in the bankruptcy and seize the fraudulent patents hidden inside the fraudulent companies. A plan that went extremely wrong when Arthur Andersen and others discovered that there were possible crimes being committed and fraudulent companies created and that this false information was being distributed to investors including, Wayne Huizenga, Ellen DeGeneres, Alanis Morissette, Crossbow Ventures and the Small Business Administration. The SBA through Crossbow's SBA loans which were two thirds of the money Crossbow invested makes the US Government one of the most aggrieved investors in Iviewit.

The Proskauer Fraudulent Billing Scheme popped up on the horizon at or around the same time the Iviewit companies were in process to close the \$25 Million Private Placement financing deal with Wachovia Securities⁷. No one other than the conspirators of the RICO crimes knew about these illegal legal actions. The Involuntary Bankruptcy was another legal scheme involving this time, Fraud on a Federal Bankruptcy Court, orchestrated by Proskauer referred management Utley and Michael Reale both formerly with IBM and Real 3D Inc. (Intel, SGI and Lockheed) on a fraudulent company with

⁷ January 2001 Wachovia Private Placement Memorandum. Please note that Rubenstein is listed as Iviewit Patent Counsel and Advisory Board Members despite his perjurious deposition statements that he knew nothing of Iviewit. Also note that Proskauer billed for their work preparing the PPM and controlled distribution of the PPM, having authored most of it, including the Management Section. Utley also makes perjurious statements regarding his resume in the PPM that are contradicted in his Deposition for the Proskauer fraudulent billing scheme.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/Wachovia%20Private%20Placement%20Memorandum%20Bookmarked.pdf>

fraudulent inventions inside it. On or about this time, Intel, a minority 20% owner of Real 3D, suddenly bought Real 3D from Lockheed the 70% owner and SGI, a 10% owner, in a publicly undisclosed transaction, taking with it the Iviewit inventions which now are alleged to be on almost EVERY chip manufactured since 1998. Through the bankruptcy the underlying IP for the inventions would have become owned by the largest creditors to the fraudulent companies, Proskauer and Real 3D, a batta-bing, like stealing candy from a baby.

Again, neither of these illegal legal actions constituting frauds on the courts, the Fraud on the Florida State Court in The Proskauer Fraudulent Billing Lawsuit or the Fraud on the Federal Bankruptcy Court via the illegal Involuntary Bankruptcy were disclosed to Wachovia, Investors, Auditors, Investment Bankers, Shareholders or Management by Proskauer or Foley. At first, upon learning of the billing lawsuit and Involuntary Bankruptcy, it was unclear why these ILLEGAL legal actions existed and what the motive was, still much of the conspiracy remains unknown but at that time very little was known. Only later, while investigating the falsified patent applications with the US Patent Office was it discovered that there were fraudulent patents inside the fraudulent similarly named companies involved in the IB, a company that Proskauer created, then sued and then with their referred co-conspirators filed the Involuntary Bankruptcy against. Companies created without authorization of Shareholders, the Board of Directors or the Investors, and, where the real owners of the fraudulent companies are still unknown and subject of ongoing investigations and calls for Acts of Congress from the US Patent Office to get information regarding the inventions that were involved in the illegal legal schemes and frauds on the courts.

Upon learning of the corporate crimes from Arthur Andersen and much of the information regarding the fraudulent legal schemes by AOLTW / Warner Bros. who were doing due diligence for the Wachovia PPM when they discovered the undisclosed actions, including information that patents filed at the USPTO were not those being given to prospective investors and more. Immediately, Iviewit retained counsel to investigate if the Billing Lawsuit, the Involuntary Bankruptcy and the thefts of the IP were realities. Counsel retained by Iviewit found that indeed there were these illegal legal actions and frauds and that the Board of Directors, Management, Investors, Investment Bankers had no knowledge and in fact were distributing the Wachovia PPM which neither mentions the Lawsuit, the Utley IP and other fraudulent IP or the Involuntary Bankruptcy.

Iviewit threw out counsel that was representing the matters without authorization or retainers from the Iviewit companies and that time it was still unknown these companies were fraudulent, as they were similarly and identically named to the legitimate companies and Iviewit counsel began representing the matters instantly. The Involuntary Bankruptcy found that Utley, Reale and Real 3d all had no employment contract or ANY binding agreement with the Iviewit company they filed against and that matter instantly went away, as soon as, it was discovered. On the Fraudulent Billing Lawsuit, well Proskauer was not so lucky, counsel retained filed a Counter Complaint exposing the basics of the fraud known at the time, I submit this Counter Complaint to this Committee for review, as it too is subject to ongoing federal investigations⁸. Again, in this fraud, Proskauer was found suing companies they had no retainers with and the bills were not even in the companies sued names but the judge, Jorge Labarga, refused to even

⁸ January 28, 2003 Iviewit Counter Complaint
<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2003%2001%2028%20Counter%20Complaint%20Filed.pdf>

acknowledge the Counter Complaint, filed by Competent Counsel, alleging that the lawyers in the Fraudulent Billing Lawsuit perhaps were involved in crimes against the United States and Foreign Nations. Labarga refusing the Counter Complaint and then illegally throwing the Lawsuit out but ruling a default judgment against Iviewit for the entire amount of the fraudulent bill, for failure to retain replacement counsel. It should be noted that Labarga on the eve of trial, cancelled the trial with no notice to Iviewit who showed up with two law firms representing their interests. At the rescheduling hearing, Labarga dismissed both of Iviewit's counsel and forced Iviewit to get new counsel for this most complex case in just a few days.

In fact, I submit to this Committee evidence that Labarga was aware of Rubenstein, Wheeler, Dick and Utley's perjurious statements made to his court, under deposition and in response to Bar Complaints, whereby perjured statements were proven prior to his throwing the case. In one instance, Iviewit Patent Counsel Rubenstein makes representation that he is being harassed to come to deposition in the matter as he knows nothing about Iviewit or the Iviewit inventions and inventors and refused to be deposed. Labarga had no legal basis to block the deposition so he ordered Rubenstein to deposition, where it became apparent that Rubenstein had LIED and PERJURED HIMSELF to the Court and knew far more about Iviewit than his sworn statements⁹.

⁹ Kenneth Rubenstein Deposition
<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/Depositions%20BOOKMARKED%20SEARCHABLE%20with%20hyperlink%20comments.pdf>

And

[http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/1999%2002%2018%20Wheeler%20letter%20regarding%20Rubenstein%20review%20of%20p\(1\).pdf](http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/1999%2002%2018%20Wheeler%20letter%20regarding%20Rubenstein%20review%20of%20p(1).pdf)

and

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/1999%2002%2018%20Wheeler%20letter%20regarding%20Rubenstein%20review%20of%20pate.pdf>

and

Despite this damning and irrefutable evidence of Perjury to his court, Labarga ruled against Iviewit and buried the case for an undisclosed amount. Again, information relevant to the case fraud has been submitted to Federal and State authorities.

Who owns all these fraudulent companies remains under investigation and all relevant information pertaining to these crimes have also been submitted to Federal and State Authorities and evidence, witness statements, copies of the fraudulent IP and much more are available in the Evidence Section of the Iviewit Homepage with over 1000 exhibits and hereby incorporated by reference in entirety herein for this Committee.

Crimes that if prosecuted would have taken down these powerful law firms overnight and put many of the perpetrators behind bars for more years than Madoff, as these crimes involved crimes directly against Federal, State and International Government Agencies, not merely Iviewit. As soon as order is restored to the courts handling these matters in conflict and the corruption plaguing the New York Court system as further supported by Anderson regarding these matters is exterminated, these criminals cloaked as law firms and lawyers will be behind bars for eternity with loss of the entire partnerships assets in a successful RICO prosecution. Knowing that it was all or nothing for the powerful law firms, they had to block due process at every venue at the highest levels, as if any of the complaints, court proceedings or investigations elevated the Billions of Dollars of revenue these firms generate would be gone and legal robes exchanged for prison garb. Herein lies the motive for the Cover-Up Crimes and Mass of Conflicts of Interest and Violations of virtually all Attorney Conduct Codes, Judicial Cannons, Public Office Violations and Law that have infected these matters at present.

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/1999%2004%2026%20Wheeler%20Letter%20to%20Rosman%20re%20Rubenstein%20opinion.pdf>

27-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

So thick are the Conflicts that not one person out of all of the courts, disciplinary agencies, law enforcement agencies, even this Committee have signed the requested Conflict of Interest Disclosure Forms provided prior to taking action in the matters. I have provided a Conflict form for the Committee submitted with my Prepared Statement for the June 08, 2009 hearing that did not happen and again have submitted one accompanying this Prepared Statement for my testimony today, again I respectfully demand signing of this COI before the Committee takes action in anyway that may have any impact good or bad on my case.

New York Ethics Complaints Filed in 2003 and Dismissed Without Investigation; The Commissioner of Patents for the US Patent Office and Harry I. Moatz, Director of OED of the US Patent Office lead Federal Investigation of Same Attorneys State Bars and Disciplinary Agencies Dismissed without Investigation; West Palm Beach FBI Joins Patent Fraud Investigation Regarding Fraud Directly Upon the USPTO

I filed complaints of professional misconduct instantly against Proskauer, Rubenstein, Wheeler, Meltzer, Joao, Foley and Dick and continuously since 2003 alleged a host of professional misconduct, adding new Defendants in my lawsuit who became involved in the Cover-Up Crimes such as Krane, Cahill, the First Department and more. Copies of the complaints can be found on the homepage or in the written Prepared Statement submitted herein to the Committee and in the Exhibit Section at the end of the document and for inclusion into this Committees permanent record, as promised by members of this Committee in accepting this statement.

I also note for this Committee that I fully reported the Iviewit frauds on the courts committed by those adjudicating the matters in conflicts in both the courts and state disciplinary agencies, to the West Palm Beach FBI office. Special Agent Stephen

28-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

Lucchesi of that office was already investigating the Iviewit companies' allegations of Frauds, Fraud on the USPTO, Intellectual Property Theft, Death Threats and the Attempted Murder by Car Bombing of my Family Mini-Van in Boynton Beach, Florida. According to the FBI, later, Lucchesi and the Iviewit files went, and remain missing at this time, although upon last speaking to Lucchesi, he was on his way to the US Patent Office to begin investigating the Fraud on the US Patent Office with investigators at the US Patent Office. Moatz confirmed that Lucchesi was in fact working with the US Patent Office regarding the Frauds on the USPTO.

The reporting of these public office crimes to the FBI and the missing investigator, led the FBI West Palm Beach Office to direct me to speak only with the FBI Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) the department responsible for handling misconduct complaints against DOJ & US attorneys. When OPR refused to speak with me, claiming they could not speak with private citizens, Inspector General of the DOJ, Glenn Fine's Office interceded and the matters were then directed to Alberto Gonzales, then to Michael Mukasey both of them who failed to respond to formal written complaints prior to them fleeing or being forced out of office. The matters have now been forwarded on to US Attorney General, Eric Holder, Jr. and while we await response from Holder at this time, we have not had a response yet. Perhaps he is busy investigating the crimes of lawyers for war crimes or the crimes of lawyers in politicizing the DOJ, or the torture memo lawyers who violated international torture treaties and more or perhaps he is busy investigating the lawyers behind the financial market meltdown who have destroyed our economy for the benefit of a few, mostly criminals disguised as lawyers. A Copy of the Letter to President Barack Obama and Holder can

found on the Iviewit Homepage or @

<http://Iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090213%20FINAL%20SIGNED%20LETTER%20OBAMA%20TO%20ENJOIN%20US%20ATTORNEY%20FINGERED%20ORIGINAL%20MAIL%20.pdf> and

<http://Iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/20080411%20Iviewit%20Response%20to%20FBI%20PR%20letter%20signed%20sent%20and%20printed%20copy.pdf>

Ultimately, Iviewit filed a Complaint of Professional Misconduct against NYS First Dept Disciplinary Committee Chief Counsel Cahill, when it was learned that Cahill had allowed Steven C. Krane of Proskauer, an active Official of the First Department to handle complaints against Proskauer and Proskauer Partner Rubenstein and ultimately himself, Iviewit filed further complaints for Violations of Public Office, Violations of Attorney Conduct Codes and Violations of Law against all of them. Yes, Krane represented the complaints filed against his firm, partners and himself, all the while concealing multiple conflicts of interest and violations of public offices at the First Department which excluded from such twisted representation.

In Florida at the State Bar we find similarly Proskauer partner Matthew Triggs

While Krane was handling the complaints he was a member of the First Department and kept this Conflict undisclosed while he levied responses on behalf of his clients Proskauer and Rubenstein that were attempts to smear the Iviewit companies and myself, claiming Iviewit was a failed dot com and that Rubenstein never heard of Iviewit and that Proskauer knew nothing about the patents, all while failing to disclose his First

Department Roles and CONFLICT. Krane, also in his role at the time as immediate past PRESIDENT of the NYSBA had public office rules barring his handling of disciplinary complaints for a period of one year after his service. His representations of his firm and Proskauer falling within that blackout and Krane again fails to disclose this Public Office Rule and Regulation that prevented his representation.

It is interesting to note that without knowing of the concealed conflicts and violations of public offices at the time, how the complaints within the First Department, despite the overwhelming evidence presented to the State Bar and Disciplinary Committees and despite the fact that the Federal Patent Bar, USPTO, USPTO OED and FBI were investigating them, how the state complaints had been “Stalled” Indefinitely. It was not until discovering the conflicts that it became overwhelming apparent. Iviewit has found Proskauer or Foley in every instance where there was **dismissal with no investigation by a State Bar or Disciplinary**, much later into the investigations, the Conflicts of Interest and Violations of Public Offices that acted as the glue that bound the Cover-Up causing the delays and dismissals without investigation, even as the First Department Court Unanimously Ordered Krane and the others for formal and procedural “INVESTIGATIONS” based on the Krane and Cahill conflict information.

It was only recently exposed in July 2007 that the underlying "Patentgate" inquiries were effectively buried, or derailed, under the leadership of Manhattan's top State ethics Chief Counsel, Thomas J. Cahill, Esq. Cahill's "retirement" was then quickly announced after his own ethical failings in the Patentgate matter and other unfolding scandal as Anderson began surfacing with Whistleblower allegations, along with other ethics complaints that were made, became known. Then the Whistleblower Anderson

came along to confirm ones worst nightmares about the Disciplinary Committees and Courts of New York. It should be noted that Cahill was later deposed in Anderson.

From an article in Expose Corrupt Courts, I quote,

July 16 2007 DOJ Widens Patentgate Inquiry:

In a letter dated July 16, 2007, the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Professional Responsibility, announced from its Washington, D.C. headquarters that it was expanding its investigation into a bizarrely stalled FBI investigation that involves an almost surreal story of the theft of nearly 30 U.S. Patents, and other intellectual property, worth billions of dollars. The probe reaches some of New York's most prominent politicians and judges, and has already proven to be a stunning embarrassment to the State's ethics watchdog committees.

The Fox and the Hen House

It was only recently exposed in July that the underlying “Patentgate” inquiries were effectively buried, or derailed, under the leadership of Manhattan’s top State ethics Chief Counsel, Thomas J. Cahill, Esq. Mr. Cahill’s “retirement” was then quickly announced after his own ethical failings in the Patentgate matter, along with other ethics complaints that were made, became known.

While no one can exactly figure out how inquiries under Mr. Cahill’s charge went so awry, one thing is certain. At the same time the Patentgate probes were being secreted by state officials in New York, the United States Patent and Trademark Office Patent bar increased their own investigation into the same matter implicating the same attorneys. (Note: Mr. Cahill’s replacement was recently decided, and an announcement is expected as early as next week by the Appellate Division, First Department Presiding Justice, Jonathan Lippman.)

Article @

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

The Damning Whistleblower Case of Christine C. Anderson – Allegations of Coercion, Assault, Title 18 and State Obstruction

of Justice via Official Supreme Court Document Destruction Inside the First Department by Public Officials, for “Favored Law Firms”

Christine Anderson provides a pivotal link in her heroic Whistleblowing revelations that shed insight into the criminal behavior running rampant at the highest levels of the First Department, including Coercion, Obstruction, Tampering with Official Investigatory Files, Threatening Federal Witnesses, Document Destruction and Physical Assaults on a Whistleblower tying Iviewit to her own complaint. Anderson’s original lawsuit filing discussed the impact of Iviewit on her situation relating to a Complaint filed against Cahill and others¹⁰, as part of her allegations. Anderson’s Original Complaint can be found at Iviewit Homepage, Evidence Link or @

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/anderson/20071028%20Anderson%20Original%20Filing.pdf>

Pages 24-25 contain references to the Iviewit Cahill, Krane et al. complaints.

Christine C. Anderson a former Staff Attorney at the First Dept filed WHISTLEBLOWER allegations in a Fed Whistleblower suit slated for trial Oct 13 in US District Court Southern District NY (USDC), Anderson v State of NY, 07cv09599.

<http://iviewit.tv/press/press1.pdf>

Anderson’s suit adjudicated by Judge Shira Scheindlin contains allegations of retaliation against Anderson for termination from her job of 6 years, after Anderson exposed systemic Whitewashing & Obstruction inside the First Dept, claiming favoritism by the First Dept for favored law firms & attorneys. I have attached in my Prepared

¹⁰ July 08, 2004 Motion to the First Department Regarding Conflicts and Violations of Public Offices. This Motion led to a Court Ordered investigation of Krane, Rubenstein, Proskauer, Meltzer, Cahill and Joao. <http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/2004%2007%2008%20RUBENSTEIN%20KRANE%20JOAO%20MOTION%20FINAL%20BOOKMARKED.pdf>

Statement links to several news articles relating to Anderson.

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2009/04/andersons-10-million-lawsuit-proceeds.html> & <http://iviewit.tv/press/press2.pdf>

Anderson's suit set to bring volcanic like testimony involving Public Office corruption & testimony by officials of the NY State Unified Court system, including Court of Appeals Chief Judge Jonathan Lippman, Presiding Judge at the First Dept during the firing of Anderson. Along with Lippman will be Defendants in Anderson, First Dept Supervisor Sherry Cohen, Former Chief Counsel Thomas J. Cahill, Hon John Buckley, David Spokony & Catherine O'Hagen Wolfe, Clerk @ US Second Circuit Court of Appeals (USCA), an initial Anderson defendant in her former job as Clerk for the First Dept, now witness in Anderson. Anderson claims Physical Assault & Harassment by Cohen for her heroic WHISTLEBLOWING efforts, Anderson gave riveting testimony at the first of these hearings by the NY Senate Judiciary Committee headed by Hon. Senator John L. Sampson. Anderson's testimony found online and links again are provided in the written statement. Anderson's testimony comes at 30min into the video found online at the NY State Senate Website or @

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HR8OX8uuAbw&eurl=http%3A%2F%2Fiviewit%2Etv%2F&feature=player_embedded

Prior to permitting Anderson to trial, Scheindlin marked 7 suits, including Ivieit's Multi-Count Multi-Trillion Dollar suit <http://iviewit.tv/press/press3.pdf> legally "related" to Anderson.

Proskauer's Control of The Courts and First Department or How a Criminal Enterprise Cloaked as a Law Firm Controls the NY Courts and Disciplinary

Much of this control at the First Department stems from Proskauer's influence over the First Department, which has tentacles extending back to Joseph Proskauer in 1923. For those of you, except Senator Sampson who is a former member of Proskauer, who may not know the history of Proskauer, allow me briefly to fill in some NY history:

A Bit of NY History Regarding Proskauer

But as LaRouche points out, such efforts were not restricted to Germany. Simultaneous with the Hitler coup in Germany, London-directed Morgan and Mellon interests were involved in organizing an attempted fascist coup in the United States against President Franklin Roosevelt. The coup plot, slated for full activation by no later than 1935, was exposed in Congressional testimony in November-December 1934 by Marine hero, Major General Smedley Darlington Butler (1881-1940). Earlier, in February 1933, these same networks attempted the assassination of FDR, the failure of which led to the "blown" coup plot option.

While at least the rudimentary facts and dates of the Hitler coup are known, the bankers' fascist plot against FDR has been, to this day, blacked out of the history books. To the extent that it is discussed at all, it has been ridiculed as the delusions of Maj. Gen. Butler, whom the coup plotters proposed for their "man on the white horse." But, as we shall show, it was not only very real, but, if not for the intervention of the hero, Maj. Gen. Butler, it had a chance to succeed in creating the pretext for a fascist police state in this country... The League's [League of Treason] initiating executive committee were Morgan-allied stooges... On its Executive Committee was Morgan stooge and former New York Supreme Court Justice Joseph M. Proskauer, the general counsel to the Consolidated Gas Company." http://american_almanac.tripod.com/smedley.htm *The Morgan-British Fascist Coup Against FDR by Lonnie Wolfe Printed in the American Almanac, February, 1999.*

From Proskauer's website I quote,

Governor Smith appointed Joseph Proskauer to fill an unexpired term on the New York State Supreme Court in June 1923. That November, he was elected to a full term, and, in 1927, was appointed an associate justice of the Appellate Division, First Department...Judge Proskauer decided to resign from the bench to return to private practice.

Article @

http://american_almanac.tripod.com/smedley.htm

Proskauer's site fails to explain the cause of Joseph Proskauer's resignation from the Appellate Division, First Department, I will leave this history lesson for another day.

At the same time the Patentgate probes were being secreted by state officials in New York, the United States Patent and Trademark Office Patent bar and the United States Patent Office suspended the Intellectual Property beginning formal investigations. Investigations by Federal Attorney Patent Bar agents into the same matters implicating the same attorneys that the NY Disciplinary Committees had dismissed on review with no investigations, despite a Court Ordered Investigation, ordered by the FIRST DEPARTMENT itself, despite knowledge of the Federal Investigations, again, without the Conflicts at the top of the disciplinary known this would seem impossible.

The Motion filed by Ivewit mentioned in Anderson's Original Complaint was filed upon the bequest of Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk of the First Department court. Wolfe exposed the Cahill and Krane Conflicts and Violations of Public Offices that led to the Court Ordered Investigations by the First Department involving Thomas Cahill, Proskauer, Rubenstein, Krane, Meltzer, Joao and others which has been "pending" since February of 2003. Wolfe had stated that despite Cahill's denial that Krane did not have Multiple Official Conflicting Public Office Positions, including those with the First Department that the three of them were having an Official First Department meeting with

Krane in Official Capacity and that Cahill was fully aware of Krane's conflicts. Wolfe then directed me to file the Motion with the First Department that led to a unanimous Order for Investigation by five Justices, for Conflicts of Interest and the Appearance of Impropriety. To hold this landslide off would require top down control of the courts and the disciplinary.

How To Block Court Ordered Investigations – Corruption Top Down

Conflicts discovered at the top of the courts and disciplinary departments, all radiating from Proskauer and Foley, showed how the criminal enterprise cloaked as law firms then networked to block due process, intertwining themselves through the various courts, law enforcement agencies and disciplinary committees to interfere in conflict wherever Iviewit filed complaints. First, in order to understand the hierarchy one must know that Krane formerly clerked for former Chief Judge of New York, Judith Kaye and I will take a moment to read into the record Krane's roles in the courts and disciplinary bodies,

- 2004 COMMITTEE, APPELLATE DIVISION, FIRST JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT REFEREE
- *2004-1996 MEMBER, DEPARTMENTAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION, FIRST DEPARTMENT
- *2004 -1996 MEMBER, NEW YORK STATE OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION TASK FORCE ON ATTORNEY PROFESSIONALISM AND CONDUCT
- 2004-1995 CHAIR, GRIEVANCE PANEL, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
- 1999-1998 COMMITTEE, APPELLATE DIVISION, FIRST JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT - HEARING PANEL CHAIR)
- 1997-1996 COMMITTEE, APPELLATE DIVISION, FIRST JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT HEARING PANEL MEMBER
- 1998 COMMITTEE, APPELLATE DIVISION, FIRST JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT - HEARING PANEL REFEREE
- 1993-1991 SPECIAL TRIAL COUNSEL, DEPARTMENTAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION, FIRST DEPARTMENT.
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, MEMBER, HOUSE OF DELEGATES, 1996 - PRESENT

- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, VICE-CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON THE FUTURE OF THE PROFESSION, 1997 – PRESENT
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, CHAIR, SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE CODE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY, 1995 – PRESENT
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, MEMBER, SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE CODE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY, 1992-1995
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, MEMBER, COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL ETHICS, 1990-1994
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, CHAIR, TASK FORCE ON SIMPLIFICATION OF LAW, 1989-1991; MEMBER 1988-1989, 1991-1992
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, MEMBER, COMMITTEE ON COURTS OF APPELLATE JURISDICTION, 1984-1988
- FINALLY, AT THE TIME OF HIS RESPONSE FOR RUBENSTEIN, KRANE WAS THE IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK STATE BAR AND WITHIN A ONE YEAR EXCLUSION FROM BEING ABLE TO REPRESENT ANY DISCIPLINARY COMPLAINTS

Bar Affiliations:

- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, PRESIDENT, 2001-2002
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, PRESIDENT-ELECT, 2000-2001
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT, 2002-2003
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, 1998-2003
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, FINANCE COMMITTEE, MEMBER, 2000-2003
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, NOMINATING COMMITTEE, CHAIR, 2004
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, NOMINATING COMMITTEE, MEMBER AT LARGE, 2003
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, HOUSE OF DELEGATES, CHAIR, 2000-2001
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, HOUSE OF DELEGATES, MEMBER 1996 - PRESENT
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, HOUSE OF DELEGATES, LIFE MEMBER, 2002 - PRESENT
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, CHAIR, SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE CODE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY, 1995-1999
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, MEMBER, SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE CODE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY, 1992-1995
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, CHAIR, SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON MULTI-DISCIPLINARY PRACTICE, 2003 - PRESENT
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, CO-CHAIR, SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO REVIEW ATTORNEY FEE REGULATION, 2003 - PRESENT
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, CO-CHAIR, PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON ACCESS TO JUSTICE, 2000-2001
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, VICE-CHAIR, SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE LAW GOVERNING FIRM STRUCTURE AND OPERATION ("MACCRATE COMMITTEE"), 1999-2003
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, VICE-CHAIR, SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE FUTURE OF THE PROFESSION, 1997-2000
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, FELLOW, NEW YORK BAR FOUNDATION, 1998 - PRESENT
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, MEMBER, SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON LEGAL ISSUES AFFECTING SAME-SEX COUPLES, 2003 - PRESENT
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, MEMBER, SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON LAW PRACTICE CONTINUITY, 2002 - PRESENT

- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, MEMBER, SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON MULTI-DISCIPLINARY PRACTICE AND THE LEGAL PROFESSION, 1998-1999
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, MEMBER, MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE, 1998-2003
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, MEMBER, COMMITTEE ON MASS DISASTER RESPONSE, 1997-2003
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, MEMBER, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, INTERNATIONAL LAW AND PRACTICE SECTION, 2003 - PRESENT
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, MEMBER, COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL ETHICS, 1990-1994
- AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, MEMBER, STANDING COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY, 2004 - PRESENT
- AMERICAN BAR FOUNDATION, FELLOW, 2000 - PRESENT
- NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON CROSS-BORDER LEGAL PRACTICE, 2004-PRESENT
- AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, MEMBER, GRAMM-LEACH-BLILEY TASK FORCE, 2002 - PRESENT
- ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, MEMBER, SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ETHICS, 1988-1990
- AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, MEMBER, HOUSE OF DELEGATES, 2000 - PRESENT
- AMERICAN BAR FOUNDATION, NEW YORK STATE, FELLOW CHAIR, 2003 - PRESENT
- ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, MEMBER, AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE LEGAL REFERRAL SERVICES, 1987-1989
- ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL AND JUDICIAL ETHICS, 1993-1996; MEMBER, 1990-1993; SECRETARY, 1985-1988
- ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, MEMBER, COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL COURTS, 1996-1999
- ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, MEMBER, AD HOC COMMITTEE ON MASS DISASTER PLANNING, 1996-1999
- ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, CHAIR, DELEGATION TO THE NYSBA HOUSE OF DELEGATES, 1997 - 1998; MEMBER 1996 - 1998

Other Affiliations:

- THE FEDERALIST SOCIETY, LAWYERS DIVISION, SENIOR ADVISOR, PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY PRACTICE GROUP, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, 2003 - PRESENT; MEMBER, 1999-2002
- THE FEDERALIST SOCIETY, LAWYERS DIVISION, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, 1999-2002
- THE FEDERALIST SOCIETY, LAWYERS DIVISION, MEMBER, NEW YORK CHAPTER STEERING COMMITTEE, 1994 - PRESENT
- NEW YORK BAR FOUNDATION, TRUSTEE, 2004 - PRESENT
- AMERICAN LAW INSTITUTE, MEMBER, 1993 - PRESENT

Clerkship:

- LAW CLERK, HON. JUDITH S. KAYE, NEW YORK STATE COURT OF APPEALS, ALBANY, NY, 1984-1985

Government Service:

- CHAIR, GRIEVANCE PANEL, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, 1995 - 2001
- MEMBER, DEPARTMENTAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION, FIRST DEPARTMENT, 1996 - 1999
- SPECIAL TRIAL COUNSEL, DEPARTMENTAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION, FIRST DEPARTMENT, 1991-1993

- MEMBER, NEW YORK STATE OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION TASK FORCE ON ATTORNEY PROFESSIONALISM AND CONDUCT, 1996 - 1998

Then, Judge Kaye was married at the time of the Iviewit matters to a Proskauer Partner the recently deceased Stephen Kaye. Judge Judith Kaye was the highest ranking Public Official in the state of New York's courts and disciplinary departments, no more is needed to be said then Kaye had absolute control over the courts and disciplinary committees.

From Kaye's husband we find further tentacles at the top and from Stephen Kaye's Biography I recite his influence at the First Department,

Steve's experience and expertise in the field of professional responsibility spans 35 years. This has included past membership in the Policy Committee of the First Department Disciplinary Committee and past Hearing Panel Chair for that Committee; past membership in the New York State Judicial Institute on Professionalism in the Law; past Chair of the Committee on Professional Discipline and past Chair of the Committee on Professional and Judicial Ethics of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. He also has served the legal community in leadership and membership capacities on a number of other committees of the City Bar Association, the New York County Lawyers Association and the New York State Bar Association.

Further, Stephen Kaye, late in life made partner of the newly formed Proskauer Intellectual Property Department, formed instantly after learning of the Iviewit inventions and after acquisition of Rubenstein and control over the MPEGLA patent pools was obtained. Then MPEGLA became one of the largest infringers of the Iviewit technologies certainly doing well for the Proskauer Intellectual Property partners and not for their client at all.

Proskauer behind all of the Conflicts of Interest and Violations of Public Offices found in the New York Courts, Judith Kaye, Stephen Kaye and Steven Krane are several

of only a handful of people who could have masterminded and perpetrated the scheme to indefinitely delay and dismiss without investigation complaints against her husband's firm Proskauer and her former law clerk Krane. Kaye having a vested interest in the outcome of the matters was notified and aware of the Iviewit complaints and orders for investigations and did nothing to intercede on Iviewit's behalf, yet at that time Iviewit had no idea of the web of conflicts of interests precluding her from "taking the bull by the horn" in her courts and why she was avoiding the unfolding scandal, as no one knew of her undisclosed conflicts in the matters. Her interests also include the fact that if they were unsuccessful at blocking the complaints, Kaye and her husband would personally suffer loss of her husbands entire net worth, the firm Proskauer would be sunk, her husband and partners at Proskauer could be facing life + prison sentences for their crimes and this provides the motive for the Cover-Up and to continue to enjoy the stolen royalties of course. Shortly after directing me to file the Motion that led to the Orders, Wolfe transferred jobs mysteriously from the State Court to the Federal US Second Circuit where my lawsuit is now pending.

With that history of Proskauer's control of the First Department and courts, from Judith Kaye's influence down through the highest public offices in New York, all those involved are now named Defendants in my Federal Lawsuit with complaints against them in a host of law enforcement and disciplinary complaints. From an article from Expose Corrupt Courts directly relating to the Patentgate matters and linking Anderson with Iviewit and calling it Tammany Hall II, I quote,

The various Cahill Proskauer issues bounced around under the public radar screen at the Court of Appeals in Albany and were ultimately transferred from the 1st Department to the 2nd Department in Brooklyn. This was done after 5 justices

41-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

of the 1st Dept ruled unanimously to investigate Krane, Rubenstein and Joao for conflict of interest and the appearance of impropriety after their review of the 1st Department complaint.


The Cahill inquiry is apparently "still pending" under attorney Martin R. Gold who, insiders say, was directed to "sit on it...forever."

Earlier this year, FBI headquarters in Washington, D.C. assigned additional agents to the Public Integrity Corruption squad at 26 Federal Plaza in Manhattan, and where agents have been actively conducting interviews.

Despite the Unanimous 5-0 Decision by the First Dept ordering Investigation of the Complaints then transferred to the Second Dept for investigation, the Second Dept DISMISSED the Complaints Summarily without Explanation or Investigation, failing to follow the Court Order thereby continuing to permit conflicts and misconduct and blocking due process once again. In fact, the Second Dept Chief Counsel, Kearse, admitted to direct conflicts with Krane of Proskauer and then acted on the matters failing to address the conflicts she had admitted too.

A few crime charts here will help show the connections to Proskauer in the Cover-Up crimes in both New York and Florida. New connections between the Virginia Commonwealth, the Virginia AG and Foley have recently been unearthed and have been reported to the USDC and USCA in my Lawsuit and new disciplinary complaints are being formulated for filing shortly.


Crime Chart 5 – Cover Up Participants



9/28/2009

6


Steven C. Krane Proskauer Rose LLP



9/28/2009

17

Matthew Triggs – Proskauer Rose LLP



9/28/2009

19

CONTINUED CULTURE OF CONFLICT AND CORRUPTION OF ETHICS RULES AND LAW APPEARING IN A SOTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK BANKRUPTCY COURT WITH MAJOR LAW FIRM DAVIS POLK WARDELL AND OTHERS

This Committee should take Notice of continued conflicts within the operation of Attorneys regulated in New York now appearing in the Southern District of NY Bankruptcy Court here in Manhattan in a recent Ch. 11 proceeding filed by Silicon Graphics Inc (SGI) on April 1, 2009 where the Davis Polk Wardell firm simultaneously represents 2 of the 3 Equity partners who owned Real3d, representing Lockheed Martin and Debtor in Bankruptcy Silicon Graphics Inc while also representing the KPMG

45-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

Accountants for Silicon Graphics who prepared the financials in the second Ch. 11 filing for SGI. Davis Polk Wardell also is simultaneously representing CIBC, Credit Suisse, Morgan Stanley, Deutsche Telekom and others under Signed NDA with the Iviewit companies and me.

Real3d Inc, of course, is the company at the center and heart of the Iviewit Technology thefts as related above herein involving Intel, Lockheed Martin and Silicon Graphics owning Real3d where the Technologies were tested and used by Real3d Engineers who deemed them “priceless” while under Non Disclosure Agreements, Licensing Agreements and Strategic Alliance Agreements with Iviewit and me personally initially. To bring the Conflicts into clear focus, the SGI Ch.11 Bankruptcy was filed just months after coming out of an earlier Ch. 11 protection proceeding and most importantly just 6 DAYS AFTER SGI In House Counsel Evelyn Ramirez was placed on express Notice of a Formal SEC Complaint that I had filed against the Intel Corporation announcing a possible and alleged Multi-Trillion Dollar Accounting Scandal to the SEC for Intel’s failures to report to shareholder in their annual report, the fact that they are named Defendants in ongoing litigation with certain risks requiring reporting as liability. Further, for their failure to properly account for the misappropriated royalties and costs of knowing infringement whereby reporting those liabilities is also required under FASB No. 5 and related accounting Standards¹¹, also involving Intel and the Sales Transactions of Real3d involving both SGI and Lockheed Martin SEC Complaints were filed. Thus,

¹¹

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090306%20Intel%20Demand%20Letter%20&%20Liability%20Exposure%20%20Signed%203549l.pdf>

And

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090325%20FINAL%20Intel%20SEC%20Complaint%20SIGNED2073.pdf>

not only did SGI file this Ch. 11 protection just 6 days after official notice of involvement in a Multi-Trillion Dollar Lawsuit and accounting scandal thru Real3d Inc, but also the filing comes a few months after SGI had published information in business articles on the web painting a rosy financial picture of the company.

What the SGI Bankruptcy Filings in the Southern District of New York show is that Davis Polk Wardell lawyers are intimately at the Heart of SGI during all of the initial years of the Theft of my Technologies while at Real3d during 1998 while simultaneously DPW is representing Lockheed Martin, 2 of the 3 Equity partners in Real3d Inc where ALL of the Sales transactions are now in question. To further complicate matters and add another layer of conflict, DPW represents the very Accountants KPMG that SGI is using in the sudden second Ch. 11 bankruptcy filing when one of the very issues at hand is that an Accounting fraud has occurred thus placing Accountants for SGI in Conflict with SGI and Lockheed YET DPW attorneys have remained to Shield and Block due process against all in blatant violation of Attorney Disciplinary Standards for representation of multiple interests and being Witnesses in litigation since officers inside SGI and Lockheed would have to discuss what was informed to the Accountants KPMG and what KPMG knows and more.

Thus, the hearing of any of these Contested Factual issues in the Southern District Bankruptcy Court or any tribunal, commission, authority or agency or other court necessarily forces the Conflicts to be addressed as multiple interests can not be represented by the same law firm yet such Culture of Ethics corruption in New York has allowed these conflicts to continue creating a wall of Title 18 Obstruction of Justice that prevents fair and due process in multiple proceedings since DPW has been permitted to

represent 2 Equity partners simultaneously and accountants for an Equity partner where the various parties could otherwise proffer separate and independent statements, evidence, etc. but for the conflicts being permitted to continue.

Shockingly, despite having filed a Formal SEC Complaint against the third Equity partner of Real3d , the Intel Corporation and requesting an investigation of the Sales Transactions involving Real3d, SGI, Lockheed and Intel and alleging a possible Multi-Count, Multi-Trillion Dollar Accounting Fraud for infringement of my technologies and FASB No. 5 and other FASB violations, DPW continues on simultaneously representing multiple interests simultaneously before SDNY Judge Martin Glenn who has deliberately refused to even mention the Conflicts in Bankruptcy proceedings despite multiple oral and written requests to resolve such conflicts leading to a formal request for mandatory disqualification of SDNY Bankruptcy Judge Martin Glenn and oversight of the Bankruptcy judge and investigation for Title 18 obstruction and related charges.


I note for this Committee that according to published sources, the law firm Davis Polk Wardell recruited Linda Chatman Thomsen back to the firm on April 13, 2009 who was the former SEC Head of Enforcement who was ousted at the SEC over the \$65 Billion Madoff Ponzi scheme failures. I also point out to this Committee that April 13, 2009 was only 4 days after I filed an Emergency Motion in the SDNY Bankruptcy Court in the Silicon Graphics Matters on April 9 2009 referencing my Twelve Trillion Dollar alleged Accounting Fraud to the SEC against Intel. More notably, the SGI Ch. 11 filing came on April 1, 2009 just 6 days after SGI received actual notice of my SEC Complaint against Intel involving Real3d and In House General Counsel Ramirez at SGI had notice of this complaint in the days before the sudden filing by SGI after just emerging from Ch.

11 bankruptcy protection months before and after previously disseminating a rosy financial picture for SGI until my SEC Complaint was filed. What should be remarkable to this Committee and should have been addressed by SDNY Bankruptcy Judge Glenn upon the filing of my Emergency Motion on April 9, 2009 is that SGI paid out huge sums of monies, in the millions, to former Equity partner in Real3d Inc Intel, to Davis Polk Wardell, to a law firm called Ropes & Gray who represents SGI in the SDNY Bankruptcy along with DPW and who interestingly has Video and Digital related Patents in their names and have refused to officially affirm or disaffirm conflicts in the proceedings, and other large payments to the law firm Sullivan and Cromwell who is currently Joined as Co-Counsel with Proskauer in another SDNY District Court case involving the MPEG Patent Pool, creating an incestuous circle of intertwined conflict.

I note that my Technologies were under Signed NDA with hundreds of companies including Fortune 1000 companies and major industry players such as Credit Suisse, Deutsche Telekom, Comcast, Warner Brothers, AOL – Time Warner, Sony Digital Pictures, Kodak, Wachovia, AT&T and a host of others and that major wall street interests are impacted by these matters thus rendering the work of any future Task Force of this Committee and the work of the Committee monumental for both its impacts upon the financial markets and fundamental to maintain fair and impartial due process and the fair administration of justice within the NYS Courts and NY Bar.

MADOFF, DREIER AND ALLEN STANFORD PONZI LINKS TO THE IVIEWIT AFFAIRS WITH PROSKAUER ALL AROUND

Proskauer = Madoff + Dreier + Stanford



17

At the heart of the unearthing of several of the largest financial scams in history, Bernard Madoff, Sir Allen Stanford and Marc S. Dreier, again we find the law firm Proskauer and their Iviewit referrals and co-conspirators such as Joao and other defendants in my lawsuit, central figures as indicated in the Crime Chart. Again, perhaps these schemes are the money laundering schemes for the royalties from the stolen technologies, a place to park bribe money like Swiss bank accounts, perhaps including those recently involved in scandal with UBS whereby the names are soon to be released or just to hide the ill gained profits. As you can imagine because my dreams and inventions have become realities for the world in transforming virtually all digital

50-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

imaging and video applications, placing Multi-Media as a more important component of the digital world now than even the operating system, i.e. Microsoft's Windows. Without the ability to play rich multi-media the operating system would have little use. The amount of converted royalties generated from the technologies over the past decade, including invention of wholly new markets, is beyond imagination and had to be laundered somehow; recent scandals may provide the explanation.

The Sir Allen Stanford Financial Fraud and Ties to Proskauer

The Stanford Ponzi investigation may be the card that knocks down the house of cards at Proskauer. Uncovering of the \$65 Billion Madoff Ponzi led the SEC & FBI to intensify investigations into Stanford; I quote the Times Online for the Committee,

'Perhaps the most alarming is that Stanford Investment Bank has exposure to losses from the Madoff fraud scheme despite the bank's public assurance to the contrary', said the SEC.

http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/us_and_americas/article5759709.ece

The Wall Street Journal reported that CFO of Stanford Financial Group, James Davis, also involved in the \$7 Billion Ponzi, pled Guilty to Federal charges while appearing to implicate counsel Proskauer & Partner Thomas Sjoblom orchestrating a plan to Obstruct SEC & FBI investigations into Stanford & more. Further information reveals blood oaths between regulators and Stanford to conceal the fraud from regulatory agencies and Stanford's possible involvement with the number one MEXICAN DRUG CARTEL with Proskauer dead center and alleged in the crimes and Cover-Up crimes. I have submitted in my Prepared Statement links to the Wall Street Journal and other articles relating to these links for the Committees further review.

<http://blogs.wsj.com/law/2009/08/28/sjoblom-proskauer-rose-face-fallout-from-stanford-affair/>

Ironically, Sjoblom worked for the SEC & now is implicated in FBI & SEC actions, advising client Stanford employees on “how” to lie to the SEC and further obstructive acts. Huffington Post on Feb 20, 09 claims,

Sjoblom, a partner at law firm Proskauer Rose doing work for Stanford's company's Antigua affiliate, told authorities that he ‘disaffirmed’ everything he had told them to date...Sjoblom spent nearly 20 years at the SEC, & served as an Asst Chief Litigation Counsel in the SEC's Division of Enforcement from 1987-1999.

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/charles-h-green/mini-madoff-scandal-scale_b_168486.html

The Committee should note the close proximity of dates between the Iviewit inventions and Proskauer’s acquisition of Sjoblom.

The Bernard Madoff Financial Fraud and Ties to Proskauer

If I may read again into the record from Bloomberg on Jan 14, 09,

The week after Bernard Madoff was charged with running a \$50 billion Ponzi scheme, Proskauer Rose...offered a telephone briefing on the scandal for its wealthy clients. With only a day’s notice, 1,300 Madoff investors dialed in. ‘This is a financial 9/11 for our clients’, said Proskauer litigation partner Gregg Mashberg...‘People are dying for information.’

<http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20601103&sid=aO32KOhPtRw&refer=us>

Following the “client” call, investigations began into major “clients” involved in Madoff, Proskauer having perhaps the most Madoff “clients”, many who originally claimed to be victims may now be accomplice.

From Fox Business, I quote,

SEC OIG delivered a stinging report on Madoff harshly criticizing lax regulators for overlooking the Madoff information from WHISTLEBLOWERS & others inside the SEC, for years.

<http://www.foxbusiness.com/story/markets/industries/government/report-set-criticize-sec-madoff-scheme/>

Proskauer has further ties to Madoff according to TPM, in 2004 an SEC attorney, Genevieve Walker-Lightfoot, notified the SEC of the Ponzi but was forced out of her job, the SEC later settling a claim filed by Lightfoot. Upon termination, Lightfoot turned over the Madoff file to Jacqueline Wood who then presumably buried the report that could have exposed the Ponzi in 04. The SEC OIG's 477 page report mentions Wood of Proskauer throughout the entire report as a key figure in the regulatory failures, along with possible collusion of Madoff family members who married into the SEC.

<http://www.sec.gov/news/studies/2009/oig-509.pdf>

TPM reports that after leaving the SEC, Wood took a **Proskauer Partnership** and I submit linkage for this Committee's review in my Prepared Statement @ TPM @ http://tpmcafe.talkingpointsmemo.com/talk/blogs/mrs_panstreppon/2009/07/bernie-madoff-sec-investigator.php?ref=reccafe .

According to Memphis Daily News, Laura Pendergest-Holt (Wood), Stanford's CIO, criminally charged in the Stanford investigation, then filed a civil suit against Proskauer & Sjoblom claiming they "hung her out to dry" before the SEC. Meanwhile, Sjoblom solicited a multi-million dollar retainer from now arrested Stanford Chairman, Allen Stanford, the night before the events with Holt took place at the SEC.

<http://www.memphisdailynews.com/editorial/Article.aspx?id=41707>

The Wall Street Journal reports filing of a Class Action suit against Sjoblom & Proskauer in TX after Davis' incriminating plea agreement implicating Proskauer, the Class Action seeking damages for the entire \$7 Billion under TX Law in damages for

Proskauer's role Aiding & Abetting the Stanford Ponzi, I quote the Wall Street Journal Legal Blog by Amir Efrati,

The suit, filed in federal court in Dallas, says Sjoblom and Proskauer are liable for \$7 billion in damages for aiding and abetting Stanford's alleged fraud...The civil suit is largely based on a plea agreement that we mentioned in this post yesterday, which focuses in part on the alleged actions of Sjoblom, who became outside counsel for Stanford's international bank based in Antigua in the Caribbean starting in 2005.
<http://blogs.wsj.com/law/2009/08/28/sjoblom-proskauer-rose-face-fallout-from-stanford-affair/>

The Marc S. Dreier Financial Fraud and Ties to the Proskauer Law Firm

Another defendant in the Iviewit Lawsuit, convicted felon Marc S. Dreier, found orchestrating yet another bizarre Ponzi and in the Dreier scheme, we find yet again another former Proskauer Partner, Sheila M. Gowan, now acting as bankruptcy trustee in the suit as reported by the Wall Street Journal, attached to my Prepared Statement.

<http://blogs.wsj.com/law/2009/01/02/former-ausa-selected-as-bankruptcy-trustee-in-dreier-case>. As already mentioned herein, Raymond Joao, the rival to Edison with patent applications dated in 1900, perhaps even claiming he invented electricity prior to Edison, then left Meltzer to Dreier, impersonating me as the inventor of my technologies. It is fitting to note, or joke, here that Dreier was also caught in his scheme using fake and fraudulent names and representations of himself fraudulently impersonating others while trying to Launder stolen money into Canada. It is known that during that time Joao made several deals and sales regarding inventions in his name, although details remain sketchy and under investigation.

NOTICE OF CONFLICT FILINGS AT THE US SECOND CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

I Notice this committee that currently pending at the US Second Circuit Court of Appeals is a Motion to Compel¹² that court to Adhere to the Judicial Cannons, Attorney Conduct Codes, Public Rules and Regulations and Law regarding regulating the MASSIVE conflicts existing in that court in violation of their own rules in my Lawsuit. The Motion outlines multiple layers of Conflicts and Mass of Violations described herein and in the Motion, which I incorporate by reference in its entirety herein. Conflicts, which despite repeated formal conflict disclosure requests, a fundamental requirement to insure due process, similar to the one attached in the Prepared Statement for the Senate Judiciary Committee Members to sign herein, have not been addressed or resolved by Members of the Bar or Courts who are regulated by the First Department and others to provide full disclosure upon request of any and all conflicts, in order to avoid the Appearance of Impropriety.

In fact, I have made a citizen's arrest of the court members of the US District Court and the US Court of Appeals in the Motion to Compel, as the conflicts act to block due process through creating a wall of Obstruction to Justice and where Obstruction is a Title 18 Federal Offense and also State Laws also make such activities illegal. Anderson providing irrefutable supporting evidence that such criminal acts were taking place in the First Department, I submit to the Committee a recent statement from Christine Anderson and I will read into the record this most riveting statement:

Christine C. Anderson
Attorney at Law

¹² Notice to Compel @ <http://Iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20090908%20FINAL%20Emergency%20Motion%20to%20Compel%20SIGNED44948.pdf>

227 Riverside Drive, Ste. 2N
New York, New York 10025

September 13, 2009 (via Confirmed Overnight Delivery)

The Hon. Eric H. Holder, Jr.
Attorney General of the United States
Office of the Attorney General
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

The Hon. Preet Bharara
United States Attorney for the Southern District of New
York
United States Department of Justice
One St. Andrews Plaza
New York, New York 10007

Hon. William M. Welch II
Chief, Public Integrity Unit
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

The Hon. John L. Sampson, Chairman
New York State Senate Judiciary Committee
409 Legislative Office Building
Albany, NY 12247

Re: Request for Federal Investigation Into Allegations of
Corruption and Witness Intimidation and Appointment of
Federal Monitor

Gentlemen:

My name is Christine C. Anderson. For six and one-half years, I was a Principal Attorney of the New York State Appellate Division, First Department's Departmental Disciplinary Committee (the "DDC"). The DDC is responsible for investigating and disciplining attorneys found guilty of misconduct in representing the public in the Bronx and Manhattan. After discovering and reporting of acts of misconduct and corruption at the DDC, which acts constituted an abuse of power and a fraud upon the public, my employment was summarily terminated in June, 2007.

56-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

Prior to my employment with the DDC, I was in private practice for over twenty years. Before that, I worked for the Human Resources Administration of New York City. In other words, I am a thoroughly seasoned attorney, with a broad based knowledge of general practice.

As a result of my wrongful termination in retaliation for my reporting misconduct in violation of my First Amendment rights, I instituted a lawsuit captioned Anderson v. State of New York, et al., 07 Civ. 9599 (S.D.N.Y. 2007). (A copy of my complaint in this action is attached hereto as Exhibit A.) Specifically, I discovered and reported that employees of the DDC had engaged in, inter alia, the “whitewashing” [of] complaints of misconduct leveled against certain “select” attorneys and law firms. This “whitewashing” sometimes involved burying cases or destroying evidence, so that certain complaints were inevitably, unavoidably, dismissed. I witnessed this destruction of evidence myself. Other reported misconduct involves victimizing attorneys lacking privileged positions or connections.

Although the then Chief Counsel of the DDC, Thomas Cahill, stepped down in 2007, evidence clearly establishes that under the leadership of Alan Friedberg, the current Chief Counsel, the same practice of corruption and whitewashing of complaints continues. Such practice robs the public of any hope at justice; it also works to the detriment of the very public the DDC is duty-bound to serve.

During the course of my litigation against the DDC, a former colleague of mine, who still works as a Principal Attorney at the DDC, agreed to testify on my behalf at a deposition. This former colleague, Nicole Corrado, has been employed by the DDC for approximately eight years, prior to which she worked as a prosecutor for New York State. On the morning of her deposition, however, while en route to her deposition, Ms. Corrado was approached on the street by a supervisor at the DDC, who threatened and intimidated her with respect to her upcoming deposition testimony. Although terribly shaken, Ms. Corrado nonetheless sat for her deposition and testified truthfully. Following her deposition, however, Ms. Corrado has been subjected to further harassment and intimidation at the

hands of the DDC. She has been forced to take a leave of absence as a result.

On June 8, 2009, I testified at a hearing convened by John L. Sampson, New York State Senator and Chairman of the New York State Standing Committee On The Judiciary. (A copy of my affidavit submitted to the Committee is attached hereto as Exhibit B.) At that hearing, several witnesses testified as to their shocking experiences with the grievance and judiciary committees in New York State. Shockingly, within days of my testimony, in my lawsuit, my sealed medical and psychiatric records were filed and posted publicly on the court's Internet filing system by counsel for the defendants – i.e., the New York State Attorney General's Office. I regard those actions as horrifically unethical and malicious, and taken in deliberate retaliation for my testifying at the Senate hearing.

The detailed testimony presented by innumerable witnesses at the June 8th Senate hearing reveals the manifold reports of corruption and abuse by the State's Disciplinary Committees. (A copy of the transcript of this hearing is attached hereto as Exhibit C.) Charges included concealment of evidence, obstruction of justice, extortionate sexual threats by attorneys, pilfering of estates by attorneys, abuse of power, fraud, conspiracy and repeated violations of state and federal constitutional rights.

In light of the foregoing, it is plain that the enduring practice of allowing attorneys in this state to police themselves is fundamentally flawed. With the numerous reports of abuse by both attorneys and state officials, the corruption in the court system has reached a critical stage. Accordingly, I respectfully request that you authorize the appointment of a Special Prosecutor to investigate the epidemic of honest services fraud in the New York state court system, and the appointment of a Federal Monitor, to oversee the lawful operation of the same.

Thank you for your time and attention. I look forward to your response.

Very truly yours,

Christine C. Anderson

58-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

cc w/o enc:

The Hon. David A. Paterson
New York State Governor
Office of the Governor of New York State
State Capitol
Albany, New York 12224

The Hon. Boyd M. Johnson III
Deputy United States Attorney for the
Southern District of New York
Public Corruption Unit
United States Department of Justice
One St. Andrews Plaza
New York, New York 10007

The Hon. Loretta A. Preska
Chief U.S. District Judge
United States Courthouse
Southern District of New York
500 Pearl Street
New York, New York 10007-1312

The Hon. Andrew M. Cuomo
New York State Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General of New York State
The Capitol
Albany, New York 12224-0341

The Hon. Luis A. Gonzalez
Presiding Justice, New York State Appellate Division, 1st
Department
27 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10010

The Hon. Joseph M. Demarest, Jr.
Assistant Director in Charge, New York Division
26 Federal Plaza, 23rd Floor
New York, New York 10278-0004

The Committee should take URGENT notice of the following information
exposed by the Internet Legal Site, Expose Corrupt Courts, in relation to Anderson's

claims perhaps of Targeting Federal Witnesses for Harassment, I again quote and read into the record @ <http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2008/11/breaking-news.html> :

FBI Probes Threats on Federal Witnesses in NY Ethics Scandal

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

Legal Authority: Pay to Play

The latest probe began in July of 2008 when numerous individuals went to federal authorities with various accounts of illegal payoffs to New York State employees at the Departmental Disciplinary Committee (“DDC”) at 61 Broadway in lower Manhattan. The DDC investigates ethics complaints against attorneys in Manhattan and The Bronx, and has been long believed to be a corrupt, political vendetta machine.

One cooperating attorney is quoted as saying, “I did not have to worry about any ethics complaints because I always paid my insurance premiums to the DDC. Everyone knew what was going on.”

Witness Tampering: Threats on a Federal Witness

Federal Agents from two different offices sprung into high gear after the summer when a DDC supervising attorney threatened another state-employed DDC attorney under his direction. The DDC staff attorney was apparently confronted days before his sworn testimony was to begin in the ethics probe, and the intended message was made perfectly clear, says the source, adding, “You have a very serious situation requiring immediate involvement by federal authorities anytime someone confronts a federal witness and warns that a death may result from testimony.”

New York Norm: Obstruction of Justice

The allegations, and initial findings, were serious enough for investigators from New York State to forward the troubling reports to federal agencies. Attorney General Andrew Cuomo was initially apprised of the witness tampering allegations and he has been tracking the various federal inquiries since. And it has been confirmed that Appellate Division, First Department, Presiding Justice Jonathan Lippman ordered that the involved DDC supervising attorney be immediately transferred to his courthouse at 27 Madison Avenue from the DDC offices on Broadway where the threatened attorney works. Another court insider believes it's "just another OCA cover-up," adding, "no one in the First Department - or anywhere in the State - wants an ethics committee supervising attorney spilling the beans to a crowd of FBI agents."

Recently appointed DDC chairman, Roy Reardon, according to sources, has been involved in DDC affairs on an almost daily basis, and he has acknowledged the seriousness of the physical threats and psychiatric issues involved. "To his credit," says the source, "Roy Reardon took immediate action after he confirmed that he was staring at witness tampering by one of his DDC supervising attorneys. It was Roy who first suggested the transfer."

It has been long rumored that virtually any ethics complaint, no matter how serious or criminal, could be made to disappear for "favored attorneys." "The feds are now beginning to understand that a 'favored attorney' in New York doesn't just involve political connections. A New York 'favored attorney' is one who pays," says one attorney who has practiced in the federal court system for over thirty years, and who asked not to be identified.

It is believed that the underlying federal action is *Anderson v. State of New York (SDNY)*, though there are other ethics cases pending, and some before the 2nd Circuit - all involving charges of corruption at the DDC.

"Win at all Costs" and "No Regard for Laws or Ethics"
Hits National Agenda

The latest allegations coincide with the obstruction of justice case in the Eastern District Court in Brooklyn against defense attorney Robert Simels and his associate Arienne Irving, who each face up to 10 years in prison for

allegedly seeking to use bribes and violence to prevent witnesses from testifying against one of their clients.

Tamanny Hall II – New York Court’s Cesspool Seeps to Washington, D.C.

In November of 2008, the U.S. Supreme Court decided to hear Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal, a case that centers on state level ethics and judges beholden to financial supporters. The Brennan Center and other advocacy groups have called the issues egregious, matters that raise underlying questions about due process on a national level.

See, "[The Unethical Ethics Committee](#)" @

<http://exposecorruptcourts.blogspot.com/2007/11/unethical-ethics-committee-sealed.html>

See, Background story on New York-Style Ethics, "[Sex Scandal at Attorney Committee on Character and Fitness](#)"

@

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

OFFICIAL NOTICE TO THIS COMMITTEE: THE STATE OF NEW YORK AND OTHER LIABLE NEW YORK GOVERNMENT AGENCIES THAT ARE NAMED DEFENDANTS IN MY LAWSUIT, FACE A TWELVE TRILLION DOLLAR PLUS LIABILITY THAT MAY NOT BE REPORTED PROPERLY IN THE LIABILITY SECTION OF THEIR FINANCIALS WITH STATE REGULATORS CAUSING FURTHER DIRECT LIABILITIES TO NY STATE AND THE PEOPLE OF NY, DWARFING THE SIZE OF MADOFF, STANFORD AND DREIER COMBINED BY THOUSANDS FOLD.

OTHER FEDERAL OFFICES HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED AND ARE INVOLVED AND ACTIVELY INVESTIGATING THE CLAIMS, INCLUDING INSPECTOR GENERAL GLENN FINE OF USDOJ; THE OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY (OPR) OF THE FBI, THE OFFICE OF ENROLLMENT & DISCIPLINE (OED) OF THE US PATENT OFFICE, THE COMMISSIONER OF THE USPTO, THE SBA INSPECTOR GENERAL, THE TREASURY INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR TAX ADMINISTRATION AND MORE.

SUGGESTED ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

62-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

I want to again thank this Committee that has so graciously invited me to speak today at this Judiciary Committee Hearing, the importance of ridding the New York Courts of a Criminal Enterprise Cloaked as Law Firms, infiltrating Disciplinary Departments, State Bar Agencies, the Courts and more is at the heart of this Committees function when self-regulation is broken and/or non-existent as appears the current case. Lawmakers acting as Lawbreakers can commit virtually any crime, trained as attorneys in virtually all of these complex crimes, they know how to beat the system, learned from the criminals they represent and therefore these crimes committed by our trusted Public Officials, Lawyers, Law Firms and Regulators are the most insipid crimes against the People, crimes that prey on the public trust and in the end can cause more damage than any simple criminal or even criminal enterprise. Unlike typical criminals their legal degrees can also be used to block due process if they are caught in their crimes, in a number of ways this Committee must SHUT DOWN.

This whole debacle reminds me of my Chicago childhood and Operation Greylord¹³ in Chicago which exposed a similar corruption for drug profits and more that used the courts, members of the courts, politicians and law enforcement to effectuate crimes committed by a criminal organization that infiltrated deep within Illinois' government and victimized thousands of Chicago's citizens. The sting operation brought down some of Illinois most powerful and respected individuals, I quote Wikipedia, "Ninety-two people were indicted, including 17 judges, 48 lawyers, ten deputy sheriffs, eight policemen, eight court officials, and a member of the Illinois Legislature.

¹³ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation_Greylord
and
<http://www.fbi.gov/page2/march04/greylord031504.htm>

Operation Greylord was named after the wigs worn by judges in Britain.” This type of Federal Operation is what the Feds (why Anderson and others have demanded a Federal Monitor for the New York Courts) must do now in order to restore order, many in New York comparing the current Corruption to Tammany Hall¹⁴ under William M. "Boss" Tweed. The Committee has asked those testifying to make representations to this Committee on how to change the corruption we see and I have several critical suggestions that could solve the problem overnight.

1. Immediately disband and destroy the Commission on Judicial Conduct and Disciplinary Committees in the 4 Appellate Division Departments as currently designed.
2. Then make all violations of Judicial Cannons, Attorney Conduct Codes and Public Office Rules and Regulations simply violations of law. Either Felony or Misdemeanor depending on the severity of the violation committed.
3. Then have the allegations investigated publically, like any other person who is accused of a crime, as no one is above the law or deserved of special treatment under our Constitution and through the courts they will be either tried and convicted or vindicated of their alleged crimes. Justices and Attorney should be no different than any other person, as it is THEIR MOTTO that “NO ONE IS ABOVE THE LAW”, thus why create these codes outside of the law.
4. Then get some Pipe Hitting Prosecutors specialized in law enforcement for violations of law committed by Judges, Lawyers, Law Firms and Public Servants, prosecutors who perhaps hate lawyers from messy divorces or the

¹⁴ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tammany_Hall

likes, to prosecute them through well established law and the rules regulating their profession. No special committees of lawyers regulating or reviewing lawyers, etc. Simply then turn the state bar associations into drinking establishments, which it appears they already are for corrupt lawyers.

5. Then triple the sentences imposed for those convicted, as they were crimes against the public trust. Violations of public trust are the most insipid and devastating crimes often affecting thousands of people before the corruption is discovered. Just look at the public office corruption recently involving lawyers. First, we have lawyers that committed alleged War Crimes by creating torture memos who will most likely stand for War Crime Tribunals eventually. Then we have lawyers that have been involved in the regulatory agencies failures that were supposed to be protecting the financial markets, where we find regulators have been looking the other way while the crimes occurred that bankrupted our nation and then taking law firm jobs even when leaving in the midst of scandals they are involved in. Behind every Madoff, behind every bad derivative and financial scheme that sunk our country and the future of our children in outrageous debt, are lawyers. As Shakespeare once claimed, albeit it is out of context yet fitting for these circumstances, "The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers" in King Henry VI- Part 2, Act IV, Scene II. This too will set good example for future lawyers thinking of committing crimes against the Public Trust as if they were above the law, when really just living in delusions of grandeur for the moment. If the verdict

is hang'em high outside the court, hang them thrice. Nooses free @
www.iviewit.tv .

6. This Committee should instantly Join in actions seeking a Federal Monitor and Federal Special Prosecutor or State Special Prosecutor.
7. Change the nature of Disciplinary Hearings to Compel Judges and Disciplinary Committee members to Testify; Refer disciplinary matters to Assembly Committees for Impeachment proceedings.
8. Continue legislative hearings seeking solutions but immediately change the current system of attorneys regulating attorney, to non-attorney investigators prosecuting the allegations.
9. Determine if NYS Comptroller and Courts are aware of and have Booked and Disclosed the Liabilities of ALL of the Lawsuits related to Anderson and Notified Liability Carriers or any/all parties that may have liabilities;

I thank you for your time and consideration in this matter and please do not hesitate to contact me in the future.

Respectfully Yours,



**Eliot Ivan
Bernstein**

Digitally signed by Eliot Ivan Bernstein
DN: cn=Eliot Ivan Bernstein, o=I-View-It
Technologies, Inc., ou=Invention,
email=iviewit@iviewit.tv, c=US
Date: 2009.10.05 21:08:53 -04'00'

Eliot Ivan Bernstein
Founder and Inventor
Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – DL
Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – DL

Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – FL
Iviewit Technologies, Inc. – DL
Uview.com, Inc. – DL
Iviewit.com, Inc. – FL
Iviewit.com, Inc. – DL
I.C., Inc. – FL
Iviewit.com LLC – DL
Iviewit LLC – DL
Iviewit Corporation – FL
Iviewit, Inc. – FL
Iviewit, Inc. – DL
Iviewit Corporation
2753 N.W. 34th St.
Boca Raton, Florida 33434-3459
(561) 245.8588 (o)
(561) 886.7628 (c)
(561) 245-8644 (f)
iviewit@iviewit.tv
www.iviewit.tv
<http://iviewit.tv/wordpress>
<http://iviewit.tv/wordpresseliot>

Exhibits & Linkage

Below are hyperlinks for specific documents referenced and incorporated by reference in entirety herein. The Numbers above the links, if any, correspond to the Iviewit Homepage Section of Evidentiary Links where the documents can be found numbered too if you are unable to click through the document. As some of these documents are chalk full of evidence, witness statements, depositions, graphics, etc. some are several thousand pages long so Patience is Still a Virtue until computers attain brain speed.

Federal Patent Bar and US Patent Office Complaints

350

[2004 03 04 - 09 630 939 - 2004 03 04 United States Patent & Trademark Commissioner approval of request for suspension while investigations are pending into Iviewit claims that their attorneys committed both fraud on the USPTO and fraud on Iviewit. Patents remain in limbo.](#)

343

[2004 02 11 - 09 587 026 Filing with the United States Patent & Trademark Office claiming that per the direction of Harry I. Moatz, Director of the Office of Enrollment & Discipline, Iviewit & Crossbow Ventures were seeking the Commissioner of Patents to suspend the Iviewit patents based on evidence of Fraud on the United States Patent & Trademark Office by Iviewit former Intellectual Property attorneys, Kenneth Rubenstein, Proskauer Rose LLP, Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel, Raymond Anthony Joao, Foley & Lardner, William J. Dick, Douglas Boehm, Steven Becker, Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, Thomas Coester, Norman Zafman, Farzahd Ahmini, Christopher & Weisberg PA, Krishna Narine, Andrew Barroway, Schiffrin & Barroway and others. This led to the Commissioner of Patents suspending certain of the Iviewit patent applications into an infinite black hole. The form also included inventor change forms which have gone wholly unresolved while patents are in black hole at the United States Patent & Trademark Office.'](#)

State Disciplinary Complaints, Bar Complaints & More *New York First Department*

Steven C. Krane – Proskauer Partner, Multiple First Department Roles and Former President of the New York State Bar Association

460

[2004 08 11 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Orders the complaints against Kenneth Rubenstein, Proskauer, Raymond Joao, Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel and Steven C. Krane to be moved for immediate investigation due to the appearance of impropriety and conflicts. The case was then transferred to the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department where further conflicts with Krane were discovered that derailed the investigation and caused a flurry of further complaints against the Second Department members.](#)

466

68-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

2004 09 07 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee's, Chief Counsel, Thomas Cahill's cover letter transferring the complaints of Steven C. Krane, Proskauer, Kenneth Rubenstein, Raymond Joao & Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel due to the unanimous decision by five justices of the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department. Very interesting that Cahill handles this as he is part of an ongoing investigation for his part in the crimes at the court and thus acts in conflict and violation of his public office. What is damning is that Cahill tries to impart to the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department that they are do as they please with the cases, which is not what the justices ordered, they ordered IMMEDIATE INVESTIGATION, yet Cahill tries to help himself and his buddies out of the mess again.

433

2004 07 12 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee's, Chief Counsel, Thomas Cahill's Motion to move the complaints of Steven C. Krane and Proskauer, note this comes after Cahill has a filed complaint against him, making this further reason for another complaint against him.

447

2004 07 28 Cahill to move Krane.

430

2004 07 08 Iviewit Motion to the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department regarding the conflicts and violations of public offices of Kenneth Rubenstein, Proskauer Rose, Steven C. Krane, Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel and Raymond A. Joao and requesting immediate investigation and to move the complaints.

384

2004 05 19 Complaint filed against Steven C. Krane and Proskauer Rose LLP at the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee to strike the conflicted response of Krane who violated his public office positions in representing his firm and partner Kenneth Rubenstein in their bar complaints.

391

2004 05 21 Steven C. Krane of Proskauer Rose response to the complaint filed against him and requesting that his responses be stricken from the Rubenstein complaint. Krane fails to disclose his roles at both the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee and The New York State Bar which both preclude him from handling complaints against his firm and partner, especially where he has personal and professional interests. The infamous Krane suicide note.

394

2004 05 24 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee letter to strike the responses of Steven C. Krane of Proskauer Rose for conflicts of interest and violations of public offices.

395

2004 05 25 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee letter to strike the responses of Steven C. Krane of Proskauer Rose for conflicts of interest and violations of public offices Supreme Court Strike Response of Steven Krane for Conflict of Interest & Violation of Public Offices.

396

2004 05 26 - Iviewit response to Steven C. Krane letter dated May 21, 2004 asking the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee's, Chief Counsel, Thomas Cahill to strike all Krane responses and pointing out his roles at the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee and NYSBA and other ethics departments that all made his representations violations of his public offices.

397

2004 05 26 Biography of Steven C. Krane showing conflicting roles at Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee, the NYSBA and other ethics departments that would have precluded him from representing his Proskauer partner Rubenstein, his firm Proskauer and himself.

398

69-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

[2004 05 26 - Iviewit response to Steven C. Krane letter dated May 21, 2004 asking the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee's, Chief Counsel, Thomas Cahill to strike all Krane responses and pointing out his roles at the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee and NYSBA and other ethics departments that all made his representations violations of his public offices.](#)

407

[2004 06 17 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee's, Chief Counsel, Thomas Cahill's Motion to move the complaints of Steven C. Krane, Proskauer and Kenneth Rubenstein for what he claims to avoid the appearance of impropriety when in fact he knew that Krane had violated his public office. Iviewit had contacted Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe of the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department who informed Iviewit that despite Cahill's initial denial that Krane had any roles with the department, that she was having a meeting with both Cahill and Krane on a Committee at the department. Holy cow Batman, their busted. Cahill writes this biased letter after learning that a complaint was filed against him and it is wholly misleading of the facts.](#)

543

[2005 03 27 Steven Krane NYSBA Positions.](#)

544

[2005 04 05 Krane ties to Bush.](#)

557

[2005 08 14 Steven C. Krane at Proskauer is counsel for the New York State Bar Association.](#)

752

[New York Bar Association STRIKE RUBENSTEIN RESPONSE - COMPLAINT AGAINST KRANE.](#)

Kenneth Rubenstein – Proskauer and Meltzer Partner and MPEGLA Counsel

460

[2004 08 11 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Orders the complaints against Kenneth Rubenstein, Proskauer, Raymond Joao, Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel and Steven C. Krane to be moved for immediate investigation due to the appearance of impropriety and conflicts. The case was then transferred to the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department where further conflicts with Krane were discovered that derailed the investigation and caused a flurry of further complaints against the Second Department members.](#)

466

[2004 09 07 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee's, Chief Counsel, Thomas Cahill's cover letter transferring the complaints of Steven C. Krane, Proskauer, Kenneth Rubenstein, Raymond Joao & Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel due to the unanimous decision by five justices of the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department. Very interesting that Cahill handles this as he is part of an ongoing investigation for his part in the crimes at the court and thus acts in conflict and violation of his public office. What is damning is that Cahill tries to impart to the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department that they are do as they please with the cases, which is not what the justices ordered, they ordered IMMEDIATE INVESTIGATION, yet Cahill tries to help himself and his buddies out of the mess again.](#)

433

[2004 07 12 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee's, Chief Counsel, Thomas Cahill's Motion to move the complaints of Steven C. Krane and Proskauer, note this comes after Cahill has a filed complaint against him, making this further reason for another complaint against him.](#)

447

[2004 07 28 Cahill to move Krane.](#)

430

[2004 07 08 Iviewit Motion to the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department regarding the conflicts and violations of public offices of Kenneth Rubenstein, Proskauer Rose, Steven C. Krane,](#)

70-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

[Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel and Raymond A. Joao and requesting immediate investigation and to move the complaints.](#)

247

[2003 07 02 Iviewit Rebuttal to Kenneth Rubenstein's response to the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee. Final 2200+ Pages ALL](#)

244

[2003 06 13 Kenneth Rubenstein affidavit to his deposition, where he writes in his answers without precedence, rhythm or reason. Judge Jorge Labarga orders Rubenstein to return to deposition and answer the questions he refused the first time after walking out of his deposition. Remember this is his deposition in his firms law suit.](#)

278

[2003 09 02 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee letter that was lost for months regarding holding off investigation of Kenneth Rubenstein, Proskauer Rose, Raymond Joao and Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel.](#)

225

[2003 04 11 - Kenneth Rubenstein and Proskauer's response to the bar complaint filed at the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee authored by Proskauer Rose attorney Steven C. Krane, who acted in conflict of interest and violation of public offices with the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee and also in violation of his role as former President of the NY Bar Association precluding him from handling any bar complaints within a one year blackout and where he had personal and professional interests he also violated his ethics. This sucks for like the guy who parades around as being an ethics leader, saddest day in the life of Socrates, rollin' in his grave.](#)

215

[2003 02 26 Original attorney misconduct complaint against Proskauer and Kenneth Rubenstein filed at the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee.](#)

216

[2003 02 26 Original Rubenstein Bar Action](#)

517

[2004 12 24 Steven C. Krane of Proskauer Rose, after being implicated for conflicts and violations of his Supreme Court and other public office positions violations starts working on a new biography of himself cutting what is implicating from his past as if it would disappear from his cover up. This is as funny as the picture of Krane at the Proskauer website where he replaces the picture where he weighs about 500 pounds with one from years earlier before he engorged himself in greed. You can run but you cannot hide Mr. Unethical.](#)

Raymond Anthony Joao – Misrepresented Proskauer Partner and Convicted Felon Marc Dreier Partner

460

[2004 08 11 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Orders the complaints against Kenneth Rubenstein, Proskauer, Raymond Joao, Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel and Steven C. Krane to be moved for immediate investigation due to the appearance of impropriety and conflicts. The case was then transferred to the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department where further conflicts with Krane were discovered that derailed the investigation and caused a flurry of further complaints against the Second Department members.](#)

466

[2004 09 07 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee's, Chief Counsel, Thomas Cahill's cover letter transferring the complaints of Steven C. Krane, Proskauer, Kenneth Rubenstein, Raymond Joao & Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel due to the unanimous decision by five justices of the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department. Very interesting that Cahill handles this as he is part of an ongoing investigation for his part in the crimes at the court and thus acts in conflict and violation of his public office. What is damning is that Cahill tries to impart to the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department that they](#)

71-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

are do as they please with the cases, which is not what the justices ordered, they ordered IMMEDIATE INVESTIGATION, yet Cahill tries to help himself and his buddies out of the mess again.

433

2004 07 12 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee's, Chief Counsel, Thomas Cahill's Motion to move the complaints of Steven C. Krane and Proskauer, note this comes after Cahill has a filed complaint against him, making this further reason for another complaint against him.

447

2004 07 28 Cahill to move Krane.

430

2004 07 08 Iviewit Motion to the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department regarding the conflicts and violations of public offices of Kenneth Rubenstein, Proskauer Rose, Steven C. Krane, Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel and Raymond A. Joao and requesting immediate investigation and to move the complaints.

238

2003 05 26 Iviewit Rebuttal to Raymond Joao attorney misconduct complaint. 1753 Pages
BOOKMARKED

227

2003 04 16 Supreme Court of New York First Department Disciplinary Committee regarding reply to Raymond Joao complaint.

279

2003 09 02 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee response regarding Raymond Joao, Proskauer Rose, Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel and Kenneth Rubenstein bar complaints which comes way late as it was lost in the mail. The document is probably fraudulent and tries to dismiss the complaints as a civil matter, although they ignore the state, federal and international crimes against the government and foreign nations exposed in the complaints.

223

2003 04 08 Raymond Joao's response to the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee. Joao actually tries to accuse Iviewit of stealing his inventions. Coooco.

214

2003 02 25 Raymond Joao 9th district original attorney misconduct complaint - somehow gets transferred to the wrong district, the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee for prosecution with the Proskauer attorney misconduct complaints, although Joao is registered elsewhere.

Joao 1900 Patent or 2020 Patent?

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/PATENT%20APP%20DATED%20in%201900%20and%202020.pdf>

Thomas Cahill – Former Chief Counsel of the Disciplinary Committee, Appellate Division, First Department

606

2007 08 05 NEWS ARTICLE "Expose Corrupt Courts" article regarding Thomas J. Cahill of the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee involved in whitewashing complaints.

487

2004 10 18 Iviewit letter to Martin Gold and Paul Curran to move the complaint of Thomas J. Cahill from the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee to a non conflicted third party, based on the Court Order for investigation of Kenneth Rubenstein, Proskauer Rose, Steven C. Krane and Raymond Joao due to conflicts and the appearance of impropriety.

72-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

460

[2004 08 11 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Orders the complaints against Kenneth Rubenstein, Proskauer, Raymond Joao, Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel and Steven C. Krane to be moved for immediate investigation due to the appearance of impropriety and conflicts. The case was then transferred to the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department where further conflicts with Krane were discovered that derailed the investigation and caused a flurry of further complaints against the Second Department members.](#)

466

[2004 09 07 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee's, Chief Counsel, Thomas Cahill's cover letter transferring the complaints of Steven C. Krane, Proskauer, Kenneth Rubenstein, Raymond Joao & Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel due to the unanimous decision by five justices of the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department. Very interesting that Cahill handles this as he is part of an ongoing investigation for his part in the crimes at the court and thus acts in conflict and violation of his public office. What is damning is that Cahill tries to impart to the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department that they are do as they please with the cases, which is not what the justices ordered, they ordered IMMEDIATE INVESTIGATION, yet Cahill tries to help himself and his buddies out of the mess again.](#)

433

[2004 07 12 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee's, Chief Counsel, Thomas Cahill's Motion to move the complaints of Steven C. Krane and Proskauer, note this comes after Cahill has a filed complaint against him, making this further reason for another complaint against him.](#)

447

[2004 07 28 Cahill to move Krane.](#)

430

[2004 07 08 Iviewit Motion to the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department regarding the conflicts and violations of public offices of Kenneth Rubenstein, Proskauer Rose, Steven C. Krane, Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel and Raymond A. Joao and requesting immediate investigation and to move the complaints.](#)

325

[2004 01 09 - Response to Thomas J. Cahill, Chief Counsel, New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee regarding the attorney misconduct complaint against Proskauer Rose, Kenneth Rubenstein, Raymond Joao and Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel being delayed due to a lost letter he supposedly had sent. This is right before Iviewit learns that the attorney for Proskauer is a Proskauer partner, in the IP department no less, who just happens to be a member of the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee.](#)

408

[2004 06 23 - Paul J. Curran, Chairman of the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee moving the complaint filed against Thomas J. Cahill for investigation according to department rules. A complaint was filed against Thomas J. Cahill for his involvement with lying about Steven C. Krane's conflicts and violations of public offices.](#)

409

[2004 06 23 Iviewit faxes the disciplinary complaint filed against Thomas J. Cahill to Paul J. Curran for investigation.](#)

410

[2004 06 23 Cahill Petition.](#)

429

[2004 07 08 Iviewit Motion to the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department regarding the Cahill complaint.](#)

607

[2007 08 08 Cahill problems in New York 1.xps](#)

Alan W. Friedberg Esq. ~ Chief Counsel of the Disciplinary Committee, Appellate Division, First Department

Roy L. Reardon ~ Chairman of the Disciplinary Committee, Appellate Division, First Department and a Special Master in the Appellate Division, First Department

Second Department Disciplinary Committee & Second Department Complaints

Diana Maxfield Kears, James Pelzer, Lawrence DiGiovanna & A. Gail Prudenti

546

[2005 04 20 Response to 2005 04 09 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department, Clerk, James E. Pelzer, letter. Very interesting reading into how due process was denied and how court ordered investigations were derailed.](#)

545

[2005 04 09 New York Supreme Second Dept Pelzer Letter Krane comments](#)
[2005 04 09 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department, Clerk, James E. Pelzer, letter whereby Pelzer, who is not an actor in the disciplinary, now attempts to claim that A. Gail Prudenti had decided to blow off the investigations, which he tries to now claim were completed, although all prior information states no investigation was done in lieu of being dismissed on review, inapposite the First Department court order stating immediate investigation was to be done. He attempts to defend Krane, showing his obvious bias, instead of relying on the supposed investigations conclusions where we are sure Krane had a lawyer representing his interests. This attempts to conclude based on a dismissal on review that Krane was not conflicted using department letterhead to deny due process and form a defense for Krane. Pelzer nor Prudenti are part of the disciplinary process and are conflicted with Krane and Kaye and what is amazing is that they should be responding to the First Department court that ordered the investigation, not Eliot Bernstein and Stephen Lamont. This is very telling.](#)

474

[2004 10 05 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee's, Chief Counsel, Diana Maxfield Kears trying to get Steven C. Krane, Proskauer, Kenneth Rubenstein and Raymond Joao out of the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Court ORDER for immediate investigation by claiming she reviewed and found no evidence of misconduct. This decision despite that she was ordered to investigate by five justice who reviewed the materials and found reason to Order investigations. No of the accused had to put a defense up, no witnesses were contacted, no evidence tested and then Kears admits that she is conflicted with Krane but refuses to answer questions regarding her conflict and tells Iviewit to put any request for that information in writing. Kears is charged with a complaint for her undisclosed conflicts after she fails to respond to the written request for disclosure of her conflicts with both Krane and Judge Judith Kaye.](#)

496

[2004 10 26 Iviewit letter response to Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee's, Chief Counsel, Diana Maxfield Kears, rebutting her decision in spite of the Court Order for investigation, to dismiss the complaints against Kenneth Rubenstein, Proskauer Rose, Steven C. Krane, Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel and Raymond Joao on review, not investigation. The letter also asks Kears to disclose the conflicts she had with Krane and Judge Judith Kaye in writing as she requested.](#)

501

[2004 11 09 - Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee's, Chief Counsel, Diana Maxfield Kears, stating that a committee member would review if the complaints ordered for investigation by the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department justices would be reopened for investigation, note no investigation was ever done but later](#)

74-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

as they get deeper in their bs, they try to state that the review was an investigation and thus they complied with the First Department order.

514

2004 12 20 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee's, Chairman, Lawrence DiGiovanna's review of Kears decision and siding with her decision to not investigate and dismiss based on review, despite the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department court Order to investigate, not review. For his part in obfuscating justice a complaint is filed against both Kears and DiGiovanna which both go undocketed and procedurally are derailed by Kears who even handles the complaint against herself???

518

2005 01 10 Iviewit letter response to 2004 12 20 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee's, Chairman, Lawrence DiGiovanna's review of Kears decision to not investigate inapposite of the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department order to investigate and other issues regarding conflicts with Steven C. Krane and Chief Judge Judith Kaye.

531

2005 02 23 Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department, Clerk, James E. Pelzer letter stating he is taking the matter of the decisions to review by Diana Maxfield Kears, Chief Counsel of the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee and Lawrence DiGiovanna, Chairman of the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee, instead of investigating as ordered by the First Department justices to the Presiding Justice of the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department, A. Gail Prudenti, for a decision.

537

2005 03 11 Iviewit letter to Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department, Clerk, James E. Pelzer regarding conflicts of interest found with State of New York Court of Appeals, Chief Judge of the State of New York, Judith S. Kaye and Steven C. Krane and asking that any new investigators sign that they have no conflicts with any of the Iviewit accused to prevent further conflicts which force further complaints.

542

2005 03 18 Diana Maxfield Kears, Chief Counsel of the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee sends a letter stating that they had lost a letter and it was mysteriously returned by the post office. The letter attempts to claim an investigation was done by a Committee in hopes that the fact that she reviewed the matter and dismissed it on review was now moot somehow. What fails to be noted is the fact that this was an investigation that none of the accused had to respond to, no witnesses provided were interviewed, no documents were examined. This document serves for further charges against Kears for even attempting to use the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division Second Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee letterhead to continue the cover up for the accused. The document appears to be evidence of mail fraud as well.

Florida Bar Complaints for Conflicts

Christopher Clarke Wheeler

233

2003 05 23 Christopher Wheeler Admits Perjury and False Statements made to The Florida Bar in his response. Of course Triggs, acting in conflict and violation of public office makes the perjurious statement a footnote.

228

2003 04 30 Eliot Bernstein / Iviewit response to Christopher Wheeler Florida Bar Complaint BOOKMARKED. Wheeler's response it is later learned was tendered by his partner Matthew Triggs who was prohibited from representing any bar complaints due to his official position with the Florida Bar'

230

2003 04 30 P. Stephen Lamont Rebuttal to Christopher Wheeler's response to the Florida Bar complaint filed against him. BOOKMARKED

75-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

221

[2003 04 07 - Christopher Wheeler and Proskauer's response to the bar complaint which is tendered by Matthew Triggs of Proskauer who acted in violation of his public office with the Florida Supreme Court agency The Florida Bar.](#)

235

[2003 05 23 Christopher Wheeler Response to Florida Bar Rebuttal 2, tendered by Matthew Triggs who acted in violation of his Florida Supreme Court Bar position in representing Wheeler.](#)

237

[2003 05 23 Wheeler Response to Rebuttal Partial](#)

242

[2003 06 03 Ivewit Rebuttal to Wheeler Florida Bar Complaint 2nd Response Final](#)

246

[2003 07 01 Florida Bar Response Wheeler Complaint trying to claim that the federal state and international crimes presented them were more a civil matter.](#)

243

[2003 06 04 Lorraine Christine Hoffman of The Florida Bar cover letter regarding Wheeler bar complaint.](#)

217

[2003 02 26 Original Florida Bar Complaint against Proskauer and Christopher Wheeler.](#)

219

[2003 04 07 - Christopher Wheeler perjured statement to the Florida Bar regarding Brian G. Utley. Wheeler in a footnote in a response tries to minimize the extent of the lie he is caught in.](#)

220

[2003 04 07 - Christopher Wheeler perjured Florida Bar statement. Florida Bar while cognizant of the crime of perjury in an official proceeding fails to take any action, although Wheeler is caught beyond a reasonable doubt and apologizes for his lies in writing. Oh yeah, the President of the Florida Bar turns out to be Wheeler's brother, James Wheeler, underling at the law firm of Broad and Cassel and fails to disclose such while receiving documents from Ivewit to investigate.](#)

Matthew Triggs

New York Attorney General Complaints for Conflicts & Title 18 Obstruction

<http://ivewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080305%20Final%20Plaintiff%20Oposition%20to%20AG%20Cuomo%20letter%20email%20copy.pdf>

<http://ivewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080314%20FINAL%20Letter%20to%20NY%20AG%20to%20reinvestigate%20investigation%20on%20new%20evidence.pdf>

<http://ivewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/2007%2009%2024%20New%20York%20AG%20Cuomo%20letter%20denying%20Ivewit%20investigation.pdf>

Virginia Bar & Virginia Attorney General Complaints

357

[2004 03 22 William J. Dick Virginia Bar Ivewit rebuttal 2,881 pages of great evidence for the IP crimes.](#)

76-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080415%20FINAL%20SENT%20TO%20COURT%20and%20Letter%20to%20Virginia%20Bar%20Counsel%20Attorney%20General%20Hall%20re%20phone%20conv.doc>

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080502%20Foley%20Anker%20Appearance%20and%20letter%20re%20conflicts.pdf>

US District Court Complaints for Conflicts and Title 18 Obstruction

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080219%20USDCSDNY%20Letter%20re%20missing%20service%20papers.pdf>

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080305%20Final%20Plaintiff%20Opposition%20to%20AG%20Cuomo%20letter%20email%20copy.pdf>

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080313%20FINAL%20Plaintiff%20Response%20to%20Schiendlin%20March%2007%202008%20Order.pdf>

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080321%20Order%20Scheidlin.pdf>

<http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/20080401%20Motion%20in%20Opposition%20to%20Motion%20to%20Dismiss%20for%20Florida%20Bar%20et%20al%20filed%20Greenberg%20Traurig.pdf>

[http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/Schiendlin%20Order%2003%2007%202008%20\(2\).pdf](http://iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/United%20States%20District%20Court%20Southern%20District%20NY/Schiendlin%20Order%2003%2007%202008%20(2).pdf)

US Second Circuit Court of Appeals Complaints for Conflicts and Title 18 Obstruction Charge

US Bankruptcy Court Southern District of New York

OTHER LINKS

566

[2006 01 07 Iviewit News Release regarding Representative Nita M. Lowey \(D-NY 18th\) taking the Iviewit matters to Representative John D. Dingell \(D-MI 15th\), Chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, who then forwards the matters for investigation to the House Judiciary Committee, under the direction of The Honorable John Conyers Jr. \(D-MI 14th\).](#)

608

77-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

[2007 08 09 and 19 State of New York Commission of Investigation letter from Anthony Cartusciello, Deputy Commissioner, denying investigation even though Thomas Cahill corruptions are being exposed at the First Department.](#)

609

[2007 08 09 2007 08 09 and 19 State of New York Commission of Investigation letter from Anthony Cartusciello, Deputy Commissioner, denying investigation even though Thomas Cahill corruptions are being exposed at the First Department.](#)

611

[2007 08 18 Iviewit letter to Andrew Cuomo regarding the uncovering of public office corruption of Thomas Cahill, Chief Counsel of the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee and to open immediate investigation of Cahill and the investigations of Proskauer Rose, Kenneth Rubenstein, Steven C. Krane, Raymond A. Joao, Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolf & Schlissel and others involved in the denial of due process of the Iviewit complaints.](#)

612

[2007 08 18 Iviewit letter to State of New York Commission of Investigation, Anthony Cartusciello, Deputy Commissioner, in rebuttal to his denying investigation in light of the unfolding ethics scandal at the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee and request to reconsider.](#)

614

[2007 09 05 Iviewit letter to Eliot Spitzer as Governor of New York to begin immediate investigation in light of the unfolding ethics scandal at the Supreme Court of New York Appellate Division First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee and Thomas J. Cahill and request to reopen all Iviewit cases against members of the department and those involved in the theft of Iviewit Intellectual properties.](#)

615

[2007 09 24 New York Attorney General Andrew Cuomo letter denying Iviewit investigation.](#)

621

[2007 12 12 Iviewit filing of 1.5 billion dollar lawsuit in the United States District Court Southern District of New York under The Honorable Justice Shira A. Scheindlin. The Iviewit case, Docket No. # 07 Civ. 11196 \(SAS\) Eliot I. Bernstein, et al. v. Appellate Division First Department, Department Disciplinary Committee et al. is filed in effort to support former employee of the New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department Disciplinary Committee, Christine C. Anderson's heroic efforts to expose corruption in the department. Case No. 07 Civ. 9599 \(SAS\) Christine C. Anderson v. the State of New York, et al. The filed amended complaint adds hundreds of defendants and claims damages over one trillion dollars, as the RICO element of the case forces the Iviewit patent crimes into the filing that began as support on disciplinary matters denying due process.](#)

630

[2008 03 05 Final Plaintiff Opposition to AG Cuomo letter email copy.](#)

631

[2008 03 05 Final Plaintiff Opposition to Proskauer letter as counsel.](#)

632

[2008 03 07 Scheindlin Order re conflicts.](#)

633

[2008 03 10 Scheindlin Order re conflicts.](#)

634

[2008 03 13 FINAL Plaintiff Response to Scheindlin March 07 2008 Order.](#)

635

[2008 03 14 FINAL Letter to NY AG to reopen investigation on new evidence.](#)

651

[2008 05 09 FINAL AMENDED COMPLAINT AND RICO SIGNED COPY HIGH.doc](#)

652

[2008 05 09 FINAL AMENDED COMPLAINT AND RICO SIGNED COPY LOW.doc](#)

653

[2008 05 09 FINAL AMENDED COMPLAINT AND RICO SIGNED COPY MED.doc](#)

744

[Motion for Rubenstein and Wheeler to resume depositions.](#)

78-90

Monday, October 05, 2009

NY Senate Judiciary Committee Prepared Statement Eliot I. Bernstein

749

New York State Bar Represented by Proskauer Rose making whole bar disciplinary system conflicted.

IVIEWIT AMENDED COMPLAINT - ONE TRILLION DOLLARS IN DAMAGES

468

2004 09 09 Steven C. Krane of Proskauer Rose, after being implicated for conflicts and violations of his Supreme Court and other public office positions violations starts working on a new biography of himself cutting what is implicating from his past as if it would disappear from his cover up. This is as funny as the picture of Krane at the Proskauer website where he replaces the picture where he weighs about 500 pounds with one from years earlier before he engorged himself in greed. You can run but you cannot hide Mr. Unethical.

469

2004 09 11 Iviewit files with LAWYERS FUND FOR CLIENT PROTECTION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

516

2004 12 24 Stephen Kaye of Proskauer Rose biography, yes this is the husband of Judge Judith Kaye, whose former law clerk was Steven Krane, partner with Stephen Kaye at Proskauer in the Intellectual Property group that was formed immediately after Proskauer took disclosures of the Iviewit inventions, then ran out and hired Rubenstein with his MPEGLA pools to steal the Iviewit inventions. Here we finally see how the denial of due process in New York was being effectuated and how the crimes were going uninvestigated and were derailed.

Pre

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE FORM

Please accept and **return signed** the following Conflict of Interest (COI) Disclosure Form before continuing further with adjudication, review or investigation of the attached **Motion Information Statement – Motion for Extension of Time and any materials relating to Eliot Bernstein and or the Iviewit companies as listed herein, failure to comply may result in criminal and civil charges against you.** This Conflict of Interest Disclosure Form is designed to ensure that the review and any determinations from such review of the enclosed materials will not be biased by any conflicting financial interest or any other conflicting interest by those reviewers responsible for the handling of this confidential information with the main alleged perpetrators of the alleged crimes in these matters.

Disclosure forms with "Yes" answers to any of the following questions are requested not to open the remainder of the documents or opine in any manner and instead forward the matters on to the next available reviewer that is free of conflict that can sign and complete the disclosure. Please identify conflicts that you have in writing upon terminating your involvement in the matters. As many of these alleged perpetrators are large law firms, members of various state and federal courts and officers of federal, state and local law enforcement agencies, careful review and disclosure of any conflict with those named herein is pertinent in your continued handling of these matters.

As these matters involve claims of conflicts, violations of public offices, interference with complaints in the Supreme Court of New York, coercion, document destruction, obstructions of justice, the need for prescreening for conflict is essential to the administration of due process in these matters. Federal Judge Shira A. Scheindlin has legally related these matters to a Whistleblower Lawsuit who alleges similar claims of public office corruption against Supreme Court of New York personnel and possibly others. Please take this as a formal written request for full disclosure of any conflict on your part, such request conforming with all applicable state and federal laws, public office rules and regulations, attorney conduct codes and judicial cannons or other international law and treaties.

Failure to comply with all applicable conflict disclosure rules, regulations and laws prior to continued action on your part **will be cause** for the filing of complaints against you for any decisions or actions you make prior to a signed Conflict Of Interest Disclosure Form with all applicable regulatory agencies. Complaints will be filed with all appropriate authorities, including but not limited to, Public Integrity Officials, Judicial Conduct Officials, State and Federal Bar Associations, Disciplinary Departments and all appropriate law enforcement agencies for failing to follow well established rules and regulations governing public office conflict, attorney conduct conflicts, judicial conduct and law.

- I. Do you, your spouse, and your dependents, in the aggregate have, any direct or indirect relations (relationships), or interest in any outside entity or any direct or indirect relations (relationships) to the following parties to the proceeding of the matters you are reviewing:
1. Proskauer Rose, LLP; Alan S. Jaffe - Chairman Of The Board - ("Jaffe"); Kenneth Rubenstein - ("Rubenstein"); Robert Kafin - Managing Partner - ("Kafin"); Christopher C. Wheeler - ("Wheeler"); Steven C. Krane - ("Krane"); Stephen R. Kaye - ("S. Kaye") and in his estate with New York Supreme Court Chief Judge Judith Kaye ("J. Kaye"); Matthew Triggs - ("Triggs"); Christopher Pruzaski - ("Pruzaski"); Mara Lerner Robbins - ("Robbins"); Donald Thompson - ("Thompson"); Gayle Coleman; David George; George A. Pincus; Gregg Reed; Leon Gold - ("Gold"); Albert Gortz - ("Gortz"); Marcy Hahn-Saperstein; Kevin J. Healy - ("Healy"); Stuart Kapp; Ronald F. Storette; Chris Wolf; Jill Zammis; FULL LIST OF 601 liable Proskauer Partners; any other John Doe ("John Doe") Proskauer partner, affiliate, company, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Proskauer ROSE LLP; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Proskauer related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
 2. MELTZER, LIPPE, GOLDSTEIN, WOLF & SCHLISSSEL, P.C.; Lewis Melzter - ("Meltzer"); Raymond Joao - ("Joao"); Frank Martinez - ("Martinez"); Kenneth Rubenstein - ("Rubenstein"); FULL LIST OF 34 Meltzer, Lippe, Goldstein, Wolf & Schlissel, P.C. liable Partners; any other John Doe ("John Doe") Meltzer, Lippe, Goldstein, Wolf & Schlissel, P.C. partner, affiliate, company, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Meltzer, Lippe, Goldstein, Wolf & Schlissel, P.C.; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Meltzer, Lippe, Goldstein, Wolf & Schlissel, P.C. related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;

3. FOLEY & LARDNER LLP; Ralf Boer ("Boer"); Michael Grebe ("Grebe"); Christopher Kise ("Kise"); William J. Dick - ("Dick"); Steven C. Becker - ("Becker"); Douglas Boehm - ("Boehm"); Barry Grossman - ("Grossman"); Jim Clark - ("Clark"); any other John Doe ("John Doe") Foley & Lardner partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Foley & Lardner; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Foley & Lardner related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
4. Schiffrin & Barroway, LLP; Richard Schiffrin - ("Schiffrin"); Andrew Barroway - ("Barroway"); Krishna Narine - ("Narine"); any other John Doe ("John Doe") Schiffrin & Barroway, LLP partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Schiffrin & Barroway, LLP; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Schiffrin & Barroway, LLP related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
5. Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP; Norman Zafman - ("Zafman"); Thomas Coester - ("Coester"); Farzad Ahmini - ("Ahmini"); George Hoover - ("Hoover"); any other John Doe ("John Doe") Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
6. Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon LLP; Martyn W. Molyneaux - ("Molyneaux"); Michael Docketman - ("Docketman"); FULL LIST OF 198 Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon LLP liable Partners; any other John Doe ("John Doe") Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon LLP partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon LLP; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon LLP related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
7. Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.; Alan M. Weisberg - ("Weisberg"); any other John Doe ("John Doe") Christopher & Weisberg, P.A. partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Christopher & Weisberg, P.A. related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
8. YAMAKAWA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE; Masaki Yamakawa - ("Yamakawa"); any other John Doe ("John Doe") Yamakawa International Patent Office partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Yamakawa International Patent Office; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Yamakawa International Patent Office related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
9. GOLDSTEIN LEWIN & CO.; Donald J. Goldstein - ("Goldstein"); Gerald R. Lewin - ("Lewin"); Erika Lewin - ("E. Lewin"); Mark R. Gold; Paul Feuerberg; Salvatore Bochicchio; Marc H. List; David A. Katzman; Robert H. Garick; Robert C. Zeigen; Marc H. List; Lawrence A. Rosenblum; David A. Katzman; Brad N. Mciver; Robert Cini; any other John Doe ("John Doe") Goldstein & Lewin Co. partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Goldstein & Lewin Co.; Partners, Associates, Of Counsel, Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Goldstein & Lewin Co. related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
10. INTEL Corporation;
11. Silicon Graphics Inc.;
12. Lockheed Martin Corporation;
13. Real 3D, Inc. (SILICON GRAPHICS, INC., LOCKHEED MARTIN & INTEL) & RYJO; Gerald Stanley - ("Stanley"); Ryan Huisman - ("Huisman"); RYJO - ("RYJO"); Tim Connolly - ("Connolly"); Steve Cochran; David Bolton; Rosalie Bibona - ("Bibona"); Connie Martin; Richard Gentner; Steven A. Behrens; Matt Johannsen; any other John Doe ("John Doe") Intel, Real 3D, Inc. (Silicon Graphics, Inc., Lockheed Martin & Intel) & RYJO partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Intel, Real 3D, Inc. (Silicon Graphics, Inc., Lockheed Martin & Intel) & RYJO; Employees, Corporations, Affiliates and any other Intel, Real 3D, Inc. (Silicon Graphics, Inc., Lockheed Martin & Intel) & RYJO related or affiliated entities, and any successor companies both individually and professionally;
14. Tiedemann Investment Group; Bruce T. Prolow ("Prolow"); Carl Tiedemann ("C. Tiedemann"); Andrew Philip Chesler; Craig L. Smith; any other John Doe ("John Doe") Tiedemann Investment

- Group partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Tiedemann Investment Group and any other Tiedemann Investment Group related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
15. Crossbow Ventures / Alpine Partners; Stephen J. Warner - ("Warner"); Rene P. Eichenberger - ("Eichenberger"); H. Hickman Hank Powell - ("Powell"); Maurice Buchsbaum - ("Buchsbaum"); Eric Chen - ("Chen"); Avi Hersh; Matthew Shaw - ("Shaw"); Bruce W. Shewmaker - ("Shewmaker"); Ravi M. Ugale - ("Ugale"); any other John Doe ("John Doe") Crossbow Ventures / Alpine Partners partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Crossbow Ventures / Alpine Partners and any other Crossbow Ventures / Alpine Partners related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
 16. BROAD & CASSEL; James J. Wheeler - ("J. Wheeler"); Kelly Overstreet Johnson - ("Johnson"); any other John Doe ("John Doe") Broad & Cassell partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Broad & Cassell and any other Broad & Cassell related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
 17. FORMER IVIEWIT MANAGEMENT & BOARD; Brian G. Utley/Proskauer Referred Management - ("Utley"); Raymond Hersh - ("Hersh"); Michael Reale - ("Reale")/Proskauer Referred Management; Rubenstein/Proskauer Rose Shareholder in Iviewit - Advisory Board; Wheeler/Proskauer Rose Shareholder in Iviewit - Advisory Board; Dick/Foley & Lardner - Advisory Board, Boehm/Foley & Lardner - Advisory Board; Becker/Foley & Lardner; Advisory Board; Joao/Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolfe & Schlissel - Advisory Board; Kane/Goldman Sachs - Board Director; Lewin/Goldstein Lewin - Board Director; Ross Miller, Esq. ("Miller"), Prolow/Tiedemann Prolow II - Board Director; Powell/Crossbow Ventures/Proskauer Referred Investor - Board Director; Maurice Buchsbaum - Board Director; Stephen Warner - Board Director; Simon L. Bernstein - Board Director ("S. Bernstein"); any other John Doe ("John Doe") Former Iviewit Management & Board partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Former Iviewit Management & Board and any other Former Iviewit Management & Board related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
 18. FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT - WEST PALM BEACH FLORIDA; Judge Jorge LABARGA - ("Labarga"); any other John Doe ("John Doe") FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT - WEST PALM BEACH FLORIDA staff, known or not known to have been involved at the time. Hereinafter, collectively referred to as ("15C");
 19. THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK APPELLATE DIVISION: FIRST JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT, DEPARTMENTAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE; Thomas Cahill - ("Cahill"); Joseph Wigley - ("Wigley"); Steven Krane, any other John Doe ("John Doe") of THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK APPELLATE DIVISION: FIRST JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT, DEPARTMENTAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE staff, known or not known to have been involved at the time;
 20. THE FLORIDA BAR; Lorraine Christine Hoffman - ("Hoffman"); Eric Turner - ("Turner"); Kenneth Marvin - ("Marvin"); Anthony Boggs - ("Boggs"); Joy A. Bartmon - ("Bartmon"); Kelly Overstreet Johnson - ("Johnson"); Jerald Beer - ("Beer"); Matthew Triggs; Christopher or James Wheeler; any other John Doe ("John Doe") The Florida Bar staff, known or not known to have been involved at the time;
 21. MPEGLA, LLC. – Kenneth Rubenstein, Patent Evaluator; Licensors and Licensees, please visit www.mpegla.com for a complete list; Columbia University; Fujitsu Limited; General Instrument Corp; Lucent Technologies Inc.; Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.; Mitsubishi Electric Corp.; Philips Electronics N.V. (Philips); Scientific Atlanta, Inc.; Sony Corp. (Sony); EXTENDED LIST OF MPEGLA LICENSEES AND LICENSORS; any other John Doe MPEGLA, LLC. Partner, Associate, Engineer, Of Counsel or Employee; any other John Doe ("John Doe") MPEGLA, LLC partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to MPEGLA, LLC and any other MPEGLA, LLC related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
 22. DVD6C LICENSING GROUP - Licensors and Licensees, please visit www.mpegla.com for a complete list; Toshiba Corporation; Hitachi, Ltd.; Matsushita Electric Industrial Co. Ltd.; Mitsubishi Electric Corporation; Time Warner Inc.; Victor Company Of Japan, Ltd.; EXTENDED DVD6C DEFENDANTS; any other John Doe DVD6C LICENSING GROUP Partner, Associate, Engineer, Of Counsel or Employee; any other John Doe ("John Doe") DVD6C LICENSING GROUP partners,

- affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to DVD6C LICENSING GROUP and any other DVD6C LICENSING GROUP related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
23. Harrison Goodard Foote incorporating Brewer & Son; Martyn Molyneaux, Esq. (“Molyneaux”); Any other John Doe ("John Doe") Harrison Goodard Foote (incorporating Brewer & Son) partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Harrison Goodard Goote incorporating Brewer & Son and any other related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
 24. Lawrence DiGiovanna, Chairman of the Grievance Committee of the Second Judicial Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee;
 25. James E. Peltzer, Clerk of the Court of the Appellate Division, Supreme Court of the State of New York, Second Judicial Department; Diana Kearsse, Chief Counsel to the Grievance Committee of the Second Judicial Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee;
 26. Houston & Shahady, P.A., any other John Doe ("John Doe") Houston & Shahady, P.A., affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Houston & Shahady, P.A. related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
 27. Furr & Cohen, P.A. any other John Doe ("John Doe") Furr & Cohen, P.A., affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Furr & Cohen, P.A. related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
 28. Moskowitz, Mandell, Salim & Simowitz, P.A., any other John Doe ("John Doe") Moskowitz, Mandell, Salim & Simowitz, P.A., affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Moskowitz, Mandell, Salim & Simowitz, P.A. related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
 29. The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. Jeffrey Friedstein (“Friedstein”); Sheldon Friedstein (S. Friedstein”), Donald G. Kane (“Kane”); any other John Doe ("John Doe") The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. partners, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. and any other related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
 30. David B. Simon, Esq. (“D. Simon”);
 31. Sachs Saxs & Klein, PA any other John Doe ("John Doe") Sachs Saxs & Klein, PA, affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Sachs Saxs & Klein, PA related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
 32. Huizenga Holdings Incorporated any other John Doe ("John Doe") Huizenga Holdings Incorporated affiliates, companies, known or not known at this time; including but not limited to Huizenga Holdings Incorporated related or affiliated entities both individually and professionally;
 33. Davis Polk & Wardell;
 34. Ropes & Gray LLP;
 35. Sullivan & Cromwell LLP;
 36. Judge Martin Glenn at the United States Bankruptcy Court ~ Southern District of New York
 37. Eliot I. Bernstein, (“Bernstein”) a resident of the State of California, and former President (Acting) of Ivewit Holdings, Inc. and its affiliates and subsidiaries and the founder of Ivewit and principal inventor of its technology;
 38. P. Stephen Lamont, (“Lamont”) a resident of the State of New York, and former Chief Executive Officer (Acting) of Ivewit Holdings, Inc. and all of its affiliates and subsidiaries;
 39. SKULL AND BONES; The Russell Trust Co.; Yale Law School;
 40. Council on Foreign Relations;
 41. The Bilderberg Group;
 42. The Federalist Society;
 43. The Bradley Foundation;
 44. Please include in the COI check the defendants and any other parties in the legally related case of New York District Court Southern District of New York Docket No (07cv09599) Anderson v The State of New York, et al. - WHISTLEBLOWER LAWSUIT;
 - A. United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit 08-4873-cv
 - B. (07cv11196) Bernstein et al. v Appellate Division First Department Disciplinary Committee, et al. - TRILLION DOLLAR LAWSUIT Defendants, in addition to those already listed herein, include but are not limited to;

1. STATE OF NEW YORK;
2. THE OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNIFIED COURT SYSTEM;
3. STEVEN C. KRANE in his official and individual Capacities for the New York State Bar Association and the Appellate Division First Department Departmental disciplinary Committee, and, his professional and individual capacities as a Proskauer partner;
4. ESTATE OF STEPHEN KAYE, in his professional and individual capacities;
5. MATTHEW M. TRIGGS in his official and individual capacity for The Florida Bar and his professional and individual capacities as a partner of Proskauer;
6. JON A. BAUMGARTEN, in his professional and individual capacities;
7. SCOTT P. COOPER, in his professional and individual capacities;
8. BRENDAN J. O'ROURKE, in his professional and individual capacities;
9. LAWRENCE I. WEINSTEIN, in his professional and individual capacities;
10. WILLIAM M. HART, in his professional and individual capacities;
11. DARYN A. GROSSMAN, in his professional and individual capacities;
12. JOSEPH A. CAPRARO JR., in his professional and individual capacities;
13. JAMES H. SHALEK; in his professional and individual capacities;
14. GREGORY MASHBERG, in his professional and individual capacities;
15. JOANNA SMITH, in her professional and individual capacities;
16. TODD C. NORBITZ, in his professional and individual capacities;
17. ANNE SEKEL, in his professional and individual capacities;
18. JIM CLARK, in his professional and individual capacities;
19. STATE OF FLORIDA, OFFICE OF THE STATE COURTS ADMINISTRATOR, FLORIDA;
20. FLORIDA SUPREME COURT;
21. HON. CHARLES T. WELLS, in his official and individual capacities;
22. HON. HARRY LEE ANSTEAD, in his official and individual capacities;
23. HON. R. FRED LEWIS, in his official and individual capacities;
24. HON. PEGGY A. QUINCE, in his official and individual capacities;
25. HON. KENNETH B. BELL, in his official and individual capacities;
26. THOMAS HALL, in his official and individual capacities;
27. DEBORAH YARBOROUGH in her official and individual capacities;
28. DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL REGULATION – FLORIDA;
29. CITY OF BOCA RATON, FLA.;
30. ROBERT FLECHAUS in his official and individual capacities;
31. ANDREW SCOTT in his official and individual capacities;
32. PAUL CURRAN in his official and individual capacities;
33. MARTIN R. GOLD in his official and individual capacities;
34. SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK APPELLATE DIVISION FIRST DEPARTMENT;
35. CATHERINE O'HAGEN WOLFE in her official and individual capacities;
36. HON. ANGELA M. MAZZARELLI in her official and individual capacities;
37. HON. RICHARD T. ANDRIAS in his official and individual capacities;
38. HON. DAVID B. SAXE in his official and individual capacities;
39. HON. DAVID FRIEDMAN in his official and individual capacities;
40. HON. LUIZ A. GONZALES in his official and individual capacities;
41. SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK APPELLATE DIVISION SECOND JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT;
42. SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK APPELLATE DIVISION SECOND DEPARTMENT DEPARTMENTAL DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE;
43. HON. A. GAIL PRUDENTI in her official and individual capacities;
44. HON. JUDITH S. KAYE in her official and individual capacities;
45. STATE OF NEW YORK COMMISSION OF INVESTIGATION;
46. ANTHONY CARTUSCIELLO in his official and individual capacities;
47. LAWYERS FUND FOR CLIENT PROTECTION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK;
48. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK;
49. ELIOT SPITZER in his official and individual capacities, as both former Attorney General for the State of New York, and, as former Governor of the State of New York;

50. COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA;
 51. VIRGINIA STATE BAR;
 52. ANDREW H. GOODMAN in his official and individual capacities;
 53. NOEL SENDEL in her official and individual capacities;
 54. MARY W. MARTELINO in her official and individual capacities;
 55. LIZBETH L. MILLER, in her official and individual capacities;
 56. MPEGLA LLC; LAWRENCE HORN, in his professional and individual capacities;
 57. INTEL CORP.; LARRY PALLEY, in his professional and individual capacities;
 58. SILICON GRAPHICS, INC.;
 59. LOCKHEED MARTIN Corp;
 60. EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE;
 61. ALAIN POMPIDOU in his official and individual capacities;
 62. WIM VAN DER EIJK in his official and individual capacities;
 63. LISE DYBDAHL in her official and personal capacities;
 64. DIGITAL INTERACTIVE STREAMS, INC.;
 65. ROYAL O'BRIEN, in his professional and individual capacities;
 66. HUIZENGA HOLDINGS INCORPORATED, WAYNE HUIZENGA, in his professional and individual capacities;
 67. WAYNE HUIZENGA, JR., in his professional and individual capacities;
 68. BART A. HOUSTON, ESQ. in his professional and individual capacities;
 69. BRADLEY S. SCHRAIBERG, ESQ. in his professional and individual capacities;
 70. WILLIAM G. SALIM, ESQ. in his professional and individual capacities;
 71. BEN ZUCKERMAN, ESQ. in his professional and individual capacities;
 72. SPENCER M. SAX, in his professional and individual capacities;
 73. ALBERTO GONZALES in his official and individual capacities;
 74. JOHNNIE E. FRAZIER in his official and individual capacities;
 75. IVIEWIT, INC., a Florida corporation;
 76. IVIEWIT, INC., a Delaware corporation;
 77. IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC., a Delaware corporation (f.k.a. Uview.com, Inc.);
 78. UVIEW.COM, INC., a Delaware corporation;
 79. IVIEWIT TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a Delaware corporation (f.k.a. Iviewit Holdings, Inc.);
 80. IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC., a Florida corporation;
 81. IVIEWIT.COM, INC., a Florida corporation;
 82. I.C., INC., a Florida corporation;
 83. IVIEWIT.COM, INC., a Delaware corporation;
 84. IVIEWIT.COM LLC, a Delaware limited liability company;
 85. IVIEWIT LLC, a Delaware limited liability company;
 86. IVIEWIT CORPORATION, a Florida corporation;
 87. IBM CORPORATION;
- C. Cases @ US District Court - Southern District NY
1. (07cv09599) Anderson v The State of New York, et al. - WHISTLEBLOWER LAWSUIT;
 2. (07cv11196) Bernstein, et al. v Appellate Division First Department Disciplinary Committee, et al.;
 3. (07cv11612) Esposito v The State of New York, et al.;
 4. (08cv00526) Capogrosso v New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct, et al.;
 5. (08cv02391) McKeown v The State of New York, et al.;
 6. (08cv02852) Galison v The State of New York, et al.;
 7. (08cv03305) Carvel v The State of New York, et al.;
 8. (08cv4053) Gizella Weisshaus v The State of New York, et al.;
 9. (08cv4438) Suzanne McCormick v The State of New York, et al.;
 10. (08 cv 6368) John L. Petrec-Tolino v. The State of New York
45. Any other known or unknown person or known or unknown entity not named herein that will cause your review of the complaint you are charged with investigating to be biased by any conflicting past, present, or future financial interest or any other interest?

NO YES

Please describe in detail any identified conflicted parties on a separate and attached sheet fully disclosing all information regarding the conflict. If the answer is Yes, please describe the relations, relationships and / or interests and please affirm whether such presents a conflict of interest in fairly reviewing the matters herein without undue bias or prejudice of any kind.

- II. Do you, your spouse, and your dependents, in the aggregate, receive salary or other remuneration or financial considerations from any entity related to the enclosed parties to the proceeding of the matters including but not limited to campaign contributions whether direct, "in kind" or of any type at all?

NO YES

Please describe in detail any identified conflicted parties on a separate and attached sheet fully disclosing all information regarding the conflict. If the answer is Yes, please describe the relations, relationships and / or interests and please affirm whether such presents a conflict of interest in fairly reviewing the matters herein without undue bias or prejudice of any kind.

- III. Have you, your spouse, and your dependents, in the aggregate, had any prior conversations with any person related to the proceeding of the Iviewit or related matters?

NO YES

Please describe in detail any identified conflicted parties on a separate and attached sheet fully disclosing all information regarding the conflict. If the answer is Yes, please describe the relations, relationships and / or interests and please affirm whether such presents a conflict of interest in fairly reviewing the matters herein without undue bias or prejudice of any kind.

- IV. I have run a thorough and exhaustive Conflict of Interest check to conform with any and all state, federal or local laws and any professional association rules and regulations obligating such check and/or disclosure to verify that my spouse, my dependents, and I in the aggregate, have no conflicts with any parties.

NO YES

- V. I have notified all parties with any liabilities regarding my continued actions in these matters, including state agencies, insurance concerns or any other person with liability that may result from my actions in these matters.

NO YES

RELEVANT SECTIONS OF JUDICIAL CANNONS, ATTORNEY CONDUCT CODES AND LAW¹⁵

Conflict of Interest Laws

Conflict of interest" indicates a situation where a private interest may influence a public decision. Conflict of Interest Laws are laws and

¹⁵ The Relevant Sections are merely a benchmark guide and other state, federal and international laws may be applicable to your particular circumstances in reviewing or acting in these matters. For a more complete list of applicable sections of law relating to these matters please visit http://Iviewit.tv/CompanyDocs/oneofthesedays/index.htm#_Toc107852933

regulations designed to prevent conflicts of interest. These laws may contain provisions related to financial or asset disclosure, exploitation of one's official position and privileges, regulation of campaign practices, etc.

New York State Consolidated Laws Penal

ARTICLE 200 BRIBERY INVOLVING PUBLIC SERVANTS AND RELATED OFFENSES

S 200.03 Bribery in the second degree
S 200.04 Bribery in the first degree
S 200.05 Bribery; defense
S 200.10 Bribe receiving in the third degree
S 200.11 Bribe receiving in the second degree
S 200.12 Bribe receiving in the first degree
S 200.15 Bribe receiving; no defense
S 200.20 Rewarding official misconduct in the second degree
S 200.22 Rewarding official misconduct in the first degree S 200.25 Receiving reward for official misconduct in the second degree
S 200.27 Receiving reward for official misconduct in the first degree
S 200.30 Giving unlawful gratuities
S 200.35 Receiving unlawful gratuities
S 200.40 Bribe giving and bribe receiving for public office; definition of term
S 200.45 Bribe giving for public office
S 200.50 Bribe receiving for public office

ARTICLE 175 OFFENSES INVOLVING FALSE WRITTEN STATEMENTS

S 175.05 Falsifying business records in the second degree. S 175.10 Falsifying business records in the first degree.
S 175.15 Falsifying business records; defense
S 175.20 Tampering with public records in the second degree
S 175.25 Tampering with public records in the first degree
S 175.30 Offering a false instrument for filing in the second degree
S 175.35 Offering a false instrument for filing in the first degree

NY Constitution ARTICLE XIII Public Officers

Public Officers - Public Officers ARTICLE 1

ARTICLE 2 Appointment and Qualification of Public Officers - ARTICLE 15 ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS

S 468-b. Clients' security fund of the state of New York
S 476-a. Action for unlawful practice of the law
S 476-b. Injunction to restrain defendant from unlawful practice of the law
S 476-c. Investigation by the attorney-general
S 487. Misconduct by attorneys
S 488. Buying demands on which to bring an action.

Public Officers Law SEC 73 Restrictions on the Activities Of Current and Former State Officers and Employees

Public Officers Law SEC 74 Code of Ethics

Conflicts of Interest Law, found in Chapter 68 of the New York City Charter, the City's Financial Disclosure Law, set forth in section 12-110 of the New York City Administrative Code, and the Lobbyist Gift Law, found in sections 3-224 through 3-228 of the Administrative Code.

TITLE 18 FEDERAL CODE & OTHER APPLICABLE FEDERAL LAW

TITLE 18 PART I CH 11

Sec. 201. Bribery of public officials and witnesses
Sec. 225. - Continuing financial crimes enterprise
BRIBERY, GRAFT, AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST
Sec. 205. - Activities of officers and employees in claims against and other matters affecting the Government
Sec. 208. - Acts affecting a personal financial interest
Sec. 210. - Offer to procure appointive public office
Sec. 225. - Continuing financial crimes enterprise

TITLE 18 PART I CH 79 Sec 1623 - False declarations before grand jury or court

Sec 654 - Officer or employee of United States converting property of another

TITLE 18 PART I CH 73 Sec 1511 - Obstruction of State or local law enforcement

TITLE 18 PART I CH 96 Sec 1961 RACKETEER INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT Organizations ("RICO")

Section 1503 (relating to obstruction of justice),
Section 1510 (relating to obstruction of criminal investigations)
Section 1511 (relating to the obstruction of State or local law enforcement),
Section 1952 (relating to racketeering),
Section 1957 (relating to engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity),

TITLE 18 PART I CH 96 SEC 1962 (A) RICO

TITLE 18 PART I CH 96 SEC 1962 (B) RICO

TITLE 18 PART I CH 96 SEC 1962 (C) RICO

TITLE 18 PART I CH 19 SEC 1962 (D) RICO

TITLE 18 PART I CH 19 CONSPIRACY Sec 371 CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT OFFENSE OR TO DEFRAUD UNITED STATES

Judicial Cannons

Canon 1. A Judge Should Uphold the Integrity and Independence of the Judiciary

[1.1] Deference to the judgments and rulings of courts depends upon public confidence in the integrity and independence of judges. The integrity and independence of judges depends in turn upon their acting without fear or favor. Although judges should be independent, they must comply with the law, including the provisions of this Code. Public confidence in the impartiality of the judiciary is maintained by the adherence of each judge to this responsibility. Conversely, violation of this Code diminishes public confidence in the judiciary and thereby does injury to the system of government under law.

Canon 2. A Judge Should Avoid Impropriety and the Appearance of Impropriety in All Activities

(A) A judge shall respect and comply with the law and shall act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.

[2.2][2A] The prohibition against behaving with impropriety or the appearance of impropriety applies to both the professional and personal conduct of a judge. Because it is not practicable to list all prohibited acts, the proscription is necessarily cast in general terms that extend to conduct by judges that is harmful although not specifically mentioned in the Code. Actual improprieties under this standard include violations of law, court rules or other specific provisions of this Code. The test for appearance of impropriety is whether the conduct would create in reasonable minds a perception that the judge's ability to carry out judicial responsibilities with integrity, impartiality and competence is impaired.

Canon 3. A Judge Should Perform the Duties of the Office Impartially and Diligently

(B) Adjudicative responsibilities.

(1) A judge shall be faithful to the law and maintain professional competence in it. A judge shall not be swayed by partisan interests, public clamor or fear of criticism.

(2) A judge shall require order and decorum in proceedings before the judge.

(D) Disciplinary responsibilities.

(1) A judge who receives information indicating a substantial likelihood that another judge has committed a substantial violation of this Part shall take appropriate action.

(2) A judge who receives information indicating a substantial likelihood that a lawyer has committed a substantial violation of the Code of Professional Responsibility shall take appropriate action.

(3) Acts of a judge in the discharge of disciplinary responsibilities are part of a judge's judicial duties.

(E) Disqualification.

(1) A judge shall disqualify himself or herself in a proceeding in which the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned

[3.11][3B(6)(e)] A judge may delegate the responsibilities of the judge under Canon 3B(6) to a member of the judge's staff. A judge must make reasonable efforts, including the provision of appropriate supervision, to ensure that Section 3B(6) is not violated through law clerks or other personnel on the judge's staff. This provision does not prohibit the judge or the judge's law clerk from informing all parties individually of scheduling or administrative decisions.

[3.21][3E(1)] Under this rule, a judge is disqualified whenever the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned, regardless whether any of the specific rules in Section 3E(1) apply. For example, if a judge were in the process of negotiating for employment with a law firm, the judge would be disqualified from any matters in which that firm appeared, unless the disqualification was waived by the parties after disclosure by the judge.

[3.22][3E(1)] A judge should disclose on the record information that the judge believes the parties or their lawyers might consider relevant to the question of disqualification, even if the judge believes there is no real basis for disqualification.

Canon 4. A Judge May Engage in Extra-Judicial Activities To Improve the Law, the Legal System, and the Administration of Justice

Canon 5. A Judge Should Regulate Extra-Judicial Activities To Minimize the Risk of Conflict with Judicial Duties

Public Office Conduct Codes New York

PUBLIC OFFICERS LAW Laws 1909, Chap. 51.

CHAPTER 47 OF THE CONSOLIDATED LAWS PUBLIC OFFICERS LAW

Sec. 17. Defense and indemnification of state officers and employees.

2 (b)

Sec. 18. Defense and indemnification of officers and employees of public entities.

3 (b)

Sec. 74. Code of ethics.

(2)

(3)

(4)

§ 73. Business or professional activities by state officers and employees and party officers.

NY Attorney Conduct Code

(a) "Differing interests" include every interest that will adversely affect either the judgment or the loyalty of a lawyer to a client, whether it be a conflicting, inconsistent, diverse, or other interest.

CANON 5. A Lawyer Should Exercise Independent Professional Judgment on Behalf of a Client

DR 5-101 [1200.20] Conflicts of Interest - Lawyer's Own Interests.

DR 5-102 [1200.21] Lawyers as Witnesses.

DR 5-103 [1200.22] Avoiding Acquisition of Interest in Litigation.

DR 5-104 [1200.23] Transactions Between Lawyer and Client.

DR 5-105 [1200.24] Conflict of Interest; Simultaneous Representation.

DR 5-108 [1200.27] Conflict of Interest - Former Client.

CANON 6. A Lawyer Should Represent a Client Competently

CANON 7. A Lawyer Should Represent a Client Zealously Within the Bounds of the Law

DR 7-102 [1200.33] Representing a Client Within the Bounds of the Law.

DR 7-110 [1200.41] Contact with Officials.

DR 8-101 [1200.42] Action as a Public Official.

DR 8-103 [1200.44] Lawyer Candidate for Judicial Office.

A. A lawyer who is a candidate for judicial office shall comply with section 100.5 of the Chief Administrator's Rules Governing Judicial Conduct (22 NYCRR) and Canon 5 of the Code of Judicial Conduct.

CANON 9. A Lawyer Should Avoid Even the Appearance of Professional Impropriety

DR 9-101 [1200.45] Avoiding Even the Appearance of Impropriety.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing statements in this CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE FORM are true and correct. Executed on this ____ day of _____ 20__ the foregoing statements in this CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE FORM are true. I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims will subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties, including possible culpability in the RICO related crimes including the alleged attempted murder of the inventor Eliot Bernstein and his wife and children in a car-bombing attempt on their lives. I agree to accept responsibility for the unbiased review, and presentation of findings to the appropriate party(ies) who also have executed this CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE FORM. A lack of signature will serve as evidence that I have accepted this document **with** conflict in the event that I continue to represent the matters without signing such COI first and will be an admission of such conflict(s).

Organization – United States Court of Appeal for the Second Circuit

Print Name & Title _____

Signature _____ Date ____/____/____

If you are unable to sign this COI and are therefore unable to continue further to pursue these matters, please attach a statement of whom we may contact as your replacement. A copy can be sent to Iviewit@Iviewit.tv or the mailing address below:

Eliot I. Bernstein
Inventor
Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – DL
Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – DL
Iviewit Holdings, Inc. – FL
Iviewit Technologies, Inc. – DL
Uview.com, Inc. – DL
Iviewit.com, Inc. – FL
Iviewit.com, Inc. – DL
I.C., Inc. – FL
Iviewit.com LLC – DL
Iviewit LLC – DL
Iviewit Corporation – FL
Iviewit, Inc. – FL
Iviewit, Inc. – DL
Iviewit Corporation

2753 N.W. 34th St.
Boca Raton, Florida 33434-3459
(561) 245.8588 (o)
(561) 886.7628 (c)
(561) 245-8644 (f)
Iviewit@Iviewit.tv
www.Iviewit.tv

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

This message and any attachments are covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. SS 2510-2521. This message is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message or call (561) 245-8588. If you are the intended recipient but do not wish to receive communications through this medium, please so advise the sender immediately.