Ethan Book for U.S. Senate

July 20, 2010

Honorable
Gayle S. Slossberg
State Senator
Chairman
Government Administration and Elections Committee
State of Connecticut
Legislative Office Building, Room 2200
Hartford, CT 06106

Honorable
James F. Spallone
State Representative
Chairman
Government Administration and Elections Committee
State of Connecticut
Legislative Office Building, Room 2202
Hartford, CT 06106

Dear Chairmen Slossberg and Spallone:

This letter is a supplement to my formal pleading to you of July 16, 2010 and what I have described as an unaddressed political cancer in state government. This matter also pertains to claims which I have made such as to the Secretary of State of me not having a full and fair opportunity to campaign (re: my Declaration and Petition for Declaratory Ruling of June 24, 2010).

In my previous pleading, I again described relevant matters of background including my role in 1985 as a specialized bank officer of having observed fundamental problems with the activities of the Connecticut Resources Recovery Authority (CRRA), of a legal proceeding which I initiated for obtaining access to the bids given to the CRRA for the redevelopment of the $300 million Greater Bridgeport Resource Recovery Project [CRRA et al. v. Freedom of Information Commission et al., 19 Conn.App. 489 (1989)], of a federal civil lawsuit that I presented in 1995 against the CRRA (Book v. CRRA et al., Case No. 3:95-cv-1344, with other named Defendants including the Office of the Attorney General and the Office of the Chief State's Attorney), and of a curiously timed wrongful conviction of me in Stamford Superior Court in 2001 for a petty misdemeanor matter. There is good cause for me to expand on the information and issues by way of a 4th Supplement to Motion for Reconsideration which I presented yesterday in Bridgeport Superior Court regarding a quite title action (Ethan Book Jr.

v. Monica L.Sullender, FBT-CV-07-5011895-S). Additional background and explanation is in order.

The federal civil lawsuit against the CRRA was filed in July of 1995 (that during the first year of the first term of service of Governor John Rowland). It was during about December of that year, while the federal lawsuit was in initial stages of pleadings, that I received a telephone call from an official of the Department of Revenue Services (DRS). I was advised that I had been selected for a business sales and use tax audit. Because of the manner and timing of that call, I was immediately suspicious of a political motive. I asked the man how and why I was selected for an audit. The man gave brief explanation which I decided to review further through correspondence. I sent to the DRS a letter requesting additional explanation. I was then provided a letter with a different explanation than what had been given to me verbally. I followed that with a formal request for information pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act for documentation which might support or corroborate what had been explained by mail. There was little effective response for which I filed a formal complaint with the Freedom of Information Commission. After a formal hearing, the Commission ordered the DRS to fully respond to my request for information. It did so with additional information which further reinforced my suspicions that I had been selected for a tax audit for arbitrary reasons which conflicted with any legitimate public purpose. I therefore resisted the DRS request to review my tax records. My thinking was that if I had been selected arbitrarily for improper reasons, then I should not be inconvenienced with the time and effort of providing the tax records, also that any records provided could well be subject to other arbitrary and politically motivated response by the DRS.

The response by the DRS to my position of peaceable resistance was to arbitrarily discount entire categories of legitimate and usual business expenses and to then assess me alleged past-due taxes of $13, 693 with interests and penalties. I presented an agency appeal which in November of 1997 was denied. The appeal was denied by Scot R. Anderson, whom had not been hired by the DRS in accord with the requirements of the State Personnel Act. At that time, the total demand was for a total amount of $24,780 in claimed taxes, interests and penalties. During the late 1990's, there were several DRS attachments of bank accounts whereby, dispute my proper and timely requests for Court review, resulted in the DRS taking more than $12,000 in personal and business funds.

This is also relevant to the setting of the curiously timed petty misdemeanor action in Stamford Superior Court (with additional detail provided in my previous pleading and also available at my campaign website, particularly at the page entitled "Political Corruption"). That wrongful conviction resulted on January 17, 2003 in further unlawful action of the late Judge Richard Tobin of revoking and appeal bond and in imposing an unusually harsh sentence. Curiously without a reasonable opportunity for early release for an alleged first offense, non-violent Class C misdemeanor (with additional information available), I was a special guest of the Department of Corrections from January 17, 2003 to January 8, 2004.

It was during that unlawful incarceration that I became late in making payments on my residential/commercial property located at 805 Kings Highway East in Fairfield, CT. During about May of 2003, I sent to the known mortgage company a lengthy letter explaining my situation, advising of my change in address and advising of the names and telephone numbers of other authorized contacts. Without any other notice, the advised acquaintances began to receive wholly misleading and coercive telephone calls from Michael Reiner of the law firm Reiner, Reiner and Bendett (Farmington, CT). Between July and early October of 2003, I sent to the mortgage company or to Attorney Reiner four additional letters regarding the mortgage. I did not receive any notice regarding a mortgage foreclosure lawsuit until October 24, 2003 (that via regular mail). The materials reflected that a mortgage foreclosure lawsuit had been initiated in June of 2003 in the name of Mortgage Electronics Registration Systems, Inc. That was the first that I had ever seen the name Mortgage Electronics Registration Systems, Inc. (MERS). It is also of interest that the foreclosure proceeding was joined by the DRS regarding the tax matter described above. The DRS has been represented by Thomas Ventre, Assistant Attorney General. I promptly presented a proper Motion to Dismiss alleging among other matters that there was not personal jurisdiction for me not having been properly served. The Motion was not reviewed by the Court until after I was released on January 8, 2004. However, on January 20, 2004, Judge Barry Stevens disregarded good information and legal references regarding dismissal for lack of personal jurisdiction and he denied my Motion. Again disregarding legitimate defenses, on March 8, 2004, Judge Stevens issued a Judgment of Foreclosure by Sale. I took reasonable and proper steps to appeal that judgment.

In accord with the usual rotation of Superior Court judges, in late 2004, Judge Earl B. Richards, III began to administer the trial court portion of the lawsuit. This is also curious in that during the late 1990's, Earl Richards was a Deputy Assistant State's Attorney assigned to New Haven Superior Court where he had administered matters of state livery statutes presented against me by the Department of Motor Vehicles. At a hearing of January 31, 2005, Judge Richards disregarded key areas of information and argument which I raised and he rather applied distorted interpretations of Practice Book 61-11 by granting a mortgage company motion to terminate the usual automatic appeal bond. At that time, MERS was being represented by Attorney David F. Borrino of Reiner, Reiner & Bendett (later renamed Bendett & McHugh). These events were also during the courtship and engagement period between Daisy Sanchez and me (My first marriage had failed largely for the pressures and complications of the unresolved CRRA issues; additional relevant information available.).

Despite my proper and vigorous objections, the mortgage lawsuit proceeded to an auction on March 26, 2005 (the same day that Daisy Sanchez and me were married). John Centopani, an associate of Attorneys Title & Abstract Co. Inc. in Fairfield, CT was the preferred bidder. On May 9, 2005, without the proper factual support, Judge Richards approved the sale. I promptly contacted Attorney Borrino to obtain the amount of the claimed deficiency. My intention was to use some peersonal investment funds to pay the deficiency and in accord with the mortgage loan, to reinstate the mortgage. However, despite repeated inquiries by me and a real estate mortgage agent acting on my behalf, Attorney Borrino never responded to my inquiry. Daisy,

her two teen-aged children, and I lived together at the Fairfield property. Despite the Court-ordered termination of the automatic appeal bond, there were various other residual appeal provisions for which the foreclosure action should not have progressed. However, under Judge Richards, it did. Nonetheless, my continuing pleadings to the Bridgeport Superior Court and the Appellate Court apparently made Mr. Centopani nervous about his perceived deal. On June 1, 2005, without proper lawful authority, he was a party to the placement of a large dumpster at the main driveway to the Fairfield property. Understandably, that made Daisy very nervous. On June 14, 2005, Judge Richards unlawfully and illegally issued an order of execution of ejectment, that specifying the date of June 27, 2005. If that wasn't enough, at a scheduled Court hearing of June 21, 2005, that at a time that Daisy had accompanied me to Court, in the Courthouse hallway and in the presence of various, Mr. Centopani, his legal counsel Joseph Sanfilippo and another associate made various very serious accusations and threats against Daisy and me (additional detail available).

The unlawful order of execution of ejectment was further unlawfully executed on the morning of June 27, 2005. At that time, Daisy, the children and I went to live at her property known as 690-692 Dewey Street in Bridgeport, CT. The property is a multi-family property. We resided in the second floor apartment. The first floor apartment was rented. Also, by mutual agreement, I used a portion of the unfinished basement as the office for my small business, a limousine service business.

The events of the mortgage foreclosure proceeding had been contemplated between Daisy and me before they occurred though they were not expected. What transpired with Mr. Centopani and Attorney Sanfilippo was neither contemplated nor expected. Notwithstanding such major challenges, during the early portion of the first year of marriage, the initial family experience at the Dewey Street property seemed to proceed well. However, a proper resolution of the mortgage foreclosure proceeding did not occur in a time frame that I had anticipated. Daisy gradually became understandably stressed. By early 2006, she was talking about separation and divorce. On March 15, 2006, she formally filed for a marital dissolution. With that, there were Automatic Court Orders. With other intervening improper governmental intrusions, there was a mandated separation beginning in late March of 2006. Substantial personal belongings of mine continued to be stored at the Dewey Street property.

On December 13, 2006, there was a fully premature and arbitrary ruling by Judge Edward Dolan to grant a dissolution. On December 20, 2006, I presented a formal Motion to Vacate Judgment. According to state procedures, such a timely motion to vacate judgment delays the effective finality of the ruling being challenged. Although I properly and timely claimed my Motion for Court review, it never appeared on the Court's short calendar for scheduling. In late July of 2007, I learned that Daisy had attempted to sell the Dewey Street property and to relocate with the two minor-aged children out of state, all in violation of the Automatic Court Orders which have continued in effect. The attempted title closing was on July 6, 2007. Also, I later learned that the title search had been performed by Attorneys Title & Abstract, the company of association of John Centopani.

When I learned about the attempted title transfer to Monica L. Sullender, I promptly contacted her to advise about personal belongings of mine which were known to be stored in the basement area. I also verbally advised her about the issue of the defective title transfer. Ms. Sullender was initially cooperative regarding my access to my personal belongings. On August 15, 2007, she and a friend assisted me in access to the belongings. I removed some limited items that I could then transport and specifically discussed with them continuing security of the items. In my presence, they placed locks on the doors of access to that basement area.

I then initiated formal legal proceedings to reverse the attempted title transfer of July 6, 2007. At that point, Ms. Sullender ceased her cooperation to me of access to my personal belongings. Ms. Sullender was represented by Attorney Brian A. Daley of Sandak, Hennessey & Grecco (Stamford, CT). Attorney Daley was effectively the counsel for Ticor Title Insurance which had relied on the title search performed by Attorneys Title & Abstract Co. However, during that proceeding, Attorney Daley used quite expansive and misleading arguments in a Request to Revise, to object to my Motion to Add Defendant, to object to my motion for emergency temporary injunction (that regarding access to my personal belongings), and in a Motion for Nonsuit. Despite my proper rebuttals to his arguments, on July 2, 2009, Judge Joseph Doherty issued a ruling to grant a Defendant's Motion for Nonsuit. On July 18, 2009, I presented a timely Motion for Rehearing of Court Ruling to Grant Defendant's Motion for Nonsuit (that raising also a substantive issue of Conn. Gen. Statutes, Sec. 51-183b regarding time limitation for a Court to issue a ruling). That unopposed Motion was denied by Judge Doherty on October 14, 2009. On November 5, 2009, I presented a timely Motion for Reconsideration. After three other unopposed Supplements, and after obtaining new disturbing information on July16th regarding substantial loss and reckless damage to my personal belongings stored at the Dewey Street property, on July 19, 2010, I presented the attached 4th Supplement to Motion for Reconsideration. Of particular note of the Supplement are the accompanying photographs which depict the basement office space as it appeared in September of 2006, that compared with how it was observed on July 16, 2010. The differences between the photographs are striking!

All the above is relevant to my substantive claims of not having a full and fair opportunity to campaign. This situation is clearly a result of systematic biases in state agencies and state courts, with particular focus on observed and implied roles of the Office of the Attorney General. Clearly, Attorney General Richard Blumenthal has denigrated his high public position to act merely like a corporate asset manager, that is to defend and deflect legitimate claims against state officials and state agencies, that also in glaring disregard for the reasonable rights of the citizenry, particularly of individual established Constitutional rights.

A key portion of the 4th Supplement is provided below (from pages 2 – 4):

> . . .The primary focus of the attached letter [to this Committee] is a wrongful conviction of the Plaintiff in Stamford Superior Court in 2001 for a first-offense, non-violent Class C misdemeanor. For the facts which are provided (which are not exhaustive), it can be said that

there were subtle twists of facts and laws applied by Stamford Superior Court in making what is fundamentally a political matter look like a criminal one. This is also in the context that near the time of the January 2001 arrest of the Plaintiff in that misdemeanor matter, the Plaintiff was taking substantive steps before the U.S. Court of Appeals regarding a proper, timely appeal of a curious action of federal District Judge Dominic Squatrito (formerly the official Campaign Manager for Senator Joseph Lieberman) in dismissing a proper lawsuit presented by the Plaintiff, Ethan Book Jr. v. Connecticut Resources Recovery Authority (CRRA), Case No. Case No. 3:95-cv-1344. In that case, there are several other named Defendants including the Office of the Attorney General (for actions taken while Mr. Lieberman was Attorney General) and the Office of the Chief State's Attorney. Presumed Assistant Attorney General Charles Walsh represents the state Defendants in that matter. It is important to understand that for various demonstrated official errors against the Plaintiff, substantive errors of the type which can be reasonably deduced to be malicious, the Plaintiff seeks in a financial demand the amount of up to $250 million. Considering the nature of the substantive, abundant and credible information which is provided in the present, it is highly likely that the extreme and intentional legal errors which were made in Stamford Superior Court regarding the petty misdemeanor were made with a view to discouraging, delaying and discrediting the Plaintiff from further pursuit of his claims in Book v. CRRA. For the nature of the usual role of the Office of the Attorney General as well as for other known information, it is likely that Attorney General Richard Blumenthal has been an active participant in a broadly pervasive culture mentality among officials of state agencies and state courts of not giving to the Plaintiff what the Plaintiff seeks before state agencies and state courts (either as a plaintiff or as a defendant), that as part of an understood or implied unarticulated strategy of discouraging, delaying and discrediting the Plaintiff from further pursuit of his federal claims. This Plaintiff further asserts that if it was not perceived by the mentioned actors that the Plaintiff's civil claims such as are found in Book v. CRRA were not with reasonable merit, there would not be cause or motive for the extreme and overt actions such as have been observed and are described here.

Then when the Plaintiff began to present and pursue additional federal claims involving both demands for federal court mandamus orders against state court officials and of seeking substantial financial demands against state court judges (e.g., Book v. Richard Tobin et al., Case NO. 3:04-CV-0442, Book v. Earl B. Richards, III et al., Case No. 3:05cv0892, and Book v. Flemming Norcott, Jr. et al., Case No. 3:07-cv-1367), the situation became even worse. In other words, for properly protecting himself from extreme and biased state actions against him, the Plaintiff has been compelled to seek relief in federal courts including against state court judges. However, in concerted retaliation against him for such proper, lawful action, the bias against him of other state court judges became even greater. Other state court judges have followed an often observed human practice of "circling the wagons" to protect those of their own kind. Thus, the Plaintiff has been clearly and substantially re-victimized.

Considering the role of Attorney General Richard Blumenthal who has been an active participant in such an unarticulated state agenda against the Plaintiff, Mr. Blumenthal has

observedly acted with the view that his broad political network and support would effect to shield him from normal responsibility and liability. Therefore, Mr. Blumenthal and those associated with him have acted in a manner, not of doing what is right, rather in doing what they have believed that they, in concert with others of similar mind, could get away with. However, recent events have caused that broad political network and support to weaken. The Plaintiff is reminded of a principle which is found in The Elements of the Art of Packing – As Applied to Juries Particularly in Cases of Libel Law by Jeremy Bentham (1821, Royal Exchange, London), that "No man can serve two masters; a prudent man will serve the [perceived] strongest" (p. 165). Also, the Plaintiff has additional information and means to make that apparent artificial network and support to further weaken and even fall.

In addition, other interested persons including private attorneys who have assumed opposing positions in the present action and others of this Bridgeport Superior Court such as in Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. v. Ethan Book Jr., Case No. CV-03-0403879-S have been well aware of such an unarticulated state agenda against the Plaintiff and rather than properly satisfy their professional role and responsibility as being "a representative of clients, an officer of the legal system and a public citizen having special responsibility for the quality of justice" (Preamble to Connecticut Rules of Professional Conduct), they have acted opportunistically and unprofessionally with the same sense of being protected by an artificial shield. The accumulated prejudice to this Plaintiff for such state practices over a period of more than two decades has been horrific, abusive and untenable!

This is presented as additional information and comments presented with a view that this Committee promptly takes up the matters which I present, that for full and prompt review, investigation and resolve. There is an unaddressed political cancer in state government which needs to be openly reviewed, diagnosed and effectively treated.

I respectfully request your full review and response.

Sincerely,

Ethan Book

Enclosure

c: M.Jodi Rell, Governor
Susan Bysiewicz, Secretary of State
Barbara M. Quinn, Chief Court Administrator
Andrew J. McDonald, State Senator; Chairman, Judiciary Committee*
Michael P. Lawlor, State Representative; Chairman, Judiciary Committee*
Christopher Caruso, State Representative (126th)*
Tony Huang, State Representative (134th)*
Thomas Drew, State Representative (123nd)*
Christopher Healey, Chairman Connecticut Republican Party
Linda McMahon, Candidate for the U.S. Senate*
Peter Schiff, Candidate for the U.S. Senate*

* Denotes those receiving notice of this letter electronically!

Constitutional integrity and individual freedom!

P.O. Box 1385 - Fairfield, CT 06825
Telephones (203) 367-8779 and (203) 943-0045
newenglimo@aol.com - www.ethanbookforussenate.org