

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

ETHAN BOOK

Plaintiff

and

ETHAN BOOK FOR U.S. SENATE

Plaintiff

: Case No. 3:10-cv-1228 (PCD)

v.

SUSAN BYSIEWICZ

Defendant

GAYLE S. SLOSSBERG

Defendant

JAMES F. SPALLONE

Defendant

RICHARD BLUMENTHAL

Defendant

and

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Defendant

: November 4, 2010

AMENDED CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT

A. PARTIES

1. ETHAN BOOK is a long-term citizen of the State of Connecticut residing in the Town of Fairfield, P.O. Box 1385, Fairfield, CT 06825. He is a Republican candidate for the position of U.S. Senate.

2. ETHAN BOOK FOR U.S. SENATE is a political campaign duly registered with the Federal Elections Commission and with an address of 225 Vine Street in Bridgeport, CT 06604..

3. SUSAN BYSIEWICZ is the elected Secretary of State for the State of Connecticut with an office at the State Capitol, Room 104 in Hartford, CT 06106. She is being sued in both her official and individual capacities.

4. GAYLE S. SLOSSBERG is an elected State Senator who serves as Co-Chairman of the legislative Government Administration and Elections Committee. Her office address is the Legislative Office Building, Room 2200, Hartford, CT 06106. She is being sued in her individual capacity.

5. JAMES F. SPALLONE is an elected State Representative who serves as Co-Chairman of the legislative Government Administration and Elections Committee. His office address is the Legislative Office Building, Room 2202, Hartford, CT 06106. He is being sued in his individual capacity.

6. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL is the elected Attorney General for the State of Connecticut. His office address is 55 Elm Street, Hartford, CT 06106. He is the Democrat Party endorsed candidate for the U.S. Senate. He is being sued in his individual capacity.

7. The STATE OF CONNECTICUT is a people occupying a fixed territory within the United States of America, bound together by one body politic and exercising, through the medium of an organized government as is limited through various provisions that are established in the U.S. Constitution and federal laws, independent sovereignty and control over all persons and

things within its boundaries. The State of Connecticut was one of the original thirteen colonies to form the United States of America. It carries the nickname the “Constitution State”.

B. JURISDICTION:

8. The jurisdiction of this federal court is invoked pursuant to the 9th and 14th Amendments, 42 U.S. Code, Sections 1983, 1985 and 1986 and Federal Rules of Civ. Pro., Rule 65 (re: 28 U.S. Code, Sec. 2283) or in the alternative Federal Rules of Civ. Pro., Rule 57 (re: 28 U.S. Code, Section 2201) and for pendent jurisdiction for negligence and conspiracy and of continuing courses of tortuous conduct.

9. This lawsuit involves issues which are specific to the campaign and state electoral process which have adversely affected the Plaintiff’s campaign and the electoral process for the candidacy for the Republican Party for the position of U.S. Senator, those regarding a Connecticut Republican Convention which took place in Hartford, CT on May 21 and May 22, 2010, a Republican Primary primary election which is presently scheduled for August 10, 2010 and for a general election which is presently scheduled for November 2, 2010. Such issues also involve matters and prejudice to both the Plaintiffs and the general public regarding unaddressed matters of what the Plaintiffs describe as a long-term, unaddressed political cancer in state government, matters for which there is ample record in this Connecticut District Court, in the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals and the U.S. Supreme Court of multiple lawsuits presented by Plaintiff Ethan Book since 1994.

Through various state court actions including Conn. Resources Recovery Authority et al. v. Freedom of Information Commission et al., 19 Conn.App. 489 (See also AC 7414, PSC-94-0290, AC 19437, PSC-00-0499.), E. Book v. Paul Silvester, Office of the Treasurer, State of Connecticut, Case No. CVB-97-0573440-S (Hartford), E. Book v. Freedom of Information Commission, AC 22359, PSC-01-0469, State v. E. Book dba New England Limousine Service of Fairfield, AC 22496, State v. E. Book, AC 22399, extensive litigation of the action of

Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc., Case No. CV-03-0403879, in Bridgeport Superior Court, the Conn. Appellate Court and also the Conn. Supreme Court, and also various administrative actions including with the Conn. Claims Commissioner (re: E. Book v. Stamford Superior Court, Judicial Branch and Office of the State's Attorney, Files No. 19126 and 19483) and most recently before the Secretary of State, there has been exhaustion of state remedies for related issues pertaining to Book. In fact, there has been institutionalized obstruction of legitimate public issues which E. Book has peaceably sought to litigate before state agencies and state courts such that Book does not have a full and fair opportunity to litigate. There are both factual and legal bases for federal court jurisdiction (See Article III, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution, also Monroe v. Pape, 365 U.S. 167.)

C. NATURE OF THE CASE

10. E. Book has been known in the State of Connecticut as a whistleblower of state activities in resource recovery, a role which began in 1985 with his experience in specialized banking. After having worked for about seven years with Bank of America in Latin America and in New York City (The work in New York City was in the Bank of America section of specialized financing to electric utility companies.), in early 1985, Book accepted a position with Connecticut Bank & Trust Co. (CBT). He was Vice President in the CBT Bridgeport Commercial Office. Early 1985 was a time that the State of Connecticut was in early stages of developing several large resource recovery (i.e., "garbage-to-energy") projects. At that time, William O'Neill (D) was the Governor and Joseph Lieberman (D) was Attorney General. With his specialized experience in regulated industries, Book was asked by his bank superiors to review such state activities of resource recovery. The primary focus of his attention was for the greater Bridgeport area including the redevelopment of a large-scale mass-burn project sponsored by the Conn. Resources Recovery Authority (CRRRA) and a smaller-scale independent project planned by the Town of Stratford.

11. Early in his review, Book saw some warning signals for the proposed CRRRA project

for greater Bridgeport. For example, he observed that the proposed Bridgeport project was grossly oversized. In addition, with his access to the proposed contract between the CRRA and Signal Environmental Systems, Inc. (aka Wheelabrator Technologies, Inc.), the developer/operator for the Bridgeport Project, Book observed that the proposed contract was very favorable to Signal. It is important to understand that the Town of Fairfield, where Book resided together with his wife and family, was one of the CRRA targets for participation in its Bridgeport Project. At that time, Jacqueline Durrell (R) was the First Selectman, Carl Dickman (R) was Selection and John Metosopoulos (R) was State Representative of the District in which Book resided.¹ When Book presented his observations to his bank superiors, that after working only for seven months with CBT, he was quickly and harshly fired (See attached text of article of April 6, 1987 of the Bridgeport Telegram; Exhibit 1, p. A-1. It is particularly noted that the facts which are represented in the article have been unchallenged.).

12. Book has two advanced degrees, both with honors. One of the degrees is from the Thunderbird School of Global Management ("Thunderbird"), located in Glendale, AZ, a specialty school where Book also served as student body president. He additionally served

¹ In a letter which Book presented on November 27, 1987 to the Fairfield Ethics Commission, he described a meeting which he had with First Selectman Durrell on August 24, 1987. In the meeting, he made reference to the lack of disclosed support for her position in August of 1985 of urging the Town to participate in the CRRA's Bridgeport Project. He specifically asked her if she had received any personal benefit, either financial or political, for such support. In the meeting, she answered negatively. However, as Book explained in his letter to the Ethics Commission, he had recorded the conversation and a subsequent voice stress analysis clearly reflected that she had answered the question negatively (A similar result of voice stress analysis for the same question presented by Book to former City of Bridgeport Mayor Leonard Paoletta reflected the same result.). Additional information is available.

Also, information regarding improper conduct of Mr. Dickman as Selectman is found as attachments to Book's Amendment of March 24, 1886 in Book v. CRRA. There are copies of Town of Fairfield approved minutes for its meetings of the Representative Town Meeting of August 12, 1985 and August 26, 1985. Between those two meetings, Mr. Dickman had commented to Book that there were people who were commenting that he might have a conflict of interest. However, that would be an inappropriate comment as Book did not then hold any public office and any potential personal interest had been fully disclosed.

a successful two-year term in the U.S. Peace Corps in Bucaramanga, Colombia. Further, Book worked very successfully for about seven years with Bank of America. However, with the unresolved political implications for his brief experience in Connecticut with CBT, he was unable to get other work in banking. In addition, there were logical domestic implications of the discharge from CBT, and further various overt acts from local political figures or those associated with them apparently intended to make Book's personal and family life uncomfortable. Specifically, Rev. David DeVries, the pastor of the Baptist Church where Book and his wife and sons attended in Fairfield mentioned to him that he had received comments from four people about possible illicit sexual conduct between Book and a woman who was active in local politics. However, after Rev. DeVries reviewed the matter, he determined that there was no basis for the rumors. Book then told the pastor that he believed that the four people were active local political figures and that they likely knew each other. Rev. DeVries did not respond to that comments. This is one example of several of observed malicious attempts to make Book's family life uncomfortable. In this setting, on June 2, 1988, there was a long-distance marital separation involving Book's wife, then of 16 years, and his three young sons (then aged 10, 6 and 5). That separation, which resulted in new residence of Book's wife and three sons in the State of Idaho at a distance of 2600 miles from Connecticut, observedly violated both state and federal laws of child custody. However, Book was not able to obtain reasonable support from state or local law enforcement agencies for that substantive issue. Other curious particular actions impacting Book's distressed family situation were observed in 1990 of Deputy Sheriff Warren Tingley who was also the Chairman of the Fairfield Republican Town Committee (that pertaining to service of an Idaho-based divorce summons, one for which there was not legal jurisdiction for the State of Idaho to administer such an action) and in 1992 regarding Connecticut enforcement of a wholly invalid Idaho divorce decree by Veronica Reich, Attorney with the Bridgeport based law firm of Rubens & Lazinger (Senior Partner Samuel Lazinger has been actively involved in the Fairfield Republican Party and in Town of Fairfield government for over 25 years and he recently served as a Republican delegate in the May Connecticut Republican Convention.). In addition to fully failing to contemplate the jurisdictional defects of the foreign state decree, she also attempted to impose a wholly novel, expanded and self-serving scope of "good faith".

13. As an alternative livelihood, in 1989 Book began a limousine service business. Shortly after beginning such livelihood, he observed yet other political warning signals. Officials of the Conn. Dept. of Transportation (DOT) appeared to be exceeding their authority in manners similar to officials of the CRRA. Book was observing some arbitrary official actions that impeded the development of the limousine service business. He did more review and learned that the DOT Commissioner is also a member of the CRRA board of directors. He further observed that the manner that the DOT attempts to administer state livery statutes, including Conn. Gen. Statutes, Sec. 13b-103 is an improper, unlawful intrusion in the 1st Amendment right of association (an apparent cornerstone to the concept of free enterprise in the U.S.; See Estelle T. Griswold et al. v. State of Connecticut, 381 US 479, 14 L.Ed.2d 510, 85 S.Ct. 1678.). Thus, Book began also to challenge such official positions in state and federal courts. While doing so, he encountered numerous other indications of invidious discrimination against him by DOT officials and local law enforcement (See State v. E. Book v. New England Limousine Service of Fairfield, AC 22496.).

14. Book also took various steps to obtain additional information regarding his observations of CRRA problem activities. Particularly through the Conn. Freedom of Information Act, he obtained a substantial amount of additional information through which he identified incidents of bid-rigging, bond fraud, mail fraud and other unlawful activities. He presented such information to the Conn. Auditors of Public Accounts and the Conn. Attorney General (then under the direction of Joseph Lieberman; See attached letter of 10/23/07 sent to Senator Lieberman; Exhibit 2, p. A-3.). However, nothing of substance was done to resolve the matters. A published Appellate Court case which dealt with Book's attempt to gain access to the bids given for the redevelopment and operation of the CRRA's Greater Bridgeport Resource Recovery Project is found as CRRA et al. v. Freedom of Information et al., 19 Conn.App. 489 (1989). Despite legitimate issues of appellate review such as error in the Superior Court having done a *de novo* review of an agency decision without the requisite authority, the Appellate Court dismissed the appeal for stated reasons which included consideration of a 1987 change in law allowing the CRRA greater discretion in determining bid procedures

(that non-retroactive law applied by the Court for consideration of bidding which took place in 1983)² and that Book was not separately represented at the appeal stage by private legal counsel (although it is normally understood that the Freedom of Information Commission represents a complainant and also that a complainants interest in a proceeding is normally based in information which is of agency record).

15. On June 18, 1994, Book sent a peaceable letter to his State Representative John Metosoupolos (copy attached at Exhibit 3, A – 9). In it, he questioned the purpose for Metosoupolos to have appeared in 1985 before the Fairfield Representative Town Meeting to urge that it participate in the CRRA's Bridgeport Project. Metosoupolos thereupon presented a formal harassment complaint against Book with the Fairfield Police Department. Without reasonable cause or investigation, Sgt. Chris Lyddy ordered Book not to communicate further with State Representative Metosoupolos. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Metsopoulos was elected to be the Fairfield First Selectman. There are other examples of improper conduct of officials of the Fairfield Police Department.

16. Book presented such matters and related issues in several cases in federal court. Such cases included E. Book v. Fed. Deposit Insurance Corp. (pursuant to federal Freedom of Information Act), Case No. 3:04-cv-01651, E. Book v. FDIC as Receiver for CBT, Case No. 3:95-cv-00001, E. Book v. Conn. Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities, Case No. 3:95-cv-00421, E. Book v. CRRA, Office of Attorney General, Office of the Chief State's Attorney, Dept. of Transportation, Town of Fairfield and First Boston Corp., Case No. 3:95-cv-01344, and E. Book v. U.S. Securities & Exchange Commission, Case No. 3:95-cv-00838. The above cases against the CRRA and CHRO were administered in federal court by Judge

² There is the appearance that the legislature's approval of Public Act No. 87-451 (amending CGS. Sec. 22a-266) was in large part to give the CRRA legal support for its position in that heavily-contested lawsuit. It is also noted that 1987 was the same year that the legislature acted to abolish the Office of the Inspector General (re: Public Act No. 87-442 as amended CGS, Sections 2-101 through 2-103), that just after Book was making progress in demonstrating to the chief inspectors the information regarding the CRRA activities.

Dominic Squatrito, who less than six months before administering the cases, was the official campaign treasurer for Joseph Lieberman [It is relevant here that there was some investigation by the U.S. Dept. of Justice about the appointment of D. Squatrito as was proposed by Joseph Lieberman and recommended by President William Clinton. There is the appearance of improper influencing in that process by empresario David Chase, a personal friend of Joseph Lieberman and then a defendant in a federal case filed by a former Texas employee, one who was wrongfully treated by the Chase enterprises in Poland, among other matters (such case also having been administered and dismissed by Judge Squatrito). A pending formal impeachment petition against Judge Squatrito was presented to Congress by Congressman Henry Bonilla of Texas.]. Most of the above cases were dismissed in federal district court and were appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals. There continues to be some remedy for these matters available to Book, however, there also appears to have been some political imbalance against him as a self-represented litigant competing in court against vested private and governmental interests. Book's earlier proper gestures before the U.S. Court of Appeals were interrupted by yet other wrongful official acts, some of which are described below (Book is aware that in some other appellate circuits, there has been directed attention to reopening cases of self-represented litigants where there is the possibility that the interests of justice have not been served.).

17. In the above setting where Book operated a limousine service, New England Limousine Service of Fairfield, while he continued to pursue other remedy for the unresolved state activities in resource recovery and of their adverse impacts to his banking career, Book developed reciprocal business relationships with various other local limousine service companies. Such business relationships were primarily for overflow work. Among those operators with which such business relationships was Martha Villamil of Park Avenue Limousine Service in Stamford, CT. Such a business arrangement began in about 1992. During that time period, there was occasional talk about dating. Such dating began in May of 2000 and lasted for about two months. At the end of that period, M. Villamil said that she did not want to go out more, however, at that same time, she affirmed that she would repay the pending business debt, at that time about \$1,500.

18. Book conducted limited peaceable communications for about six months. His primary purpose was the collection of the business debt. Ms. Villamil had never told Book directly not to communicate with her. On January 5, 2001, Book received a telephone call from Sgt. Anthony Lupinacci of the Stamford Police Department. Sgt. Lupinacci advised Book that Villamil had placed a formal harassment complaint against Book and that he would like Book to come to the police station to discuss the matter. Book believed that he had done nothing wrong. He went for a meeting on January 6, 2001.

19. Early in that meeting, Sgt. Lupinacci told Book that he should not communicate more with M. Villamil. E. Book objected by saying that she owed him money. Sgt. Lupinacci said that he would speak again with Villamil and that he would get back with Book on the following day. He never got back with Book either the next day, or the next, or the day after that. On January 9, 2001, Book sent to Villamil a simple peaceable letter. On January 11 and January 18, 2001, he left for her during regular business hours simple telephone messages. On January 9, 2001, E. Book was arrested at his Fairfield residential/commercial property by four police officers, two of the Stamford Police Department and two of the Fairfield Police Department. At an arraignment hearing of January 22, 2001, Stamford Police Officer Paul Mabey argued that the bond should be set at \$25,000 because Book had previously been ordered by the Fairfield Police not to contact his own state representative.

20. The Stamford misdemeanor matter appeared to be so simple that Book took the matter to trial. However, other warning signals of biased official conduct were abundant. Among other matters, the September 2001 trial was administered by the late Judge Richard Tobin, one who had approved the initial arrest warrant and who also acted to deny a proper motion to vacate the arrest warrant (a substantive defect according to Practice Book, 1-22 which was acknowledged by federal District Judge Janet Bond Arterton in a written decision of 8/16/05 in the action of E. Book v. R. Tobin et al., Case No. 3:04-cv-0442).³ Another point of

³ It is also relevant that Judge Tobin received an annual pension of \$53,000 from Cummings & Lockwood, a law firm then contracted as outside legal counsel to the CRRA.

information to support the issue of substantive systematic court bias is observed of a statement made just before trial. Public Defender Thomas West reportedly commented to an acquaintance that the attorneys of Stamford Court and the Stamford judges intended to see Book convicted as he has been a thorn to the state in other forums. Additional detail in this matter and the mishandling of it by the Stamford police and state judges is contained in the Complaints for separate pending federal lawsuits, E. Book v. Anthony Lupinacci, the Stamford Police Department and Martha Villamil, Case No. 3:04-CV-01661 (PCD) and E. Book v. Richard Tobin and Martin Nigro, Case No. 3:04-CV-0442 (JBA) (with pleadings on each presently before the U.S. District Court). In any event, after an initial appeal was curiously dismissed by the Appellate Court (that for the reported reason that the appeal was initiated too early, although that appeal contained issues of pre-trial decisions which are distinctly appealable) and after Judge Tobin, despite the existence of a pending Motion for Reconsideration of Ruling to Deny Motion for Acquittal or Rehearing, and without proper prior notice as is required of Practice Book, 61-11, revoked E. Book's appeal bond, from January 17, 2003 through January 8, 2004, E. Book was incarcerated for a 1st-offense, non-violent Class C petty misdemeanor (A timely notice of appeal of Judge Tobin's action of 1/17/03 in revoking the appeal bond and in imposing the sentence remains with the Stamford Court Clerk, without endorsement and return to E. Book as is the usual, necessary procedure for initiating an appeal.).

21. It is also relevant that during November of 2001, Book was arrested by Fairfield Police for a charge of failure to pay wages to two drivers of his limousine service business. One of the arresting officers was Fred Caruso (brother to long-term Republican political figure Dan Caruso and then serving as Probate Judge). While Book was being transported to the police station, he asked Ofcr. Caruso what was going on. Ofcr. Caruso replied that he observed that Book was not cooperating with the Department of Transportation regarding state livery statutes. In April of 2002, that matter was *nolled* in Bridgeport Superior Court for lack of supporting evidence. It is curious that one of the complainants was a brother to a Fairfield Police Officer.

22. During the unlawful incarceration for the mentioned misdemeanor matter, Book became delayed in making monthly mortgage payments on his Fairfield residential/commercial property. In May of 2003, he sent to his known mortgage company a lengthy letter explaining of his situation, advising of a different address and of giving notice of authorized alternate contacts in Bridgeport, CT. However, in June of 2003, Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. attempted service of a mortgage foreclosure lawsuit by leaving a copy of the complaint at Book's Fairfield property. Despite four intervening letters, Book did not receive any notice of the pendency of that lawsuit until October 24, 2003, and that merely by regular mail. Book promptly and properly presented a Motion to Dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. However, the Court denied the Motion, among other actions of judicial error in that proceeding. An automatic appeal bond was improperly terminated by Judge Earl B. Richards, III and on June 27, 2005, a premature and unlawful order of execution of ejectment was satisfied (See also Book v. Earl B. Richards III et al., Case No. 3:05cv0892 and Book v. Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc., Case No. 3:08-cv-0821.).⁴ That began yet another set of very prejudicial consequences for Book (Additional information is available including at Book v. Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. et al., Case No. 3:08-cv-0821; Book v. Sgt. Kimberly Parks and the City of Bridgeport Police Department et al., Case No. 3:09-cv-0472 and Book v. Robert Mendoza and the Clint Independent School District, Case No. 3:07-CV-1468,).

23. In most of this interrelated series of events, there is a frequently observed factor of the role of Attorney General Richard Blumenthal and/or of officials under his direct responsibility. In the above-mentioned federal lawsuit of Book v. CRRA et al., the state defendants were

⁴ The case also involves a claim of the Department of Revenue Services (DRS), that for a tax assessment resulting from Book's resistance to a curiously timed late 1995 request for a sales and use tax audit, that where there is abundant evidence that the agency decision was arbitrary (See Book's Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion for Reconsideration presented on July 10, 2005 in Book v. Earl B. Richards, III et al., Case No. 3:05-cv-0892, especially at page 12 with reference to a letter sent by Book on May 10, 2005 to State Senate President Pro Tempore Donald Williams and State House Speaker James Amman.).

represented by presumed Assistant Attorney General Charles Walsh, that under the authority of Mr. Blumenthal. The case made very substantive claims of mail fraud, bond fraud, bid-rigging and conspiracy, of 14th Amendment violations and evasion of responsibilities of the Office of the Attorney General, the state legislature, among others and of continuing course of tortious conduct. In addition, there is explicit detail regarding particular prejudice to Book as a specialized bank officer. For proper causes as are appropriate for the types claims and of the nature of the prejudice to Book, he seeks in that lawsuit financial compensation of up to \$250 million. On July 31, 1995, on behalf of the named state defendants, presumed Assistant Attorney General Walsh presented a formal Motion to Dismiss. Among other matters, he argued insufficiency of service of process, failure of the complaint to satisfy the statutes of limitations and lack of plaintiff standing. On September 21, 1995, Book timely presented a substantive Objection to that Motion to Dismiss. Concerning the issue of service of process, Attorney Walsh had argued that Book had not served the Complaint to the State Defendants in the manner specified by state statutes. However, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, 4(j)(2) specifically allows for service other than the manner prescribed by state statute. With respect to statutes of limitations Book pointed out that a continuation of the program of wrongful activity allows for tolling as does the point in time that a plaintiff learns of various elements of wrongful conduct. Regarding standing, Book was clear that the substantial injury incurred by him was particularized for reason that the injuries stemmed from his role as a specialized bank officer. On April 17, 1996, Federal Judge Dominic Squatrito (who within six months of having been assigned in 1995 the case was Senator Lieberman's official campaign manager) ruled to dismiss the case for primary reasons given including of the above-mentioned arguments made by Attorney Walsh (Book later learned that Attorney Walsh had not been hired by the Office of the Attorney General in accord with the statutory requirements of the State Personnel Act.). A judgment was entered on June 13, 1996. On June 26, 1996, Book presented a Motion for Reconsideration of the Court Order to Dismiss the Action. That was also denied by Judge Squatrito. A timely appeal was filed with the U.S. Second Circuit Court of Appeals (where Judge Jon O. Newman was then acting as Chief Judge). That appeal was dismissed without prejudice for curable procedural matters.

24. On September 9, 1997, Book presented a Superior Court appeal to an action of State Treasurer Paul J. Silvester to decline to issue a declaratory ruling regarding an issue of earlier action by former State Treasurer Francisco Borges dealing with a CRRA bond issue (Book v. Christopher B. Burnham and Paul J. Silvester, Office of the Treasurer, State of Connecticut, Case No. CV 97-0573440-S). On November 4, 1997, Assistant Attorney General William J. Prensky, under the authority of Mr. Blumenthal, presented a Motion to Dismiss in which he argued that the Superior Court does not have the jurisdiction to review an agency decision to not issue a declaratory ruling. However, such a position fails to consider that an agency decision to not issue a declaratory ruling is, in fact, a ruling which pursuant to the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act is appealable. In Book's Opposition of November 8, 1997, he pointed out that the cases references used by Attorney Prensky discussed Court consideration of why the agency had failed to issue a declaratory ruling.

25. With respect to the federal lawsuit of Book v. CRRA discussed above in Paragraph 23, Book would periodically present pleadings to the Court of Appeals regarding the procedural issue for which the respective appeal was dismissed. One such formal pleading was mailed on March 15, 2000. A complete copy of that pleading was properly sent to Attorney Walsh. On March 21, 2000, three uniformed and armed officials of the Department of Motor Vehicles arrived to Book's Fairfield residence. Their explicit purpose was to confiscate the commercial vehicle plates for the various commercial vehicles that were owned and operated by Book in his small business. There was no proper procedural or legal purpose for such state action. Book later learned that Attorney Walsh was the designated legal counsel for the Department of Transportation and the Department of Motor Vehicles.

26. During the unlawful incarceration described above in Paragraph 20, Book was of the understanding that he would be eligible for early release. This would be particularly true where the matter involved a first-offense, non-violent Class C misdemeanor. He had been advised that he would be eligible for such release in July of 2003. Prior to that time, he presented proper requests for early release. However, the requests were denied for reasons which appeared to be arbitrary. After several such attempts at obtaining approval for early

release, Book became increasingly suspicious that Attorney General Blumenthal was having a direct role in the observed official conduct. On November 6, 2003, he sent to Mr. Blumenthal a letter (Exhibit 4 at A – 11). As can be observed, the second paragraph begins as follows:

Has the [Office of the Attorney General] had a specific role with officials of the [Department of Corrections] with regard to me?

Mr. Blumenthal never specifically answered that letter.⁵ That fact may not be of great significance as Mr. Blumenthal rarely answers any of Book's letters. However, within the Department of Corrections, there was an established system for inmates to formally communicate with Department officials. It was a Request system which used particular forms. During the nearly full year that Book was unlawfully incarcerated, he utilized the Request system often. Sometimes, Department officials would deny the Requests but they almost always would reply in some written manner. When the mentioned letter was sent to Mr. Blumenthal, Book was housed at Carl Robinson, C.I. The same letter reflects that a copy was provided to Warden John Sieminski. However, in a note sent to Book on November 10, 2003, the Warden evaded any reasonable comment by saying that it was not necessary for Book to send him a copy of the letter. Book responded with another Request on November 11, 2003. The Warden answered the matter with a note of November 12, 2003 with reference to "irrelevant issues". Then on November 15, 2003, Book sent to the Warden a separate request with 16 specific points of inquiry. The 16th follows:

Finally, has there been *ex-parte* communication regarding me and my case? In this regard, what role have officials of the Office of the Attorney General had regarding [Department of Corrections] attitudes, actions and conduct toward me?

On November 19, 2003, Warden Sieminski sent to Book a brief memorandum in which he commented as follows:

⁵ Book also points out that the second full paragraph of the third page of his letter of November 6, 2003 should be considered together with the above footnote 1.

In my review of this correspondence I find it to be presumptuous and self-righteous. You have been treated the same as all other inmates with regard to [Department of Corrections] policies and procedures. You have been given no extra attention, positive or negative

In a Request which Book sent to the Warden on November 21, 2003, he pointed out that the statement that Book has “been given no extra attention, positive or negative” was in conflict with information which Book provided to Correction Official Vasquez in a Request of with what his Dormitory Counselor Watkins had told him. Also, the statement is in conflict November 22, 2003. Further, Book separately received information that his computerized record had been marked to ensure that there be no early release.

In a letter of January 8, 2004 sent to Department of Corrections Commissioner Theresa Lantz, Book reiterated his questions regarding “an unarticulated political agenda directed at me”. On February 8, 2010, with specific reference again to Book’s letter of November 6, 2003 to Mr. Blumenthal, Book sent to Acting Commissioner Brian Murphy a letter reiterating his relevant points of inquiry. In a letter sent to Book on March 3, 2010, Mr. Murphy evaded the questions. Other exchange of correspondence including of April 10 and April 30, 2010 resulted in no change to the official position of evasion of responsibility.

27. On March 16, 2004, Book filed a federal lawsuit against Stamford Superior Court Judges Richard Tobin and Martin Nigro regarding errors pertaining to the 2001 misdemeanor action discussed above at Paragraphs 17 – 20 and 22 (Book v. Richard Tobin et al., Case No. 3:04-cv-0442). In that, Book seeks a mandamus and financial compensation. In a formal Motion to Dismiss of October 13, 2004, Assistant Attorney General Daniel R. Schaefer (whom was not hired by the Office of the Attorney General in accord with requirements of the State Personnel Act) under the authority of Mr. Blumenthal argued that the lawsuit should be dismissed for the Rooker-Feldman doctrine (which in some instances prohibits a federal District Court from review of a final state court judgment) and for the doctrine of judicial immunity (which in certain manners prohibits a claim for financial compensation for judicial errors). The problem with such arguments is that they fail to recognize proper exceptions to the raised doctrines.

Despite on-going litigation where Book has specifically asserted the proper exceptions, Attorney Schaefer has persisted to the Court in his position even as recently as January 12, 2010.⁶

28. On September 12, 2007, Book filed a federal lawsuit against various Connecticut Supreme Court justices (Book v. Flemming Norcott Jr. et al., Case No. 3:06-cv-1367). In that, he seeks a mandamus to reverse rulings regarding the above-mentioned mortgage foreclosure lawsuit (at Para. 22). In that, he seeks a mandamus for reversing state court judgments and a declaratory ruling regarding state procedures which likely adversely impact the judicial function. On January 10, 2008, Assistant Attorney General Philip Miller, under the authority of Mr. Blumenthal, presented a Motion to Dismiss. In that, he argued lack of Court jurisdiction for the Rooker-Feldman doctrine and the principles of comity which would normally preclude a federal court from interfering with day-to-day operations of a state court. However, such positions fail to consider established exceptions to Rooker-Feldman such as where there is no claim for financial compensation for injury arising after and as a result of the state court judgments. He also failed to establish that the issues of regulation to which Book referred pertain to day-to-day court operations.

29. In a state court appeal of the above-mentioned mortgage foreclosure action (Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. v. Book et al., AC 27491), on September 9, 2008 there were oral arguments before the Appellate Court. At that time, Assistant Attorney General Thomas Ventre, under the authority of Mr. Blumenthal, argued various issues regarding the assessment imposed by the Department of Revenue Services (See footnote 3 above.). However, he never addressed Book's primary claim that the 1995 DRS decision to select

⁶ It is of note that in a Court ruling of April 28, 2009 issued by District Judge Janet Bond Arterton, the following was stated:

Nothing in this order – or in any previous orders – precludes Book from engaging in the political activity that he values so highly, or from utilizing the political process to effectuate the systematic change he desires. . . .

him for a sales and use tax audit was arbitrary, a substantive 4th Amendment issue. Without proper consideration of that issue, all the other legal arguments which were asserted by Attorney Ventre had no value.

30. In each of the instances cited in the above Paragraphs 23 through 29, the administering officials of state courts and a state agency acted in accord with the expansive, unconstitutional and unprofessional arguments of Mr. Blumenthal and/or those acting under his responsibility or within his influence.

31. The Connecticut Post of January 7, 2010 reports that from 1973 – 1974, Richard Blumenthal served as law clerk in Connecticut District Court for Judge Jon O. Newman (later serving as Chief Judge for the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals: See above Para. 23.) and that from 1974 – 1975, he was law clerk for Supreme Court Justice Harry A. Blackman (a Court to which Book has recently presented two Petitions including for Book v. Tobin and Book v. Norcott described above). Also, from 1981 – 1984, he was a partner in Cummings & Lockwood (See above footnote 3.).

32. General Statutes. Section 1-25 contains the oath of office which is administered to officials of the Executive Branch. The Attorney General is part of the Executive Branch.

31. The text follows:

You do solemnly swear (or affirm as the case may be) that you will support the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of the State of Connecticut, so long as you continue a citizen thereof; and that you will faithfully discharge, according to law, the duties of the office of . . . to the best of your abilities; so help you God.

The Introduction to the Preamble of the Connecticut Rules of Professional Conduct includes the following:

A lawyer is a representative of clients, an officer of the legal system and a public citizen having special responsibility for the quality of justice.

Also, reference is made to Krulewitch v. United States, 336 U.S. 440, 445-48, 69 S.Ct. 716, 719-20 (1949). At footnote 4 on page 720, there is a quote from American Cases:

“It would appear that a conspiracy must be a combination of two or more persons by some concerted action to accomplish some criminal object; or some object not criminal by criminal means; or, some object not criminal by means which are not criminal but where mischief to the public is involved; or, where neither the object nor the means are criminal, or even unlawful, but where injury or oppression to individuals are the result.”

What is described here of Mr. Blumenthal’s conducts and practices are certainly not consistent with the duties of the Attorney General as are established in Conn. General Statutes, Sec. 3-125 and not consistent with the U.S. or Connecticut Constitutions.

32. For all the above, it is apparent that Mr. Blumenthal and/or officials under his authority abuse their positions to attempt to influence officials of state agencies and state courts as collateral attack against those who might have legitimate federal claims against state officials or state agencies. This assertion has been made by Book in multiple pleadings in federal courts and also in multiple mediums in his political campaign. It has never been disputed. Additionally, there would not likely be a logical motive for such extreme conducts as are described above if there was not the understanding by Mr. Blumenthal that Book’s claims such as are present in the above described Book v. CRRA et al. were not legitimate claims.

33. In a manner that is consistent with the comment quoted above of District Judge Arterton (at footnote 6), on March 30, 2008, Book sent to Christopher Caruso, then Co-Chairman of the Government Administration & Elections Committee, a letter regarding the long-term unaddressed issues of defects of activities of the CRRA and of a very serious chain of consequences experienced by him (Exhibit 5 at A – 14). Other supplemental communications were sent on April 13, 2008, November 22, 2008 and November 2, 2009. On March 28, 2009, Book electronically sent a follow-up message to the Committee Chairmen and the respective Committee members (Exhibit 6). Additional related communications were sent on July 16 and July 20, 2010. To date, there has been no direct response of any type from the Committee (Compare with above footnote 2.).

34. On January 7, 2010, Senator Christopher Dodd announced that he would not seek re-election in November of 2010. On that same date, Attorney General Blumenthal announced that he would seek the Democrat Party nomination for that position. The Connecticut Post of January 7, 2010 reports Mr. Blumenthal as describing himself as a fighter and that “I will make a priority the people of the state of Connecticut and I will fight for them”. He further reportely states that “I will be reaching out to citizens, regardless of political party, all around the state who have stake in someone who will fight for them and put them first, and stand strong against special interests and scams”. Considering what is presented above at Paragraphs 23 – 32, Book felt that such public comments were disingenuous and misleading for which on January 9, 2010, he sent to Mr. Blumenthal a four-page letter expressing his objection to Mr. Blumenthal’s objective (text available at campaign website www.ethanbookforussenate.org). It was after sending that letter and in considering the active issues discussed in it that Book began to feel like a candidate. He discussed the prospect with various personal acquaintances and he began to take steps toward initiating a formal campaign.

35. On the evening of Monday, February 1, 2010, Book attended a meeting of the Fairfield Republican Town Committee. At the end of the meeting, he spoke briefly with Chairman James T. Baldwin. Book confirmed with Mr. Baldwin the probability of him beginning a campaign for the U.S. Senate and that he likely would want to present himself and his campaign to the Town Committee. Mr. Baldwin responded simply by saying merely that Book should give him advance notice. Mr. Baldwin also commented briefly that he had been aware of some issues between Book and John Metsopoulos (See above Paragraphs 11 and 15.). In fact, Book was aware that Mr. Baldwin was Town Attorney while Mr. Metsopoulos was First Selectman. In a conservative attempt to deal with yet unaddressed issues of the state activities in resource recovery, that as pertains to conduct of local political figures, on February 6, 2010, Book sent to Mr. Baldwin a letter (Exhibit 7). In that, Book specifically requested review and comments of Mr. Baldwin. Other communications including a letter of February 27, 2010 were sent by Book. In that letter, Book stated the following:

It is further my opinion that there were various of the [local] Republican party leadership who applauded what was happening in [2001] in Stamford Superior Court as they saw such an action to be a convenient means of avoiding politically inconvenient issues.

At the close of the letter, Book again invited Mr. Baldwin's comments.

36. On February 25, 2010, at the Azul Restaurant on Main Street in Bridgeport, CT, Book made a formal public announcement of his candidacy for the U.S. Senate (full announcement speech available at campaign website). On February 26, 2010, the Fairfield Citizen published an article reporting on the announcement (Exhibit 8 at A – 33). There were various valuable points discussed in the article. However, the multiple references to the 2001 misdemeanor action were incomplete and described in a manner that would likely lead to misinterpretation. For such reason, Book presented a letter-to-the-editor which was published on March 5, 2010 (available at campaign website under "Political Corruption").

37. At a time that Book was in the process of formalizing his candidacy with the Federal Elections Commission, on Friday, April 23, 2010, he sent to Mr. Baldwin an e-mail. In that, he referred to a Tuesday, May 4th scheduling of a Fairfield Republican Town Committee. Book advised of his intention to be at the meeting to present himself and his candidacy to the Town Committee. The timing was important for the scheduling of the Connecticut Republican Convention on May 21, 2010. Later the same day, Mr. Baldwin sent him an e-mail reply as follows:

Ethan, I'm sorry to inform you that the meeting on May 4th is closed to all candidates. As you can surely appreciate, it will be a long meeting just to vote for each office up for nomination for the state convention.

Particularly considering what Mr. Baldwin had advised Book on February 1, 2010, the message was quite a surprise. It was also a disappointment to Book for in order to elicit support for his candidacy from other municipal districts, it would be important to reflect some support from his home Town Committee. Book objected to Mr. Baldwin for what appeared to be a late arbitrary position, to no avail.

38. He nonetheless decided to attend the May 4th meeting. When he arrived, it became

apparent that the planned agenda was being postponed to another time. Also, at the outset of the meeting, Mr. Baldwin announced that candidates could speak. Dee Dee Brandt, a candidate for state office, was allowed to speak. When she completed her comments, Book raised his hand. His intention was to clarify procedures. However, without even hearing Book, Mr. Baldwin abruptly and rudely stated that Book had been aware that candidates would not be allowed to speak at the meeting. What is curious is why Mr. Baldwin changed his opening statement of allowing candidates to speak but then after a candidate for state office spoke, he limited his offer only to candidates of state office. Probate Judge Dan Caruso was standing at the rear of the meeting room (See above Paragraph 21.). Various written inquiries by Book to Mr. Baldwin have gone without reasonable or complete explanations from him.

39. It can be said that such dysfunctional and arbitrary conducts from officials and/or political figures of the Town of Fairfield are a consequence of yet unaddressed legitimate claims that Book made in other matters such as Book v. CRRRA et al. of which the Town of Fairfield is a named Defendant.

40. In these respects, it is also important to point out that early in her campaign, Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate made public statements to the effect that she is willing to dedicate \$50 million in personal funds to her campaign. This is in the context of her well-known status of being the wife of the creator and developer of World Wrestling Entertainment (WWE) Vincent McMahon. At a public meeting of the Wallingford Republican Town Committee of May 12, 2010, she stated that she would spend whatever it takes to become elected. Early in the campaign, there were public reports that McMahon had hired the wife of Connecticut Republican Party Chairman Christopher Healy as a consultant. In addition, it has been reported to Book that McMahon was aware that a Republican Town Committee Chairman had a son who was attending college. She asked the man if she could hire the boy for her campaign. The man opened the door for that and the son was hired. The same Republican Town Committee Chairman has endorsed McMahon. There have been extensive newspaper reports about McMahon's past lobbying practices as an executive of WWE and of campaign practices

of “buying votes”. What is most significant to Book is her public statements that she is willing to spend many millions of dollars to win the campaign. There is the appearance to prospective candidates that if they don’t have substantial financial resources, notwithstanding the qualifications of the candidate and the value of his platform and message, that they should not try to run to compete with her. In addition, the message has impact to prospective supporters of any other candidate. The message is well expressed by various with whom Book has spoken that “how can one compete with \$50 million?” In reality, the message which McMahon has been giving is to legitimize and encourage a class system for candidates, effectively a type of systematic bias (re: 42 U.S. Code, Section 1985). In addition, such a position is in conflict with the 9th Amendment.

41. The above is also in the context that Book received a credible report that for another office, Connecticut Republican Party Chairman Christopher Healey instructed some delegates how to vote. Also, it was reported that a Stamford Republican delegate was held in a room and told by Town Committee leaders that he would not be allowed to leave the room until he agreed to vote for a particular candidate.

42. Book had early begun to take steps to elicit support from qualified delegates to nominate and second the nomination for his candidacy for the Connecticut Republican Convention scheduled for May 21st. His attempts became more in earnest during May. On Friday, May 14, 2010, Meriden delegate Tim Lenox offered to give the seconding speech. There was considerable discussion of Book as a candidate and the nature of the campaign. When Lenox offered to make the seconding speech and Book accepted, Book asked Lenox if he could announce this. Lenox agreed. Book then made a conservative, limited announcement on Facebook. Within a couple of days of the announcement, Lenox began to express some doubts. On Monday, May 17, 2010, Lenox explained to Book in a telephone conversation that he had been in separate telephone conversations with several regarding his position of nominating Book. He specifically stated that “No one has gotten to me!”. Although everything that he explained of the various conversations suggested otherwise. Among other matters, he was told that Book is an annoyance to political leadership in Fairfield (that in the

background context of what is described above) and that Book had spent a year in prison (a factor which had been fully disclosed and explained to Lenox on May 14th). Book offered to allow Lenox to view the video which had been prepared to be presented at the Convention following the nominating and seconding speeches. A meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, May 18, 2010. The video was presented (with the same presentation available at Book's campaign website; at a campaign up-date of May 25, 2010). Upon seeing the video, Lenox said that he would not give the seconding speech because he was sure that the delegates would dismiss Book's candidacy upon seeing the video. From such an extreme position as well as of the very compulsive conduct which is observed of Lenox after that, it is clear that there was much more than a mere issue of Lenox's stated opinion of the video. Also, for an e-mail blast which Lenox made on May 20, 2010 (copy available), it is apparent that Lenox was attempting to sabotage Book's candidacy.

43. The time for the Connecticut Republican Convention arrived. Book traveled to Hartford early in the afternoon to make preparations and to continue to attempt to arrange delegate support for making nominating and seconding speeches. He spoke to many. There was good apparent interest in him and his campaign however he wasn't able to get agreement from qualified delegates to give the nominating and seconding speeches. Book was the third of five candidates scheduled to be nominated. Speeches were given for Peter Schiff. As speeches were being given for Rob Simmons, Book contacted the Party leadership to advise that he was compelled to withdraw from the convention. That decision was properly announced to the Convention and speeches for Vinny Forras and Linda McMahon followed. The numerical delegate vote reflected that Linda McMahon was the party endorsed candidate. Later, when Book discussed the situation with a woman who is a candidate for state office, she promptly responded by saying that the Conventions are inside jobs.

44. Book then proceeded to seek the requisite number of signatures for a primary election. However, factors similar to what he had encountered up to the Convention were again observed.

45. It was following the June 8, 2010 deadline for filing petitions for a primary that on June 10, 2010, there was a Quinnipiac University poll indicating that despite her millions spent on the campaign and despite her, it was reported that McMahon still trailed Democrat Party endorsed Blumenthal by 20%.

46. Book was curious. On about June 15, 2010, he contacted the Elections Division of the Office of the Secretary of State. He requested a copy of the Certificate of Endorsement which McMahon would have presented. He was promptly provided the attached copy (Exhibit 9 at A – 35). Book immediately observed various problems. He observed a glaring lack of the word “duly” where at the upper portion of the form there is reference to “each of the following persons was [] endorsed as candidate” The lack of the word “duly” tends to invite the kinds of party shenanigans which the public seeks to avoid. Also the lack of the word “duly” tends to diminish public confidence in the process. Also, he observed that there was no date provided together with the signature of the “Chairman or Presiding Officer of the Convention” as the same form requires. Then the bottom of the form gives an explicit bold letter warning that if the form, “properly completed, is not received by the SECRETARY OF STATE by the deadline indicated above, the party shall be deemed to have made NO ENDORSEMENT OF ANY CANDIDATE for the office”. Book is also aware that the existence of such negative words provided with a statute or regulation makes such explicit terms to be mandatory and jurisdictional. There ensued various e-mail communications between Book and Ted Bromley, Staff Attorney in the Elections Division of the Secretary of State. Through these, Book was also advised that the prepared form that is used for a Certificate of Endorsement was never formally promulgated by the legislative Regulation Review Committee. Based on Book’s understanding of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act, such Committee review and approval is mandatory for any corresponding official action to be valid. Hence, no filing of the McMahon Certificate of Endorsement could be valid for any proper consideration. In addition, there are various factors for which Book deems that the State would be legally estopped from accepting and processing the McMahon Certificate for above errors and omissions of the Office of the Attorney General and the Government Administration and Elections Committee

such that Book has not had a full and fair opportunity to campaign. For such reasons, among others, on June 24, 2010, Book presented to the Secretary of State a formal Declaration and Petition for Declaratory Ruling (Exhibit 10 at A – 36).

47. On July 22, 2010 (with an indicated date of July 16, 2010), the Secretary of State issued a response (Exhibit 11 at A – 38). As is observed, without a hearing as is required, the Secretary of State only commented on the statutory terms of Conn. General Statutes, Sec. 9-388 without addressing the relevant requirements of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act, without addressing the substantive due process issue of the lack of the word “duly” regarding a party endorsement, and without addressing the substantive and specifically raised issue of a lack of full and fair opportunity for Book to campaign, among other matters.

48. On July 27, 2010, Book presented to the Secretary of State a formal Petition for Reconsideration (Exhibit 12 at A – 39). In addition to reaffirming the unaddressed issues mentioned above, Book also pointed out that if the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act would not require the Office of the Secretary of State to seek and obtain formal approval for the form of the Certificate of Endorsement, then Conn. General Statutes, Sec. 3 would provide that the form be treated as law.

49. On July 29, 2010, the Office of the Secretary of State issued a response to Book’s Petition for Reconsideration (Exhibit 13 at A – 46). As is observed, the Secretary of State failed to address the issue that Book had raised of a lack of hearing, also failed to address the issue of the lack of the word “duly” on the prepared form, and further failed to address the substantive issue of a lack of full and fair opportunity for Book to campaign. In addition, while acknowledging the applicability of Conn. General Statutes, Sec. 9-3 as is discussed above, the Office fails to address the point that the intra-office prepared form for Certificate of Endorsement should be treated as law. Further, the Office fails to address the more substantive matter of the applicability of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act.

50. During the election process, there emerged again public attention to the matter of the State's participation in multi-state litigation against several tobacco companies and to a Master Settlement Agreement which was reached in 1998. As part of that recent public attention was focus on an estimated \$60 million which was paid to three private Connecticut law firms for professional services rendered on behalf of the State for that litigation (with one of the law firms being a former employer for Defendant Blumenthal). The actual amounts paid to the three law firms has never been disclosed. For the public significance of such matters particularly in the context of Defendant Blumenthal's candidacy for the U.S. Senate, the Plaintiffs presented to Defendant Blumenthal as Attorney General several formal requests for information pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (See Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration of Court Ruling to Grant Defendants' Motion for Relief from Discovery Planning Conference Requirement, #20 at Exhibits 2 – 4.). Without having received a reasonable response to his requests, in fact while observing conflicting and evasive responses, on September 26, 2010, the Plaintiffs filed a formal Complaint with the Freedom of Information Commission. For the significance to the pending election process, the Plaintiffs also specifically requested expedited Commission processing. To this date, the Plaintiffs have not received any acknowledgement or response from the Commission.

51. On November 2, 2010, there was a general election for the office of U.S. Senator. Amid some very glaring issues of deficiencies in voting procedures such as in the City of Bridgeport, Defendant Blumenthal is the reported victor of that electoral process. For the issues raised of defects of the McMahon Certificate of Endorsement including the lack of a full and fair opportunity for the Plaintiffs to campaign for which Defendant Blumenthal has had a long term role (See above Paras. 23 – 34 and 46 and.), there continues to be cause to suppress the election results for the primary election of August 10, 2010 but also of the general election of November 2, 2010. In addition, there are some issues of defects of the McMahon Certificate of Endorsement presented to Defendant Bysiewicz on June 2, 2010 which parallel defects of the Certificate of Endorsement presented on May 26, 2010 on behalf of Defendant Blumenthal (i.e., failure of Defendant Bysiewicz to have had the form properly promulgated and for the failure to have included the word "duly" before the word "endorsed). For such proper, lawful

causes, on November 3, 2010, the Plaintiffs presented to Defendant Bysiewicz a new formal Petition seeking that the results of the portion for U.S. Senator of the recent general election also be suppressed and again that there be scheduled a separate special election (copy attached at Exhibit 14 at A - 47).

52. For the four corners of legal consideration of a matter, the Certificates of Endorsement of both Linda McMahon and Defendant Blumenthal are wholly procedurally, legally and equitably invalid for which the Secretary of State is without proper authority to accept them and to process them.

D. CAUSES OF ACTION

For such good and lawful causes, Book hereby demands relief of federal court a declaratory ruling to the effect of fully invalidating the Certificates of Endorsement of Linda McMahon and Defendant Blumenthal, a mandamus to order that the State of Connecticut suspend the Primary Election results for the Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate, that the State of Connecticut suspends the results of the recent general election for the U.S. Senate, and an award of reasonable financial compensation for economic and non-economic injuries.

COUNT ONE: That Secretary of State Susan Bysiewicz erred in not having a form for Certificate of Endorsement reasonably prepared (with the mentioned word “duly”) and properly promulgated, in having received on June 2, 2010 a Certificate of Endorsement from Linda McMahon which was not “properly completed” as is mandated, and that for a long-term series of institutionalized errors and omissions regarding Book, he did not have a full and fair opportunity to campaign. Such errors constitute negligence and 14th Amendment claims (42 U.S. Code, Section 1983) and issues of systematic bias (42 U.S. Code, Section 1985).

COUNT TWO: That Secretary of State Susan Bysiewicz erred in not having a form for Certificate of Endorsement reasonably prepared (with the mentioned word “duly”) and properly promulgated for Defendant Blumenthal. Such errors constitute negligence and 14th Amendment claims (42 U.S. Code, Section 1983) and issues of systemic bias (42 U.S. Code, Section 1985).

COUNT THREE: That Attorney General Richard Blumenthal and those under his direct authority has acted over a long-term period in manners that exceed the norms for the conduct of his office, that to the effect of violating Book’s constitutional rights, of negligence and conspiracy to deprive Book of his rights including of his rights of reasonable access to state and federal courts and of establishing, creating and/or taking advantage of systematic biases in state government and in federal courts.

COUNT FOUR: That Defendants Slossberg and Spallone erred in not having reasonably and timely addressed specific and formal pleadings which Book properly presented to the Committee beginning before March 20, 2008 and up to March 28, 2010. Such error is an actionable constitutional violation and it constitutes the continuation of an official posture of deliberate indifference and institutionalized conspiracy.

E. REQUEST FOR RELIEF:

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff Book demands relief of federal court a declaratory ruling to the effect of fully invalidating the Certificates of Endorsement of Linda McMahon and Defendant Blumenthal, a *mandamus* to order that the State of Connecticut suspends the results of the August primary election for the Republican candidate for the U.S. Senate, a *mandamus* to order that the State of Connecticut suspends the results of the portion of the recent general election for U.S. Senator, that this Court directs the State of Connecticut to schedule a special election four months from the date of respective court orders and an award of reasonable financial compensation for economic and non-economic injuries.

F. JURY DEMAND

With reference to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Sec. 38, the Plaintiff requests a jury trial for the damages portion only of this lawsuit.

Respectfully submitted for Ethan Book
and Ethan Book for U.S. Senate

Ethan Book
P.O. Box 1385
Fairfield, CT 06825
Tel. (203) 367-8779
newenglimo@aol.com

CERTIFICATION:

I hereby certify that a complete copy of the foregoing Plaintiffs' Amended Civil Rights Complaint was mailed by 1st class regular mail in accordance with Rule 5(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on November 4, 2010 to the following:

Robert D. Snook
Office of the Attorney General
55 Elm Street
P.O. Box 120
Hartford, CT 06141-0120
Robert.Snook@ct.gov

Also, this Motion has been presented to the legal representative of the Defendants electronically as well also to other potentially interested persons such as Christopher Healy, Linda McMahon, Rob Simmons and Peter Schiff, among others.

Ethan Book

