

Docket No. FBT-CV-07-5011895-S

ETHAN BOOK JR.

Plaintiff

v.

MONICA L. SULLENDER

Defendant

: SUPERIOR COURT

: JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF

: FAIRFIELD AT BRIDGEPORT

: July 19, 2010

PLAINTIFF'S FOURTH SUPPLEMENT TO MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

As is allowed with Practice Book Rules including Section 10-10, the Plaintiff Ethan Book Jr. hereby presents a Fourth Supplement to his pending Motion of November 5, 2009 for Reconsideration of Court Rulings Regarding Motion for Rehearing (#158.00; that pertaining to a Court ruling of nonsuit against this Plaintiff), an unopposed Motion which was formally supplemented on January 27, 2010, March 3, 2010 and April 26, 2010.

The primary purpose of this Supplement is to provide relevant information regarding the context of the Plaintiff's undisputed and unaddressed claims of there existing in state courts factors of systematic biases and also to provide information as to the status of Plaintiff personal property which has been known to be stored in the basement area of the property which is subject of this lawsuit, 690-692 Dewey Street in Bridgeport, CT.

Again, in this lawsuit, the Plaintiff has been clear about raising an issue of systematic biases that are practiced in state courts (See Amended Complaint of December 3, 2007, #101.00 at Affidavit, Items #4 and 5; Pl. Motion for Rehearing of July 15, 2009, #153.00 at pgs. 13-17; and Pl. Motion of November 5, 2009 for Reconsideration, #158.00, esp. at pgs. 1-2 and 6-12.). Among the observed biases is political bias related to the Plaintiff's long-term role as a whistleblower of

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

state activities in resource recovery. Recent events have afforded cause for closer review of such matters as is observed in the attached Plaintiff letter sent on July 16, 2010 to the Chairmen of the legislative Governmental Administration and Elections Committee. The undisputed, credible factual representations which are made in the letter together with its attachments are part of the understanding of an unaddressed political cancer which continues to exist in the State. This information as it is discussed in the attached letter is relevant to the issues of systematic court biases which the Plaintiff has raised in this matter.

Additional commentary is in order. The primary focus of the attached letter 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