

Westlaw

1/31/89 NYLJ 5, (col. 1)  
1/31/89 N.Y.L.J. 5, (col. 1)

Page 1

New York Law Journal  
Volume 201, Number 20  
Copyright 1989 by The New York Law Publishing Company

Tuesday, January 31, 1989

## TEXT OF JUSTICE MURPHY'S REPORT

Following is the text made public yesterday by Presiding Justice Francis T. Murphy of the Appellate Division, First Department, of his report to the Departmental Disciplinary Committee on the resignations submitted earlier this month by Michael Gentile, the committee's chief counsel and Sarah McShea, deputy chief counsel:

On Jan. 3, I requested the resignations of Michael Gentile, the chief counsel, and Sarah McShea, the deputy chief counsel, of the Departmental Disciplinary Committee (hereinafter DDC). In his letter of resignation, Mr. Gentile stated:

"As we discussed today, I will be resigning my position as Chief Counsel to the Departmental Disciplinary Committee effective March 1st, 1989. I am looking forward to spending most of my days until then clearing up some remaining loose ends in the office and by taking some much needed vacation time. I am, of course, ready and willing to help effect a smooth transition during this period.

"On a personal note, I want to thank Your Honor and the entire Court for a very satisfying and fulfilling eight years as the Committee's Chief Counsel.

"I wish you all the best."

In her letter of resignation, Ms. McShea stated:

"I learned today that Mike Gentile has informed you of his intention to resign as Chief Counsel to the Disciplinary Committee effective March 1, 1989.

"Having served happily as Mike's Deputy for three and a half years, this strikes me as a propitious time for me to pursue new professional opportunities for myself. I am therefore resigning my position as Deputy Chief Counsel to the Disciplinary Committee effective March 1, 1989.

"I have greatly enjoyed my eight years on the Committee's staff, not only for the invaluable trial and administrative experience it has afforded, but for the opportunity to work with a Committee and Court devoted to upholding professional standards and intent on making attorney discipline a reality in New York.

"I thank Your Honor and the entire Court for your support and kindness over the years. Best regards."

1/31/89 NYLJ 5, (col. 1)  
1/31/89 N.Y.L.J. 5, (col. 1)

Page 2

At the time of their separate resignations, neither Mr. Gentile nor Ms. McShea attributed my request for their resignations to any cause unrelated to the discharge of their duties at the DDC. Ms. McShea's resignation was consistent with steps taken by her in July 1988 to find other employment. She was then, and for months thereafter, angered by the July 6 promotion and appointment of Donald Brudie, Esq., to the newly created position of executive assistant to William E. Jackson, Esq., the DDC chairman, a post created by me because, among other reasons, there was substantial cause to conclude that Mr. Gentile had in fact abandoned the operation of the DDC to Ms. McShea. By the terms of Mr. Brudie's appointment, he was given, together with Mr. Gentile, joint administrative power over the DDC. Further, Mr. Brudie was expressly made this Court's administrative liaison with the Committee. The vesting of joint administrative power is an undesirable step, unless it is required by necessity, and that necessity then existed in the DDC.

Since my request for the resignations of Mr. Gentile and Ms. McShea on Jan. 3, I have been criticized in the press for having discharged Mr. Gentile and Ms. McShea without good cause. Though I am not required by law to assign any reason for my request for their resignations, I now must regretfully state several of the causes underlying those resignations. These causes would have been disclosed to those two DDC members, Mr. Hynes and Mr. Greenberg, who, in the exercise of sound professional judgment, to say nothing of ordinary fairness, should have inquired of the Court before speaking to the press about a matter of which they knew they were not wholly informed, and indeed were substantially ignorant. When speaking to the press they should have disclosed the length of their friendships with Mr. Gentile. It might have explained why even to this day they have never asked me why I had asked their friend to resign.

First, for about six years Mr. Gentile filed work sheets in which he falsely represented work periods when he was not employed anywhere in the business of the DDC. This problem, the specific character of which I did not know, was on occasion suspected by me and led to my meetings with Mr. Jackson, the DDC chairman, on April 6, 1987 and June 2, 1988, and to telephone calls, too numerous to count, between myself, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. (Harold) Reynolds (Clerk of the Court). It led, as well, to conferences between myself and Mr. Gentile. It led, several years ago, to a conference between the Clerk of the Court and Mr. Gentile's secretary who signed Mr. Gentile's attendance records. Upon being informed by Mr. Reynolds of the legal risk involved in signing Mr. Gentile's attendance sheets, should they be false, Mr. Gentile's secretary declined to sign them.

What were the time periods for which Mr. Gentile was paid when he was not actually working for the State either in the DDC office or out of it?

Writings, given by an attorney on the DDC staff under penalty of perjury, and by a DDC secretary, whose identities are available to the DDC, indicate that Mr. Gentile, for ?? that he appeared daily, or a weekly figure much more probably in the

area of 12 hours, because he regularly failed to appear one or two days a week, or appeared at odd hours, stayed briefly, and then left. I doubt that there is any member of the public who believes that the State should pay, upon false work sheets, an annual salary of \$80,000 for work of about 12 hours weekly. As for Ms. McShea, there can be no doubt that she knew of Mr. Gentile's abandonment of his office, an abandonment that alone was sufficient for his discharge on Jan. 3d.

Second, during the last six years, Mr. Gentile was the chief disciplinary prosecutor of this Court which has jurisdiction over 44,000 attorneys in Manhattan and the Bronx. During those six years, a period when the annual intake of docketed cases remained relatively stable, the backlog of docketed cases grew from 720 at the end of 1983 to over 1,300 in December 1988, the month in which it was decided that Mr. Gentile's resignation was required. Nor may we speak confidently of the figures supplied by Mr. Gentile over the years to the Court. In a writing executed under penalty of perjury, this Court has had confirmed information given to it prior to Mr. Gentile's resignation:

"[Mr. Gentile's] major concern was that he should be criticized by the Court or the Clerk of the Court. Consequently, he took great pains to insure that a true picture of conditions existing in the DDC were concealed from the Court.

"The emphasis was on closing complaint files at any cost to reduce the number of backlogged cases. Monthly quotas were imposed on lawyers for closed cases and pressure was applied to close cases regardless of their merit. At one staff meeting that I attended several years ago, Mr. Gentile stated that we were to use 'prosecutorial discretion' to close cases. Although he was careful not to expressly state it, the implication was that we were to close anything and everything in order to reduce the backlog to below 1200 cases.

"I have a suspicion that over the last few years statistics have been altered to give the appearance that the number of backlogged cases was smaller than it actually was. I do know that in prior years hundreds of new complaints were accumulated in baskets and withheld for months before they were opened. In this way, Mr. Gentile was able to represent to the Court at the end of each year that the number of backlogged cases had been reduced, when in fact that was not true."

These facts alone justify Mr. Gentile's discharge and may implicate Ms. McShea as well.

Third, during the past two years, Chairman Jackson and I, as well as Mr. Reynolds, learned of Mr. Gentile's improper conduct in at least three cases involving political figures and a fourth involving a former Committee member.

In the first case, Mr. Gentile, recommending dismissal of two complaints, stated to Mr. Jackson that the complaints involved only political charges made during a campaign. He thus procured the signature of Mr. Jackson necessary for the closing of the file. In fact, as Mr. Gentile well knew, the complaints sufficiently stated

1/31/89 NYLJ 5, (col. 1)  
1/31/89 N.Y.L.J. 5, (col. 1)

Page 4

claims of professional misconduct in two wholly commercial matters. In unlawfully closing the file, Mr. Gentile wrote a servile letter to that political figure, inviting him to contact Mr. Gentile, and a letter to the complainant chastizing him for having filed the complaints.

In the second case, after a petition had been served, Mr. Gentile conferred with the respondent and his attorney. The respondent offered to accept a private admonition but Mr. Gentile said that the chairman, Mr. Jackson, had demanded the respondent's acceptance of a public censure. When the respondent said that he would appeal to Mr. Jackson because he could not believe that that was Mr. Jackson's position, Mr. Gentile answered that, if the public censure were not accepted, he would amend the petition in order to add serious additional counts of which Mr. Gentile had known when the petition was drawn. Upon learning of Mr. Gentile's statements, Mr. Jackson immediately repudiated them, saying that he had never taken the position represented by Mr. Gentile and that an admonition was unquestionably acceptable.

In the third case, Mr. Gentile, without authorization from anyone, and contrary to the purpose of a rule of this Court, entered into an agreement with the United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York to refrain from examining any witness in a highly publicized criminal prosecution until it had been terminated.

In the fourth case, one in which the facts pointed to the possibility of conversion, Mr. Gentile, a close friend of the respondent who was then a member of the DDC, caused the termination of the investigation and the closing of the file, notwithstanding that the file as it then stood contained facts sufficient to justify the public censure of that DDC member.

Lying to or deceitfully misleading the chairman, misrepresenting the chairman's position to a respondent, entering into an unauthorized agreement with a criminal prosecutor that stifled a DDC investigation at its inception, and covering up the misconduct of a DDC member, were ?? for ?? discharge.

Fourth, except for the Roy Cohn case, during the six-year period when Mr. Gentile, sitting in or absent from, the growing shade of a backlog that ultimately almost doubled. Mr. Gentile, as far as we have been able to ascertain, was not involved in any investigation of any case nor did he try a single case before a hearing panel. Nor may it be claimed that Mr. Gentile was the counterpart of a district attorney who, primarily an administrator, cannot ordinarily try cases. Mr. Gentile was not the holder of a position comparable to that of a district attorney. The DDC's chief counsel holds a hands on position requiring at least the trial of major matters. It was learned, before Mr. Brudie's appointment in July 1988, that Mr. Gentile had not had any cases assigned to him. On several occasions, the matter was discussed by me with the DDC chairman, together with the problem of reports to the Court of Mr. Gentile's absences from his office and his

1/31/89 NYLJ 5, (col. 1)  
1/31/89 N.Y.L.J. 5, (col. 1)

Page 5

failure to be engaged in DDC work in any other place. The chairman himself often could not contact Mr. Gentile, for no one at the DDC knew where he was.

These reports of the absences and nonproductivity of Mr. Gentile caused me concern upon the filing with the DDC in October 1988 of the complaints of the Attorney General of the State of New York against C. Vernon Mason in the Brawley case, a filing that was made public by the Attorney General in an extensive release to the press. Upon that filing, Mr. Gentile, repeatedly informed the Clerk of the Court that he, Mr. Gentile, was so frightened by the prospect of the Mason matter that he was inclined to find a way of avoiding it. Indeed, Mr. Gentile had the cases assigned not to himself but to a DDC attorney who was told that that attorney would in fact have nothing to do with it. The Committee should read that file and determine the character of Mr. Gentile's professional judgment.

As to Mr. Gentile's personal judgment, grave doubt about it had arisen in September 1988 when a complainant before the DDC drew in the DDC office what was identified by a staff attorney as a gun, threatened to use it unless his pending complaints were satisfactorily determined, and then left the office. Court officers were immediately summoned to the DDC. Thereafter, the Clerk of the Court inquired of Mr. Gentile whether Gentile would cause the gunman's arrest. Mr. Gentile answered that he would not do so because, he said, the gunman was guilty of only a "violation" and, in any event, the gunman might shoot Mr. Gentile if he causes his arrest. When told that the gunman had committed crimes and that his arrest was necessary in protection of the staff and of the Court itself, Mr. Gentile refused to authorize the arrest of the gunman when police, having seized him that night, called Mr. Gentile. Thereafter, it was necessary to direct Mr. Gentile to place the decision before the DDC chairman, Mr. Jackson, who ordered that the matter be taken to the office of the District Attorney, a staff member of which ordered the gunman's arrest.

It was apparent to me that a chief counsel whom we could rarely locate, who seemingly tried no cases, whose backlog seemed permanent, whose staff lawyers fell from the masthead with an awe-inspiring frequency, whose unethical conduct in certain cases had caused alarm, and who was lacking in professional courage, was not a chief counsel of anything.

Upon the ground of inertia alone, Mr. Gentile was dischargeable.

In fact, on Jan. 4 he informed The New York Times that he had been thinking about resigning before I asked for his resignation. He knew of his danger of discharge in or about March 1988 when he was informed that I had intended to recommend a very small increase in his salary. He was informed that he should not misread the increase. He was told that it was given to encourage him to avoid conflicts about his work and to fix a salary that would attract his successor should Mr. Gentile fail.

As for Ms. McShea, the causes of her discharge are at least several. She knew of Mr. Gentile's abandonment of his public office and did not disclose it to the DDC or the Court, perhaps because it had vested her with Mr. ?? which in 1983 had become scandalous. I have cause to believe that the overwhelming majority of Committee members, eager to work, shared my concern that of the more than 1,200 docketed matters only 25 had been heard in all of 1988, and those 25 were spread among four panels which sat a total of 51 days. Surely Mr. Hynes must have thought it odd that he had sat only eight days in 1988. Did he not wonder why the staff was not reducing the backlog?

More persuasive for Ms. McShea's discharge, however, was the reputation earned by Ms. McShea for her treatment of the legal and lay staff following her appointment as deputy chief counsel. I set forth in full a 1987 affidavit which purports to describe an aspect of Ms. McShea's personality as it existed when she undertook her new post as deputy chief counsel. All comments concerning Ms. McShea that I thereafter heard were consistent with the personality outlined in that affidavit, a copy of which is available to any DDC member:

"[Name], an attorney duly admitted to practice in the State of New York, affirms the following under the penalty of perjury:

"1. I am a Staff Attorney to Michael A. Gentile, Chief Counsel to the Departmental Disciplinary Committee of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, First Judicial Department, and have been so employed since Dec. 8, 1980.

"2. Within the offices of the Departmental Disciplinary Committee, located on the 39th floor of 41 Madison Avenue, New York, New York, my own office space is located immediately next to and adjoining that occupied by the 1st Deputy Chief Counsel, and shares one (1) contiguous wall with that office. The door frame of that office abutts the wall common to both offices, and the distance from that door to the door of my office is about 10 feet.

"3. Before April 6, 1987 the occupant of the above-described office, and the First Deputy Chief Counsel to the Committee, was Howard Benjamin. After Mr. Benjamin's departure on April 6, 1987 pursuant to his resignation, effective May 1, 1987, the office and title of First Deputy Chief Counsel was assumed by Sarah Diane McShea.

"4. I was in my office with Alan S. Phillips, an Associate Attorney with the Committee Staff, on Tuesday, April 14, 1987, when Sarah Diane McShea knocked on the door and requested to speak to Alan S. Phillips. Mr. Phillips and I walked to the door of her office.

"5. Standing at the door jamb of her office, and in the presence of Mr. Phillips and myself, Sarah Diane McShea displayed to Mr. Phillips a reference inquiry form which had been received in the mail. The form was on 8 1/2 x 11 white paper, with bold black type heading which read, 'Administrative Law Judge,' and below that, in

1/31/89 NYLJ 5, (col. 1)  
1/31/89 N.Y.L.J. 5, (col. 1)

Page 7

less bold type, read 'Personal Reference Inquiry for Administrative Law Judge Positions.' Below that, in the otherwise blank address space of the form, appeared 'Mr. Howard Benjamin' along with the address of the Committee.

"6. Sarah asked Mr. Phillips, 'What should we do with this?' to which Mr. Phillips responded that it should be given to Howard Benjamin for his completion. Sarah responded to the effect that since Howard was no longer with the Committee, and she had assumed his position, she should fill it out in her capacity.

"7. Mr. Phillips responded that the form requested Mr. Benjamin's evaluation as a reference, and was therefore personal to Mr. Benjamin and not to his title. That at any rate, Mr. Benjamin was 'still on the payroll' in the title of First Deputy Chief Counsel. Mr. Phillips stated that he had named Howard Benjamin as a reference because he and Howard had known each other for eight years, regardless of Howard's title.

"8. Ms. McShea insisted that the form was received by her as Howard's successor and that she would complete it in that capacity with an explanation that Mr. Benjamin had resigned. Mr. Phillips repeated that the form was addressed to Howard Benjamin.

"9. At that point Chief Counsel Michael A. Gentile approached the three of us and inquired as to what was going on. Both Sarah and Alan reiterated their positions, and Mr. Gentile walked away without answering the question.

"10. At that point, Sarah had walked to the desk in her office. I began walking toward the door of my office, and Mr. Phillips remained, standing stationary in Sarah's office, about 1 1/2 feet in from the doorjamb. As I walked away, and before I was more than two feet away, I heard Ms. McShea say, in a tone of voice that was as much serious business as it was conciliatory, 'I'll tell you what we'll do.' I stopped and turned around, as I was curious to hear her proposal or proposed 'resolution' to the situation.

"11. At that point I heard Sarah Diane McShea say to Alan S. Phillips: 'I won't fuck you, but I want forty (40) closings for this month and three (3) sets of new charges.'

"12. I did not see Mr. Phillips' reaction, as his back was to me, nor did I hear his response, if any, as I turned and continued walking into my office.'

?? with the backlog was Ms. McShea's oppressive use of a quota system which, at least to my eye, must have terrorized the legal staff and tended to victimize complainants. In my opinion, the imposition and maintenance of a quota system specifically for the production of dismissals of complaints were unethical acts of which Mr. Gentile knew and of which neither he nor Ms. McShea informed the DDC.

Last, Ms. McShea's negative reaction to the appointment of Mr. Brudie as, among

1/31/89 NYLJ 5, (col. 1)  
1/31/89 N.Y.L.J. 5, (col. 1)

Page 8

other things, liaison with this Court, was of such a prolonged magnitude that I believed her severance desirable. In my opinion, she was not a person to whom power over others should be granted, and she had seemingly identified herself with Mr. Gentile's interests. Accordingly, it did not surprise me that Ms. McShea's letter of resignation stated, in substance, that having learned of Mr. Gentile's resignation and having served "happily as Mike's Deputy," this was "a propitious time" to resign in order "to pursue new professional opportunities."

As I sat through the Jan. 3 resignation conferences with Mr. Gentile, and then Ms. McShea, each knew and concealed a fact that I did not know and of which I learned on Jan. 4 when it was discovered that, during December, Hal Lieberman, the DDC lawyer assigned its major cases of extraordinary significance, had resigned, effective at the end of January. On Jan. 4, Mr. Lieberman had met with the Clerk of the Court and had volunteered in the presence of another attorney that he had resigned because the backlog of cases was "menacing" and, for lack of any planning by Mr. Gentile and Ms. McShea, the backlog was "out of control." Further, he stated that the staff was "demoralized" by the leadership of Mr. Gentile and Ms. McShea.

Thereafter, Mr. Lieberman met with me. In the presence of two other attorneys, he volunteered to me the very same statements concerning his resignation -- the backlog was lacking "a comprehensive plan" and the staff was "demoralized and alienated" by Mr. Gentile's and Ms. McShea's poor leadership. He stated that 20 important cases that should be tried were languishing in the files. It is strikingly significant that, while in December I had been considering the discharge of Mr. Gentile and Ms. McShea for reasons which included the backlog and a demoralized staff, Mr. Lieberman had concurrently decided to resign for those two reasons.

As to certain falsehoods that have been marketed to the press by Mr. Gentile or Ms. McShea, or the both of them, I shall give the brief answers that they deserve.

It is said that, particularly in Mr. Gentile's case, he was brutally removed from his office at 5 P.M. on Jan. 6, the day of a snow storm. In the afternoon of that day, the Clerk of the Court received a telephone inquiry from a reporter who claimed that he had learned that Mr. Gentile had been ousted because of a reason that the Clerk knew to be false. The Clerk told the reporter that he would call Mr. Gentile and ask him to call the reporter. Upon being asked to call the reporter and affirm or deny the cause for discharge described by the reporter, Mr. Gentile repeatedly shouted in a virtually incoherent state, "I'm having a nervous breakdown! I'm on the brink of a nervous breakdown! No comments to the press! No comments to the press!"

The Clerk became alarmed that Mr. Gentile was in that state in the 39th floor office of the DDC, an office that was not fully staffed because of the snow storm. It would be imprudent for Mr. Gentile to deny under oath the telephone "conversation" had by him with the Clerk on the afternoon of Jan. 6.

1/31/89 NYLJ 5, (col. 1)  
1/31/89 N.Y.L.J. 5, (col. 1)

Page 9

The Clerk reported that conversation to me after Mr. Brudie, a DDC attorney, stated that, upon telling Mr. Gentile that he had had the office locks changed and that he would be closing the office at 5 P.M., Mr. Gentile said to Mr. Brudie that he would not leave the office at that time but would stay until any hour desired by him. In view of the report of Mr. Gentile's state and the impossibility of predicting his conduct, I advised Mr. Reynolds to direct Mr. Brudie to request the entire staff then in the DDC office to leave at 5 P.M., and to ask the court officer then on duty at the DDC to request another court officer to be present when the office was closed. Provision for the posting of a court officer in the DDC office had been made by the Office of Court Administration since September 1988 in consequence of Mr. Gentile's claims that such an officer was necessary because, among other things, Mr. Gentile was in danger of attack by a disbarred lawyer who had been following him for months. Accordingly, at 5 P.M., there was a brief, peaceful leaving of the DDC office by Mr. Gentile and Ms. McShea. No officer drove them out. None stood by the desk of Mr. Gentile or Ms. McShea ?? eviction were in progress. Their leaving was painful to them but, insofar as such events may be accompanied by civility, they received it.

With respect to the Steinberg DDC matter, several points are noteworthy.

First, Judiciary Law §90 draws a curtain of secrecy only around those disciplinary proceedings involving attorneys who have been lawfully admitted to the Bar. By §90 the Legislature intended to protect only the reputations of such attorney# against the damage of unproved charges; a rational Legislature could never have intended to extend confidentiality to persons like Steinberg who had secured their admissions to the Bar by fraud. Hence, the Steinberg file did not require a motion for its release to the public.

Second, the Daily News did not mysteriously learn of the Steinberg file and then request it. In its issue of Nov. 6, 1987, the News published an article concerning the 1983 post-conviction claims of Steinberg's client, John Novak, and Novak's wife, that Steinberg was addicted to cocaine when he represented Novak in a 1981 federal narcotics trial. There was nothing unusual when, more than one year later, the News on Dec. 22, 1988 made a request of this Court for an examination of the DDC's Steinberg file concerning Novak's complaint, a request made by the News during a two week adjournment in the Steinberg criminal trial.

Third, Mr. Gentile's resignation was not requested solely because of his indefensible handling of the Steinberg case. The resignation of Mr. Gentile was decided upon before the Dec. 22 request of the Daily News for an examination of the Steinberg file.

Fourth, The New York Times on JAN. 5 published an interview of Mr. Gentile together with a photograph of him taken in his DDC office. The Times article quoted Mr. Gentile as having described the DDC's handling of the Steinberg matter as "a terrific job." In answer to that characterization, the Court stated that it "was

1/31/89 NYLJ 5, (col. 1)  
1/31/89 N.Y.L.J. 5, (col. 1)

Page 10

of another opinion." Mr. Gentile had blundered incredibly in recommending that the complaint in Steinberg be dismissed.

The DDC might consider appointing a subcommittee to read the Steinberg file and to decide whether the testimony of three persons, Mr. and Mrs. Novak and Mark Ames, who would have testified to Steinberg's cocaine addiction, together with Steinberg's invocation of his privilege against self-incrimination in answer to any questions concerning cocaine, including his addiction to cocaine, would not have caused the DDC to move immediately to suspend Steinberg. According to the Times and the New York Law Journal, Professor Gillers of New York University School of Law apparently thinks that suspension would have followed. If that is the opinion of the subcommittee, the DDC should read the Times' Jan. 5 report of its Jan. 4 interview of Mr. Gentile. There Mr. Gentile said of the Novaks, whom he had never met, "It is quite common for disgruntled clients to make some-sort of effort to attack their lawyers' performance." There is no evidence in the Steinberg file that the Novaks were "disgruntled."

The Times article stated that Mr. Gentile "said the Novaks lost interest in helping disciplinary officials make a case against Mr. Steinberg," these ?? words of our former chief counsel in whose office the Steinberg case had been awaiting determination from November 1983 through October 1986 and who was under this Court's direction to compel unwilling witnesses, such as the Novaks, to appear (Rule 605.9). The Novaks would have been ideal witnesses because they had testified in the 1983 federal post-conviction proceeding that Steinberg apparently was addicted to cocaine. Those transcripts were part of the Steinberg file when Mr. Gentile recommended the dismissal of the complaint.

As for the third witness against Steinberg, Mr. Ames, the Times reported that Mr. Gentile said that Ames "was not reliable." Mr. Gentile had never met Mr. Ames, and there is no evidence in the file that Ames was unreliable.

Is there any member of the DDC who would have kept in his office a lawyer who had made the deceptive statements that Mr. Gentile had made to the Times on Jan. 4?

Last, the nature of the relationship between the DDC and the Court needs to be restated.

The DDC is the Court's disciplinary nominee. Its staff is constituted of civil servants whom the Committee has neither the power to appoint nor to discharge. The Court has those powers and, in the case of noncompetitive confidential employees such as the chief counsel and the deputy chief counsel, need not assign any cause to the DDC or to anyone else. This broad ?? for many reasons, one of which involves the necessity for the exercise of discretion in deciding who is desirable for the execution of sensitive powers.

?? basis for the resignations requested by me, you must ask yourself whether your acceptance of your appointment was subject to the condition that the Court exer-

1/31/89 NYLJ 5, (col. 1)  
1/31/89 N.Y.L.J. 5, (col. 1)

Page 11

cise its discretion in discharging DDC employees only in ways acceptable to you. Put another way, your commitment to serve the public interest could not have been made subject to a matter wholly within the Court's discretion. To say otherwise would be to say that your appointment is subject to the Court's opinion concerning the wages you pay your employees, a condition that would surprise you, to say nothing of your employees.

However, should you think that I am right, or that certain issues are seemingly unresolvable, or that you would have exercised your discretion in a different way but for the same purposes, or that this Committee's involvement in the resignations of Mr. Gentile and Ms. McShea has shown why it is not the proper business of this Committee to review a discretion vested by law solely in this Court, then I invite you to resume the work of this Committee which has enjoyed a prestige unshared by any other disciplinary body in the nation. Our efforts should be in the direction of what is constructive and unitive, not in the direction of what is destructive and divisive.

1/31/89 NYLJ 5, (col. 1)

END OF DOCUMENT