

February 25, 2017
500 Pearl Street
New York, New York 10007

David Roemer
345 Webster Ave., Apt. 4-0
Brooklyn, NY 11230

Subject: 1:17-cv-00703-PKC-AJP

Dear Judge Castel,

I read your Order of Dismissal. I certainly understand that you have the right to dismiss my lawsuit against the General Counsel of Columbia University. My complaint accuses Ms. Booth of violating the academic freedom of the Columbia University community by not allowing me to send emails offering to give a lecture/lesson on the cosmological argument for God's existence to the dozen or so "Religious Life Advisors" who are appointed by the University Chaplain. The emails I want to send includes a link to my article on Academia.edu titled, "Why People Think God Caused the Big Bang" and a handout with 28 questions about the arguments for God's existence. Ms. Booth authorized Andrew Schilling to file a motion dismissing the complaint against her. However, I just got word from my process server that the summons was served on Lee Bollinger. How do you know Mr. Schilling is representing Lee Bollinger? Mr. Bollinger may claim that Mr. Schilling acted on his behalf without his knowledge.

Also, what gives you the right to dismiss my complaint against the Attorney Grievance Committee? I mailed a request for a waiver of a summons on January 30, 2017, however, I have not yet gotten a waiver. Yesterday, I had a meeting with an attorney from the NYLAG Legal Clinic for Pro Se litigants. I was advised to hire a process server after giving the Attorney Grievance Committee the 30 days to grant the waiver. When the summons is served on the Attorney Grievance Committee they may admit that they made a mistake in finding Jane Booth not guilty of violating the New York Rules of Professional Conduct.

I think you should recuse yourself from this case because you were once the Chairman of the Attorney Grievance Committee and presumably know and are friends with the individuals who did not sanction Ms. Booth. I have reasons for thinking there was maliciousness in the dismissal of my complaint against Ms. Booth. In other words, the dismissal was not just the knee-jerk assumption that Columbia U. does not need a retired high school teacher to explain to them the cosmological arguments for God's existence.

I filed the complaint against Ms. Booth to Mr. Jorge Dopico on October 18, 2016 with seven exhibits. I was advised over the telephone that the usual procedure would be to send me a postcard with the docket number of my complaint. I did not get the docket number in writing until January 5, 2017, when Mr. Dopico wrote, "Ms. Booth's actions on behalf of Columbia University, as demonstrated by the exhibits to your complaint, do not appear to constitute violations the New York Rules of Professional Conduct." The letter implies that Ms. Booth was not advised of my complaint. I don't believe this. I think Ms. Booth was told about my complaint and she put pressure on Mr. Dopico to dismiss the complaint without requiring Ms. Booth to justify her reasons for sending me the letter you quoted from.

Another reason you should recuse yourself from this case is that the Order of Dismissal has two statements that are inane.

In the fourth paragraph, you write, "Lest there be any doubt on the subject, this Court expresses no views on Mr. Roemer's religious and philosophical beliefs." There is nothing in the complaint about my religious or philosophical beliefs. Paragraphs 10, 11, and 12 state only facts. The facts are that the cosmological argument for God's existence is based on this scientific fact that human beings did not evolve from animals, and that the professors and students at Columbia U. don't know or understand this.

In the same paragraph, you write, "There is no basis in law for this Court to Order the Attorney Grievance Committee to discipline an attorney or hold it accountable for failing to do so." Suppose I found out that Columbia's librarian was destroying books promoting faith in God. I tell the President of Columbia, and get a letter from the General Counsel threatening to sue me for libel if I publish my accusation. I file a complaint against the General Counsel with the Attorney Grievance Committee and the Attorney Grievance Committee dismisses my complaint without investigating whether or not books are being destroyed or asking the General Counsel about my accusation. In this hypothetical case, it is obvious to me that there is a cause of action against the Attorney Grievance Committee, the President, and General Counsel for using the power of the New York Unified Court System to promote the religion called *humanism*.

For the time being, I am ignoring this demented and illegal order. I will pick up the proof of service on Lee Bollinger on February 27 and ask the Pro Se Intake office to put it in the docket. If they put it on the docket, I will serve a summons on the Attorney Grievance Committee in the hope that you will remove yourself from this case.

/s David Roemer, pro se

345 Webster Ave., Apt. 4-O, Brooklyn, NY 11230

david@dkroemer.com

347-414-2285