

Judiciary Committee Hearing Public Hearing, February 15, 2012; Questions for Judge Sheldon:

1. Are you aware that you took an Oath of Affirmation required by Article VI that was required of all "judicial Officers" of the "several states" to be "bound" to "support this Constitution" of the United States as the "Supreme Law of this Land?"
2. At the November 2010 Rules Committee meeting did you deliver a legal defense of the writ of habeas corpus to your fellow judges indicating that the proposed modifications of the rules of practice for 2011 that would "provide judicial discretion" to allow a judge to "save money" by not bringing a prisoner to court for all hearings, would never stand up as "constitutional" if that proposed modification was ever challenged in federal court?
3. Was the November 2010 meeting chaired by interim Rules Committee Chairperson Justice Ian McLachlan?
4. Was the modification of the rights of habeas corpus of prisoners tabled for adoption by the Rules Committee meeting in November 2010?
5. Were you contacted between the November 2010 Rules Committee Meeting and the December 2010 Rules Committee meeting by Justice Peter Zarella, or any other member of the Supreme Court, the Rules Committee on a state owned computer, telephone or letter to coerce you into getting you to approve the proposed modification on habeas corpus rights which you opposed at the November 2010 meeting?
6. Do the publicly posted minutes of the November 2010 Rules Committee meeting properly reflect your legal arguments stating your opposition to the modification proposal of the Rules Committee to violate the fundamental "constitutional rights of prisoners" to be brought to all court proceedings and be replaced by "teleconferencing hearings without consent" in criminal proceedings only?
7. Do you recall receiving letters faxed to your offices from citizen advocate Michael Nowacki in October, November and December 2011 protesting the adoption of rules of practice which "empowered judges" despite a legal mandate passed in 1953 by the legislature and defined in CGS 51-14 which states that "such rules SHALL NOT abridge, enlarge or amend any substantive rights or the jurisdictions of any of the courts?"
8. What transpired to change your "constitutional" principles about protecting prisoner's rights as "inviolate" oath of office to pledge to uphold the federal and statutory Constitutional rights of prisoners to be brought to court and trading those rights for cost savings between the November 2010 Rules Committee meeting and the "flip flop" of voting in favor of "teleconferencing hearings" at the December Rules Committee minutes posted on line?

9. Was the December 2010 meeting of the Rules Committee chaired by Supreme Court Justice Peter Zarella and did Justice Zarella, Justice Chase Rogers or any other member of the Rules Committee apply any pressure to reverse your opposition to the "teleconferencing" empowerment of judges to cede fundamental rights of prisoners to be brought to court?

10. Were you promised any future "award" or recognition of appointment to the Appellate Court if you capitulated to the recommendations of the Rules Committee Chair for reversing your opposition that would relate to a promise of appointment to the Appellate Court seat you are now recommended for?

11. Please explain what "federal case law research" you did between the November 2010 Rules Committee meeting and the December 2010 meeting that would have supported your "change of heart" vote to cause you to adopt and recommend for adoption a rule modification to obviate the rights of prisoners for writ of habeas corpus as defined the Constitution of the United States as only subject to denial in cases of insurrection in which the safe transport of a prisoner to and from a court couldn't be secured?

12. Do you remember five citizens including Cheryl Martone, Henry Martuchio, Ken Krajewski, Francis Knize and Michael Nowacki speaking at the Supreme Court on May 31, 2011 concerning the unlawful abridgments of CGS 51-14(a) (b) and (c) of citizen rights to legislative hearings and judiciary hearings and then ignoring those public comments and 700 pages of documents provided by one citizen Michael Nowacki about the dangers and unlawful nature of "teleconferencing hearings" to which Nowacki was a victimized by on two occasions?

13. Did you actually say at the Rules Committee meeting on May 31, the following;

"I don't believe that it is the responsibility of the Rules Committee to pass a legal position on the Constitutionality of Practice Book Rules before passing them for adoption?"

14. How can you reconcile the statement you made on May 31, 2011 at the Rules Committee meeting with your Oath of Affirmation required by CGS 1-25 which contains a common oath for the legislature, the executive branch and the members of the judiciary to "solemnly swear or solemnly affirm as the case may be to support the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of the State of Connecticut" and to enforce the laws of the State of Connecticut"

15. Would you support a mandated public hearing conducted by the legislature to review all of the Rules of Practice adopted since 1969 which abridged citizen rights to public hearings before "such rules" could be adopted and promulgated at the annual judges meeting?

16. Would you support the repeal of all practice book rules adopted since 1969 if such rules violated the mandated protocols of review defined in CGS 51-14? If not, why not?

17. Were you notified in writing and at the public presentation of documents in May 2011 by citizen Michael Nowacki that the collusion of the legislative judiciary committee and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court constituted "treason" of the federal and State of Connecticut Constitutional provisions of separation of the powers of government?

18. Were you notified after recommending and also casting your own vote at the annual judges meeting of June 21, 2011 to adopt a series of unlawful modifications of practice book rules resulted in a lawsuit being filed against you and other judges who engaged in an abuse of their "administrative" authority as a judge in endorsing and promulgating for implementation "such rules" which "abridged, enlarged or modified any substantive rights or the jurisdiction of any of the courts?"

19. Do you believe that the adoption of CGS 51-14 modifications of "such rules of practice" was a "wanton", "neglectful" or "malicious" act which would represent a liability for the State of Connecticut for you as a "public official" governed by your Oath of Office?

20. Do you believe that judges in the State of Connecticut who are sued in federal court should be defended for abuses of administrative authority defined in CGS 51-14 should be defended for their misconduct by using taxpayer funded services of the Office of Attorney General?

21. Do you believe your conduct as a member of the Rules Committee and as a Superior Court Judge was consistent with your fiduciary responsibility to the federal Constitution, the Constitution of the State of Connecticut and CGS 51-14 as mandated by "your solemn" pledge to be "bound" by your Oath of Affirmation for judicial Officers defined in Article VI of the US Constitution?

22. Do you wish to withdraw your name for having defiled your Oath of Office from consideration as a nominee to the Appellate Court based upon these questions?

Michael J. Nowacki
319 West District Drive
New Canaan, CT 06840
MNOWACKI@AOL.COM
(203) 273-4296 (cell)
(203) 966-6474 (work + fax)