

Center for Judicial Accountability

From: Center for Judicial Accountability <elena@judgewidth.org>
Sent: Saturday, January 17, 2015 1:00 PM
To: 'jenny@jsquaredmedia.com'; 'news@whatthefolly.com'; 'editor@whatthefolly.com'
Subject: NEWS LEAD: Who will be testifying in opposition at the Senate Judiciary Committee's hearing to confirm Attorney General nominee Loretta Lynch?

Dear Ms. Jiang,

Thank you for what you are endeavoring to do: providing “explanatory and public service journalism” based on “accurate reporting, thoughtful news analysis, and access to curated research materials...”, targeting “an engaged audience of independent voters, activists, journalists, as well as federal, state and local government officials.”

Doubtless attention to – and funding for – what you are doing would be greatly advanced if you were to break a major national news story.

Yesterday Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Grassley announced that on January 28th-29th, the Committee will hold its hearing to confirm the nomination of U.S. Attorney Loretta Lynch as Attorney General. According to the announcement: “The first day will consist of opening statements from the Chairman and Ranking Member, an opening statement from the nominee, and questions by committee members. The second day will feature outside witnesses invited by both the majority and the minority.” <http://www.grassley.senate.gov/news/news-releases/grassley-sets-hearing-attorney-general-nominee-jan-28-and-29>

Who are the “outside witnesses invited by both the majority and the minority?” – and what was the Committee’s criteria for its “invit[ations]”? Were ALL members of the public who contacted the Committee requesting to testify “invited” to do so – and what are their names? How many of those not “invited” had requested to testify in opposition? What “vetting”, if any, did the Committee do to evaluate their prospective opposition testimony? Has the Committee informed those not “invited” that they may submit written testimony? – and will such written testimony be posted on the Senate Judiciary Committee’s website, included in the Committee’s report on the nomination to the Senate, and bound in the Committee’s after-the-fact printed volume on the confirmation?

I was perhaps the first member of the public to request to testify – in opposition. I telephoned the Committee – both its majority and minority sides – on Monday morning, November 10th – the first business day after President Obama’s nomination of U.S. Attorney Lynch on Saturday, November 8th. This – and the serious and substantial basis for the opposition: U.S. Attorney Lynch’s corruption in office, the deficiencies in her pre-nomination vetting, and the inadequacies, if not perjury, in her responses to the Senate Judiciary Committee’s questionnaire -- are recounted by my December 17, 2014 letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee, to which, as of this date, there has been no response.

Nor has there been any response to my January 5, 2015 letter to President Obama – which I sent to the Senate Judiciary Committee under a coverletter highlighting the paragraph reading:

“...the scandalous truth – which the press has yet to report to the American People – [is] that the Senate Judiciary Committee’s own vetting is a fiction and its confirmation hearings essentially rigged to ensure confirmation, which it does by excluding opposition testimony from members of the public having dispositive evidence of nominee unfitness, such as corruption and ethics breaches.” (at p. 3).

These two letters – both of which I also sent to U.S. Attorney Lynch for response – are posted on the website of the non-partisan, non-profit citizens’ organization, Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA), www.judgewidth.org,

accessible *via* the prominent homepage link: “CJA’s Citizen Opposition to Senate Confirmation of U.S. Attorney Loretta Lynch as U.S. Attorney General”. Here’s the direct link: <http://www.judgewatch.org/web-pages/searching-federal/lynch/2014-opposition-lynch-ag.htm>.

Once you read the letters – and review the substantiating evidentiary proof, also posted – I trust you will agree that this is a MAJOR news story, with the potential to make sweeping good government reform, in Congress, the Justice Department, and the State of New York, for starters. What more could you ask for?

I am available to answer your questions and to be interviewed, including over this weekend.

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
www.judgewatch.org
Tel: 914-421-1200
Cell: 646-220-7987
elena@judgewatch.org