

Center for Judicial Accountability

From: Center for Judicial Accountability <elena@judgewidth.org>
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2015 9:38 AM
To: wpruden@washingtontimes.com
Cc: jsolomon@washingtontimes.com; cdolan@washingtontimes.com; mstainer@washingtontimes.com; jbourantas@washingtontimes.com; cbryant@washingtontimes.com; vmorton@washingtontimes.com; dsands@washingtontimes.com; jharper@washingtontimes.com; yourletters@washingtontimes.com; jmcclhatton@washingtontimes.com; 'smiller@washingtontimes.com'
Subject: Accurate Reporting & Editorializing on Loretta Lynch's Nomination & Confirmation as Attorney General

Dear Mr. Pruden,

I sincerely appreciate your taking the time to respond to my yesterday's e-mail – and your correction of my language. If what I should have said is “seriously mistaken”, rather than “seriously erroneous”, because, at issue, is opinion, I stand corrected.

As I do know the difference between fact and opinion, I would appreciate even more if you would confirm that you have read my FACT-SPECIFIC December 17th letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee and January 5th letter to President Obama – and examined any of the EVIDENCE to which they refer, posted on CJA's website, www.judgewidth.org, accessible *via* the prominent homepage link “CJA's Citizen Opposition to Senate Confirmation of U.S. Attorney Lynch as Attorney General”.

If nothing else, have you examined my fully-documented March 23, 2001 complaint of professional misconduct against Ms. Lynch, filed with the Justice Department's Office of Professional Responsibility, sent to her by certified mail/return receipt – which she would have been required to disclose both with respect to her nomination and confirmation in 2010 as US Attorney for the Eastern District of NY and her nomination and confirmation now as Attorney General. Here's the direct link to the webpage I constructed yesterday to facilitate examination of it – and of the larger issues it presents of a corrupted complaint process at the Justice Department's Office of Professional Responsibility – which, upon her confirmation at Attorney General, would be her duty to address: <http://www.judgewidth.org/web-pages/searching-federal/lynch/justice-dept-opr.htm>.

What is your opinion? Based on the December 17th and January 5th letters – and the substantiating EVIDENCE – to which I invited Ms. Lynch's response, without response from her or anyone else – is it your opinion that ANY Senator could properly vote for her confirmation? Does it not concern you that the Senate Judiciary Committee has yet to “invite” me to testify in opposition to Ms. Lynch's confirmation at its hearing, now only five days away, nor posted these letters on its website: <http://www.judiciary.senate.gov/nominations/executive/pn2136-113>.

Not to lose sight of the forest for the trees, shouldn't the Washington Times be IMMEDIATELY informing the public – whether editorially or on its news pages – of the EVIDENCE now before it that the Senate Judiciary Committee's confirmation hearing – and the “vetting” that precedes it – are charades for public consumption, concealing beneath an illusion of scrutiny, a political deal to confirm the nominee?

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)