

## Center for Judicial Accountability

---

**From:** Center for Judicial Accountability <elena@judgewatch.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 30, 2015 1:52 PM  
**To:** 'tgraham@mrc.org'  
**Subject:** Dueling Posts: Your Jan. 27th Post (7:25 pm): "Critics Unquoted as WashPost Hails Loretta Lynch's Touch of 'Steel' and 'Velvet'" & Media Matters' Jan. 27th Post (3:13 pm): "The Loretta Lynch Hearing: A Showcase of Right-Wing Media Regulars"  
**Attachments:** 1-28-15-comments-to-media-matters.pdf; media-matters-1-28-15-comment3.jpg; media-matters-1-28-15-comment2-upclose.jpg; media-matters-1-28-15-comment1-upclose.jpg; media-matters-1-28-15-tip-suggestion-idea.jpg

Dear Mr. Graham,

This follows up the phone message I left for you this morning, with Briana, introducing myself as the opposition witness who was NOT permitted to testify at the Senate Judiciary Committee's yesterday's hearing to confirm Loretta Lynch's nomination as Attorney General, at which not a single witness testified in opposition.

Hours before the two-day hearing began on January 28<sup>th</sup>, while responding to the Media Matters' January 27<sup>th</sup> post "The Loretta Lynch Hearing: A Showcase of Right-Wing Media Regulars", <http://mediamatters.org/blog/2015/01/27/the-loretta-lynch-hearing-a-showcase-of-right-w/202283>, I came upon your own January 27<sup>th</sup> post "Critics Unquoted as WashPost Hails Loretta Lynch's Touch of 'Steel' and 'Velvet'," <http://newsbusters.org/blogs/tim-graham/2015/01/27/loretta-lynch-steel-magnolia-and-velvet#sthash.TcYcUUaU.dpuf>.

I did not then have time to respond to your post, but I now have an even juicier story for you: the three comments I posted on the Media Matters' website that have inexplicably disappeared – the third of which read:

"Why do my previous posts on media cover-up of the true facts pertaining to Lynch's qualifications & 'vetting', which I twice posted, because they disappeared the first time, not appear? Is it because the media fabrications and concealments are by BOTH the liberal and conservative media? See [www.judgewatch.org](http://www.judgewatch.org) – 'CJA's Citizen Opposition to Senate Confirmation of US Attorney Lynch as US Attorney General?'

Elena Sassower, Director  
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)  
914-421-1200  
[elena@judgewatch.org](mailto:elena@judgewatch.org)."

Attached is the text of those three comments – and my screen shots of them, immediately upon my posting them. Likewise attached is a photo of my "tip...suggestion...idea" for coverage – which, promptly upon posting my first comment, I sent to Media Matters, via its webpage for "Taking Action": [http://action.mediamatters.org/got\\_an\\_idea](http://action.mediamatters.org/got_an_idea). Like my first comment, it had stated:

"Your praise of Loretta Lynch's 'record' is misplaced, as likewise reliance on the praise of those 'across the political spectrum'. That you do so is the product of media, liberal and conservative both, that not only REFUSES to report on her corruption in office as U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, but REFUSES to report on the corruption of

appropriate 'vetting' of Ms. Lynch, pre-nomination by the White House/Justice Department and post-nomination by the Senate Judiciary Committee, both the democratic and republican sides, including their collusive exclusion from the witness list of anyone -- such as myself -- having DISPOSITIVE EVIDENCE of her corruption as U.S. Attorney. **Will you report it?** Here's the Press Alert I widely circulated to the media just two days ago:

IS LORETTA LYNCH'S CONFIRMATION A REPRIS OF THE CLARENCE THOMAS FIASCO -- BUT WORSE?" (capitalization in original, underlining and bold added).

I have received no response to it.

Finally, with respect to your own "*Critics Unquoted as WashPost Hails Loretta Lynch's Touch of 'Steel' and 'Velvet'*", below is the e-mailed Press Alert I had sent to the Washington Post at 10:37 a.m. on Monday, January 26<sup>th</sup>, without response from it, other than, if not the "'Steel' and 'Velvet'" fluff piece you descry (which I believe was posted in the late afternoon), its subsequent superficial and slanted reporting and editorializing comment.

This is a BIG STORY – establishing the collusion of ALL Republican and Democratic Senators of the Senate Judiciary Committee to RIG a "yes" vote for confirmation – and to cover-up for President Obama, whose duty it was to withdraw the nomination, as they each knew from my telephone calls and correspondence with them.

I am available to answer questions and to be interviewed. Feel free to call me, including over the weekend and at night.

Also, I would greatly appreciate if you could furnish me with contact information for Sharyl Attkisson and Catherine Engelbrecht, each of whom I unsuccessfully tried to contact on January 28<sup>th</sup>.

Thank you.

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

---

**From:** Center for Judicial Accountability [mailto:[elena@judgewatch.org](mailto:elena@judgewatch.org)]

**Sent:** Monday, January 26, 2015 10:37 AM

**To:** 'national@washpost.com'

**Subject: PRESS ALERT: Is Loretta Lynch's Confirmation a Reprise of the Clarence Thomas Fiasco -- But Worse?"**

**[Is Loretta Lynch's Confirmation a Reprise of the Clarence Thomas Fiasco -- But Worse?](#)**

It's not about race, or sex, or her political views. It's about irrefutable evidence of her corruption as U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, both in her first and second terms, as to which NO senator can vote to confirm her for Attorney General.

U.S. Attorney Lynch's corruption, covering up high-level public corruption by New York's highest public officers and key state oversight entities – and the deficiencies of her "vetting", both pre- and post-nomination – are the subject of two FULLY-DOCUMENTED letters to the Senate Judiciary Committee from our non-partisan, non-profit citizens' organization,

Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA). Each highlight, in the first instance, the March 23, 2001 complaint of professional misconduct against her that we filed with the Justice Department's Office of Professional Responsibility, which she was duty-bound to disclose as part of her "vetting". Did she disclose it? Or did she perjure herself on the "confidential" portion of her Senate Judiciary Committee questionnaire, in response to its question:

"Have you ever been the subject of a complaint to any court, administrative agency, bar association, disciplinary committee, or other professional group for breach of ethics, unprofessional conduct or violation of any rule of practice? If so, please provide full details."

The first letter, e-mailed to the Senate Judiciary Committee on December 17, 2014, was not posted on the Committee's webpage for the confirmation until Friday, January 23th, shortly before 6 pm [<http://www.judiciary.senate.gov/nominations/executive/pn2136-113>] – and only then, most likely, because of inquiries from Washington Times reporter Jim McElhatton recited at the end of his January 22<sup>nd</sup> article "*Senate urged to ask AG nominee Loretta Lynch about stock fraud case*" [<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/jan/22/senate-urged-to-ask-loretta-lynch-about-stock-frau/?page=all#pagebreak>].

The second letter, e-mailed to the Senate Judiciary Committee on January 6, 2015, has not been posted. It enclosed CJA's January 5, 2015 letter to President Obama and expressly invited the Committee's response to what it recited about the Committee's "vetting and hearing procedures", including, specifically, its statement:

'...the press has yet to report to the American People – 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 have dispositive evidence of nominee unfitness, such as corruption and ethics breaches.

At bar, NO Senator can vote for U.S. Attorney Lynch's confirmation based on the evidence here presented.'" (capitalization in the original).

In support, this January 6, 2015 letter identified that we had "yet to receive any response" from the Senate Judiciary Committee to our December 17, 2014 letter "other than a generic, automated e-mail acknowledgment of receipt, which was solely from the then minority Republican side."

Today, 20 days later, and with only 2 days until the Senate Judiciary Committee's hearing on Ms. Lynch's confirmation as this nation's highest law enforcement officer is scheduled to begin, we still have "yet to receive any response" from the Senate Judiciary Committee to our December 17, 2014 letter – or to our January 6, 2015 letter. This includes to my request to testify in opposition at the confirmation hearing, as to which I left a phone message for Senate Judiciary Committee Chief Nominations Counsel Ted Lehman at 10:40 am on January 23rd.

You can readily judge – within minutes – the duty of Senate Judiciary Committee counsel and investigators to have long ago called me to be interviewed, including under oath, so that the Committee could reject Ms. Lynch's nomination, without necessity of a hearing. Both CJA's December 17, 2014 and January 6, 2015 letters – and the dispositive evidence supporting them– are posted on our website, [www.judgewatch.org](http://www.judgewatch.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>.

**Is the Senate Judiciary Committee going to "invite" me to testify at the confirmation hearing in opposition? What is its criteria for opposition witnesses and who has the Committee already "invited" to testify in opposition? Didn't those opposition witnesses write letters to the Committee requesting to testify in opposition – and, if so, why are their letters not posted on the Committee's webpage for the confirmation? Or are there no opposition witnesses?**

**I am available to answer your questions – and to be interviewed about this MAJOR NEWS STORY, whose far-reaching consequence, beyond rejection of Ms. Lynch’s unworthy nomination, is non-partisan, good-government clean-up of corruption in the Justice Department, the U.S. Attorneys' offices – and in Congress, for starters.**

Thank you.

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