

Center for Judicial Accountability

From: Center for Judicial Accountability <elena@judgewatch.org>
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2015 6:04 AM
To: jturley@law.gwu.edu; 'nqr@law.georgetown.edu'; 'legomsky@wulaw.wustl.edu'
Subject: Vindicating the Constitution & the Public's Rights: The Rigged Confirmation Hearing of Loretta Lynch at which You are Testifying Today

Dear Professors Turley, Rosenkranz, and Legomsky,

I look forward to your testimony later today. However, the Republican and Democratic sides of the Senate Judiciary Committee have collusively rigged the hearing to exclude evidence-based testimony that establishes U.S. Attorney Lynch's corruption in office, dispositive that not a single senator can properly vote for her confirmation. This is why I will not be joining you today in testifying before the Committee.

You can determine this for yourselves from my December 17, 2014 and January 6, 2015 letters to the Senate Judiciary Committee, outlined by my below press alert, "*Is Loretta Lynch's Confirmation a Reprise of the Clarence Thomas Fiasco -- But Worse?*", which I circulated to the press beginning 4 days ago – to which there has been no response.

As you cannot otherwise appreciate what a charade the hearing was yesterday – and will doubtlessly be today – with the Senators extolling and giving deference to Ms. Lynch's purported record, qualifications, respect for the rule of law, equal justice, etc., I respectfully request that, in advance of your testifying today, you take a few minutes to review these two letters, accessible *via* the below links – the accuracy of which has not been denied or disputed by anyone, including U.S. Attorney Lynch, to whom I sent them for response.

Indeed, inasmuch as the ultimate question is "what information – if any – [you] have to offer about Lynch's record" ("*The Loretta Lynch Hearing: A Showcase of Right-Wing Media Regulars*", Media Matters, 1/27/15 – <http://mediamatters.org/blog/2015/01/27/the-loretta-lynch-hearing-a-showcase-of-right-w/202283#comment-1821537895>), you may find these letters additionally important should you be asked whether you are aware of any blemish to Ms. Lynch's record.

In any event, and irrespective of whether you are testifying in opposition or in favor, I respectfully submit that it is your civic-duty, over and beyond your duty as attorneys and scholars, to "blow the whistle" on what the Committee has done in precluding public presentation of my evidence-based testimony, dispositive of U.S. Attorney Lynch's corruption in office – and of the Senators' disgraceful public posturing as if it does not exist.

Needless to say, there must be scholarship on the Senate Judiciary Committee's brazen fraud on the American People and violation of its sacred duty with respect to this confirmation– illustrative of what the Committee does with respect to other confirmations – likewise, with no report by the press. Following today's hearing, I will be calling you so that we can discuss which constitutional scholars can be enlisted for such a vital, far-reaching task – and which reporters might be immediately contacted so as to yet report on what will otherwise be a most cynical *fait accompli*, perpetuating the catastrophic injury to the People of the State of New York caused by U.S. Attorney Lynch's documentarily-established corruption in office.

Thank you.

Most respectfully,

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

914-421-1200

elena@judgewatch.org

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

Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 11:06 PM

To: 'editor@legislativegazette.com'; 'alan@wamc.org'

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 22nd 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, 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