

CENTER for JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY, INC.

P.O. Box 69, Gedney Station
White Plains, New York 10605-0069

Tel. (914) 421-1200
Fax (914) 428-4994

E-Mail: judgewatch@aol.com
Web site: judgewatch.org

Elena Ruth Sassower, Coordinator

BY FAX: 212-643-7828 (6 pages)

BY CERTIFIED MAIL/RRR: 7000-1670-0007-9431-9967

December 20, 2001

Michael Aronson, Editorial Board
New York Daily News
450 West 33rd Street
New York, New York 10001

RE: Scheduling a Meeting for the Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA) to make an *Evidence-Based* Presentation to the Daily News Editorial Board on its "*Judging the Judges*" Editorial Series

Dear Mr. Aronson:

Today's New York Law Journal has a front-page article reporting that Daily News Editorial Page Editor, Richard J. Schwartz, is meeting today with a delegation of judges who intend to show Daily News editors that "they drew the 'wrong conclusions' from court statistics" – in their "*Judging the Judges*" series of editorials.

Please bring to Mr. Schwartz' attention that the Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA), a New York-based non-partisan, non-profit citizens organization, has ALSO requested a meeting with the Editorial Board – and provide, for his review, CJA's supporting letters, dated November 30th and December 10th, addressed to you.

In our brief telephone conversation this past Monday, December 17th, you acknowledged having received these letters. However, with all due respect, I couldn't help but feel that you had NOT necessarily read them – and that you had not reviewed nor made provision for review of the voluminous documentation transmitted with the November 30th letter, consisting of the appellate papers in the ground-breaking public interest lawsuit against the New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct, now pending in the Appellate Division, First Department – as to which there may be a decision any day. Indeed, from our phone conversation, I was not at all sure you actually read my published Letter to the Editor, featured on the Daily News editorial page of December 7th under the title "*Judicial Reforms*".

As set forth in CJA's November 30th and December 10th letters to you, CJA has a wealth of *readily-verifiable* EVIDENCE germane to the Daily News "Judging the Judges" editorial series – which is properly the subject of investigative reporting. This includes the evidence that this state's judicial disciplinary mechanism is not merely "secretive" and "ineffective", which is how the Daily News' November 26th editorial, "Disorder in the Courts", describes it. Rather, the Commission on Judicial Conduct – the key disciplinary monitor -- is verifiably CORRUPT. It also includes evidence that "merit selection" appointment will NOT remove, or even reduce, politics and corruption from judicial selection -- contrary to four of the five Daily News' "Judging the Judges" editorials. Indeed, the record of the pending lawsuit against the Commission – including the appellate papers in your possession – provides irrefutable evidentiary proof of how thoroughly corrupt the appointive process can be – including its results.

In our December 17th phone conversation you stated that "maybe, after the New Year" you would "try to have a time to have a meeting". While I am not complaining that the Daily News did not tell the delegation of judges to ALSO wait until after the New Year, I am complaining that you have *not* made a firm commitment to a meeting at that time. Therefore, please advise what more CJA must do to show that the Editorial Board would immeasurably benefit from our providing it with an overview presentation of *readily-verifiable* EVIDENCE on the *very* subjects about which it is opining in its on-going "Judging the Judges" editorial series.

Meantime, enclosed is my fax of today's date to the Daily News City Desk. Obviously, if Chief Judge Kaye's "voice will absolutely be heard at the appropriate time in the near future" on the "Judging the Judges" editorials, the Editorial Board should want to meet with CJA as soon as possible for an overview of the *readily-verifiable* EVIDENCE of the Chief Judge's facilitating – indeed, criminal -- role in the "pitiful condition" of the state justice system.

Thank you.

Yours for a quality judiciary,



ELENA RUTH SASSOWER, Coordinator
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)

Enclosure

TRANSMISSION VERIFICATION REPORT

TIME : 12/20/2001 16:03
 NAME : CJA
 FAX : 9144284994
 TEL : 9144211200

DATE/TIME	12/20 16:59
FACILITY NAME	13126437826
DURATION	00:03:46
PAGES	05
FEE/UNIT	OK
MODE	STANDARD ECM

**U.S. Postal Service
 CERTIFIED MAIL RECEIPT**
 (Domestic Mail Only; No Insurance Coverage Provided)

10001

Postage	\$ 0.80	UNIT ID: 0136
Certified Fee	2.10	Postmark Here
Return Receipt Fee (Endorsement Required)	2.50	Clerk: KCKMOS
Restricted Delivery Fee (Endorsement Required)		12/22/01
Total Postage & Fees	\$ 4.40	

Sent To: *Michael Arhugh Editorial Board*
Ny Daily News
450 West 33rd Street
Ny Ny 10001

See Reverse for Instructions

COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY
2, and 3. Also complete if Delivery is desired. Add address on the reverse turn the card to you. Do the back of the mailpiece, space permits.	A. Received by (Please Print Clearly) <i>Goodin</i> B. Date of Delivery <i>12/27/01</i>
	C. Signature <i>Goodin</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Agent <input type="checkbox"/> Addressee
	D. Is delivery address different from item 1? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If YES, enter delivery address below:
	3. Service Type <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certified Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Express Mail <input type="checkbox"/> Registered <input type="checkbox"/> Return Receipt for Merchandise <input type="checkbox"/> Insured Mail <input type="checkbox"/> C.O.D.
	4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

2. Article Number (Copy from service label)
 7000 1670 0007 9431 9967