

Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)

From: Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA) [elena@judgewidth.org]
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2008 11:21 AM
To: 'zorn@psu.edu'
Subject: Building Scholarship -- The Solicitor General, Supreme Court, & the "Disruption of Congress" Case
Attachments: roberts-riding-coattails-1993.pdf; levy-judges-role-ethics-1982.pdf

Dear Professor,

So terrific to have finally met you – especially as you were the key reason for my going to the Empirical Legal Studies Conference this year, as likewise last. How fortuitous, too, that you were the discussant for the Conference segment on federal judicial selection/confirmation, as this is the very issue from which the “disruption of Congress” case arises.

The cert petition and petition for rehearing in the “disruption of Congress” case provide an unprecedented window into the functioning & relationship of the Solicitor General’s office and the Supreme Court in covering up the annihilation of the rule of law by the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia and the D.C. Courts to perpetuate the corruption of federal judicial selection/confirmation – all established by irrefutable primary source documents and “celluloid DNA”, in the form of a videotape.

Attached, for your convenience, is Chief Justice Roberts’ 1993 article in the *Legal Times*, “*Riding the Coattails of the Solicitor General*”, as well as Professor John Levy’s 1982 law review article “*The Judge’s Role in the Enforcement of Ethics – Fear and Learning in the Profession*” – cited by my September 17, 2007 and October 9, 2007 motions to the Supreme Court to compel the Solicitor General’s response to the cert petition and rejection of his waiver [RA-9, RA-32], with the second motion citing and quoting your 1997 paper “*When (and Why) Does the U.S. Go To Court?*” [RA-32]. These two motions, as originally formatted, as likewise the entire record of the “disruption of Congress” case, are posted on CJA’s website, www.judgewidth.org, accessible via the sidebar panel “Disruption of Congress”.

Please note that my October 9, 2007 motion [RA-37] identifies the information I had requested from the Supreme Court’s Clerk by a September 21, 2007 letter [RA-50-51], to which he had not responded, including:

“(d) the percentage of criminal cases in which the Solicitor General waives the Government’s ‘right to file a response’ to cert petitions; and

(e) whether in any of those criminal cases, the petitioners ever made motions to either a single justice or to the Court for the Government’s response – and, if so, whether the Clerk’s Office also sent those motions back to the petitioners, and did so without entering them on the case dockets – in which event I asked for the case numbers or names.”

I hope you will be enthusiastic about broadening your scholarship about the U.S. Solicitor General to include these explosive issues and the “disruption of Congress” case. If not, I would appreciate your assistance in locating other scholars (as well as graduate students in search of dissertation topics) who would.

Please advise.

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director
 Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
www.judgewidth.org
 Tel: 914-421-1200
 Fax: 914-428-4994
 E-Mail: elena@judgewidth.org

9/15/2008