

Center for Judicial Accountability

From: Center for Judicial Accountability <elena@judgewatch.org>
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2015 7:36 AM
To: 'georgewill@washpost.com'
Subject: Correcting my Correction: Your "Questions for attorney general nominee Loretta Lynch" (Washington Post 1/9/15)

Your widely-published column on the confirmation of Loretta Lynch appears under various titles. In the [Washington Post](#), it was entitled "*Questions for attorney general nominee Loretta Lynch*" – and the publication date was January 9, 2015. Apologies for the inaccuracies.

Elena Sassower

From: Center for Judicial Accountability [<mailto:elena@judgewatch.org>]
Sent: Wednesday, January 14, 2015 5:24 PM
To: 'georgewill@washpost.com'

Subject: ALERT: Correcting Your "Questions for a nominee"

Dear Mr. Will,

Your widely-published "*Questions for a nominee*" ([Washington Post](#), January 11, 2015) is materially erroneous, compelling "*Questions for the columnist*"

What is the basis for your opinion that U.S. Attorney Lynch "should be confirmed as attorney general"? You state that she is "a talented lawyer and seasoned U.S. attorney". But what actually do you know about her on-the-job performance as U.S. Attorney in either her first or second terms? Are you relying on news articles, editorials, and the opinions of other columnists? If so, which? Have any examined Ms. Lynch's record as U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York with respect to conflict of interest issues and her handling of citizen complaints of government corruption?

And when you state "Senate confirmation hearings put nominees on notice that, as a Michigan state legislator reportedly once said, 'I'm watching everything you do with a fine-toothed comb'", do you actually believe that the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, either in the run-up to its confirmation hearings or at the confirmations hearings, is combing the nominee's record to ascertain whether evidence exists of a disqualifying nature? Here, too, what is the source of your opinion on which you would have the public rely? What do you know about the Senate Judiciary Committee's vetting of nominees? Are you familiar with what the Committee does when members of the public contact it with information of nominees' professional misconduct, proffering and furnishing documentary proof to support requests to testify in opposition at the Committee's confirmation hearings? Do you know the Committee's criteria for who will be permitted to testify in opposition?

Germane to your answers are letters presently before the Senate Judiciary Committee and President Obama from our non-partisan, non-profit citizens' organization, Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA). These letters, dated December 17, 2014 and January 5, 2015, furnish evidence dispositive of U.S. Attorney Lynch's corruption in office and the flagrant deficiencies in her vetting for Attorney General, both pre-nomination by the White House and Justice Department and post-nomination by the Senate Judiciary Committee. They 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>.