

Center for Judicial Accountability

From: Center for Judicial Accountability <elena@judgewatch.org>
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2015 10:30 PM
To: 'g.gibson@ibtimes.com'
Subject: Loretta Lynch's Senate Questionnaire -- more than one "notable omission"

Dear Ms. Gibson,

In "*Attorney General Nominee Loretta Lynch Omitted HSBC Interview From Senate Questionnaire*" ([International Business Times](#), Jan 27, 2015), you write:

"the questionnaire U.S. attorney general nominee Lynch submitted to the Senate Judiciary Committee has a notable omission. Lynch failed to include an interview in which she defended the controversial settlement she orchestrated with the bank HSBC."

There's another "notable omission": a March 23, 2001 complaint of professional misconduct against her, filed with the Justice Department's Office of Professional Responsibility – believed to be omitted from the "confidential" portion of her questionnaire.

On that subject – and others – is the Press Alert I e-mailed yesterday to a long list of reporters – without follow-up. Perhaps you'll pursue it – or be kind enough to pass it on to a reporter who will. It is below – and is a game-changing, MAJOR news story.

Thank you.

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

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-fraud/?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