

By Fax and Mail:

202-225-3737

16 Lake Street, Apt. 2C  
White Plains, New York 10603  
August 26, 1993

Edward O'Connell, Counsel  
Subcommittee on Intellectual Property  
and Judicial Administration  
Room 207  
Canon House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515

RE: Judicial Discipline and Removal

Dear Mr. O'Connell:

This letter follows up our telephone conversation on August 12, 1993 in which you stated that "there has never been an investigation of an individual complaint in the history of the House Judiciary Committee".

If so, the Report of the National Commission on Judicial Discipline and Removal is highly misleading in suggesting, as it does, that the House Committee on the Judiciary is an available mechanism for addressing complaints of judicial misconduct.

We refer you, specifically, to pages 33-39 of the Draft Report<sup>1</sup>, which identify the House Committee on the Judiciary as the proper recipient of complaints regarding judicial misconduct. Nowhere is it stated or even suggested that individual complaints alleging impeachable conduct not within the purview of the 1980 Act will not be investigated by the Committee.

Indeed, both Michael Remington and William Weller, Director and Deputy Director, respectively, of the National Commission on Judicial Discipline and Removal, informed me that the House Committee on the Judiciary was the appropriate place for review of our complaint against District Court Judge Gerard L. Goettel and Circuit Court Judge Jon O. Newman.

Such position was shared by Francis Lorson, the Chief Deputy Clerk of the Supreme Court to whom I made inquiry immediately following that Court's June 4, 1993 denial of our Petition for Rehearing. Mr. Lorson stated that investigation of the misconduct alleged in our Petition for Rehearing was the

---

<sup>1</sup> Page references are to the Commission's Draft Report since the the Final Report is not yet available from the Government Printing Office.

R-75

August 26, 1993

responsibility of the House Committee on the Judiciary. It was for this reason that we filed our June 9, 1993 complaint with you.

Since there appears to be substantial contradiction as to the investigatory role of the House Committee on the Judiciary--and its Subcommittee on Intellectual Property and Judicial Administration--we believe a statement on the subject by you, as counsel to the Subcommittee, and by Allen Erenbaum, counsel to the Committee, is appropriate. Inasmuch as both you and Mr. Erenbaum are liaisons to the National Commission on Judicial Discipline and Removal, we trust you will be particularly concerned about ambiguities which its Report creates.

Obviously, where complaints received by the House Committee are properly within the scope the 1980 Act and can be handled by the judicial mechanism, there is no need for investigation by the Committee.

The important question is what the House Committee does with complaints, such as ours: (a) which are not covered by the Act; (b) where appellate remedies have been exhausted and have shown themselves ineffective; and (c) where the allegations, if true, would constitute impeachable conduct. If, as you indicated by telephone, the answer is nothing--such fact should be unequivocally reflected in a "clarification" to the Commission's Report.

Certainly, one would not infer from the Report that the sole purpose of the House Committee's receiving complaints is so that it can play score-keeper: compiling statistical tabulations of the "number and nature of judicial discipline complaints received" for publication in its "Summary of Activities" (at p. 36). What is the purpose then?


We note that page 39 of the Draft Report refers to the Commission's analysis that "well over 90 percent of the complaints [received by the Committee] do not raise genuine issues pertinent to judicial discipline or impeachment". In light of your statement to me that "there has never been an investigation of an individual complaint in the history of the House Judiciary Committee", are we, therefore, correct in assuming that the nearly 10 percent of the complaints received by the House Committee which do raise serious "discipline or impeachment" issues are not investigated? Are these complaints simply "archived" by the House Committee (at p. 36) and allowed to lie fallow, without follow-up. A direct answer to this question is essential since our complaint--which, indisputably, raises serious "discipline [and] impeachment issues"--is plainly within the aforesaid 10 percent category.

R-76

August 26, 1993

It is shocking to believe that such serious complaints--which citizens take the time and trouble to present in the interest of protecting our system from dishonest and unethical federal judges--would simply be ignored without investigation by the House Committee responsible for such review.

Very truly yours,



ELENA RUTH SASSOWER

cc: Michael J. Remington, Director  
William J. Weller, Deputy Director  
National Commission on Judicial Discipline and Removal  
Francis J. Lorson, Chief Deputy Clerk, U.S. Supreme Court  
Congresswoman Nita Lowey  
Jeffrey M. Shaman, Senior Fellow and Project Director  
American Judicature Society  
Charles Stephen Ralston, Esq.  
NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund

R-77

PS Form 3800, June 1991

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID

GEORGETOWN, VA 22182

AUG 21 1993

548 613

2

\$ 2.25

Room 207, Capitol Hill  
Washington, DC 20515

*Edward O'Connell*  
*Chairman*  
*Subcommittee on*  
*Intellectual Property*  
*and*  
*Administration*

**Receipt for Certified Mail**

No Insurance Coverage Provided  
Do not use for International Mail  
(See Reverse)

P 271 548 613

Is your RETURN ADDRESS completed on the reverse side?

**SENDER:**

- Complete items 1 and/or 2 for additional services.
- Complete items 3, and 4a & b.
- Print your name and address on the reverse of this form so that we can return this card to you.
- Attach this form to the front of the mailpiece, or on the back if space does not permit.
- Write "Return Receipt Requested" on the mailpiece below the article number.
- The Return Receipt will show to whom the article was delivered and the date delivered.

I also wish to receive the following services (for an extra fee):

- Addressee's Address
- Restricted Delivery

Consult postmaster for fee.

3. Article Addressed to:  
*Edward O'Connell*  
*Chairman*  
*Subcommittee on*  
*Intellectual Property*  
*and*  
*Administration*  
*Room 207, Capitol Hill*  
*Washington, DC 20515*

4a. Article Number  
*P 271 548 613*

4b. Service Type  
 Registered  Insured  
 Certified  COD  
 Express Mail  Return Receipt for Merchandise

5. Signature (Addressee)  
*E. O. Connell*

6. Signature (Agent)

7. Date of Delivery  
**AUG 31 1993**

8. Addressee's Address (Only if requested and fee is paid)

PS Form 3811, December 1991 U.S. GPO: 1992-323-402 **DOMESTIC RETURN RECEIPT**

Thank you for using Return Receipt Service.

R-78