

RE: Thank you -- but consider a "notice"

Subject: RE: Thank you -- but consider a "notice"

Date: 5/18/2004, 5:52 PM

From: Kristina Fischer <kfischer@amlaw.com>

To: 'Elena Ruth Sassower' <judgewatchers@aol.com>

Of course. We will send the papers.
Kris

Kris Fischer
Editor-in-Chief
New York Law Journal
(212) 545-6102
kfischer@amlaw.com

> -----

> From: Elena Ruth Sassower
> Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2004 4:44 PM
> To: Kristina Fischer
> Subject: Thank you -- but consider a "notice"

>

> Thank you. But if my published Letter will not be available to on-line
> subscribers, please do reconsider my request, at very least, for a
> "Correction" notice (which is carried on-line).

>

> If not, please give some thought to some other even more
> euphemisticly-titled notice to on-line subscribers (if not to "hard
> copy" readership).

>

> I thank you for your regards and personal closing, which I also extend.

>

> Elena

>

> P.S. As we ourselves are on-line Law Journal subscribers, I would
> appreciate if you would mail me two copies of tomorrow's paper. Thanks.

>

>

>

>

>

> Kristina Fischer wrote on 5/18/2004, 4:22 PM:

>

> > Ms. Sassower,

> > The point has been considered. We are not able yet get letters on
> > line, but

> > letters do go onto Lexis and are attached to the original article. I
> can

> > make sure Lexis knows to attach this letter.

> > Regards,

> > Kris

> >

> > Kris Fischer

> > Editor-in-Chief

> > New York Law Journal

> > (212) 545-6102

> > kfischer@amlaw.com

> >

> > -----

> > > From: Elena Ruth Sassower

> > > Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2004 2:35 PM

RE: Thank you -- but consider a "notice"

> > > To: Kristina Fischer
> > > Subject: Thank you -- But will my Letter to the Editor be available
> > > to on-line subscribers -- or otherwise made known to them?
> > >
> > > Dear Ms. Fischer:
> > >
> > > Thank you for your notification of publication of my Letter to the
> > > Editor in tomorrow's Law Journal.
> > >
> > > However, it occurs to me that since Letters to the Editor are NOT
> > > available to on-line Law Journal subscribers, an on-line notice is
> > > necessary. How else will such subscribers be alerted to my response
> to
> > > the two "News in Brief" items that were (and are) accessible to them
> as
> > > part of their on-line subscription? This is especially so if the Law
> > > Journal will not run a "Retraction & Apology" -- or even a
> > > "Correction",
> > > which does appear on-line (as, most recently, this past Friday, May
> > > 14th).
> > >
> > > Thanking you, in advance, for your consideration of this important
> > > point
> > > -- perhaps not considered by the Law Journal before.
> > >
> > > Elena Sassower, Coordinator
> > > Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc.
> > > Box 69, Gedney Station
> > > White Plains, New York 10605-0069
> > >
> > >
> > > Kristina Fischer wrote on 5/18/2004, 1:55 PM:
> > >
> > > > Ms. Sassowerr,
> > > > Thank you for your letter. It will be in the Law Journal tomorrow,
> > > > Wednesday, May 19.
> > > >
> > > > Kris Fischer
> > > >
> > > > Kris Fischer
> > > > Editor-in-Chief
> > > > New York Law Journal
> > > > (212) 545-6102
> > > > kfischer@amlaw.com
> > > >
> > > > -----
> > > > From: Elena Ruth Sassower
> > > > Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2004 11:36 AM
> > > > To: kfischer@amlaw.com
> > > > Cc: jgroner@legaltimes.com; tschoenberg@legaltimes.com
> > > > Subject: Status of my Letter to the Editor
> > > >
> > > > <<File: 5-17-04-ltr-editor.doc>><<File: ATT223160.htm>>
> > > > TO: Kris Fischer, Editor-in-Chief
> > > > New York Law Journal
> > > >
> > > > FROM: Elena Ruth Sassower, Coordinator
> > > > Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)

RE: Thank you -- but consider a "notice"

> > > >
> > > > RE: The Status of my Letter to the Editor, "The Documented
> > > Facts"
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > As I have not yet heard back from you with regard to my Letter
> > to the
> > > > Editor, "The Documented Facts", sent to you yesterday, I take
> the
> > > > opportunity to bring to your attention that Legal Times has
> "hard
> > > > copies"
> > > > of virtually all the "Paper Trail" documents posted on the
> > homepage
> > > of
> > > > CJA's website, www.judgewidth.org . This includes the March
> > 26, 2003
> > > > written statement AND the two motions therein particularized as
> in
> > > > and of
> > > > themselves sufficient for verifying Judge Wesley's on-the-bench
> > > > corruption
> > > > as a New York Court of Appeals judge in my public interest
> lawsuit
> > > > against
> > > > the NYS Commission on Judicial Conduct and in Bob Schulz' public
> > > > interest
> > > > lawsuit against the NYS Legislature, et al. These were
> > > > hand-delivered by
> > > > me on March 22, 2004, when I met and spoke with Jonathan Groner.
> > > > Indeed,
> > > > at that time, I not only provided such "Paper Trail" documents
> as
> > > > would
> > > > enable Legal Times to expose the bogus and malicious nature of
> my
> > > > May 22,
> > > > 2003 arrest for "disruption of Congress" -- and the corruption
> of
> > > > federal
> > > > judicial selection/confirmation it chronicled -- but a copy of
> all
> > > > the
> > > > motion papers in the case up to that March 22nd date. I then
> > > > supplemented
> > > > this on April 6th, with a copy of my April 6th petition for a
> > writ of
> > > > mandamus/prohibition and motion for stay. I gave these to Tom
> > > > Schoenberg,
> > > > in hand, at the outset of his interview of me so that he could
> > > > better
> > > > understand the important "first impression" issues involved in
> the
> > > > case --
> > > > and that, as demonstrated by the copy of the case file I had
> > > > delivered two
> > > > weeks earlier, I was being railroaded to trial by a
> > > > new-to-the-bench
> > > > "merit selected" judge -- for whom fundamental legal standards
> and

