Subject: **Did You Yourself Actually Read CJA's June 17, 2004 Complaint -- and Review the Substantiating Cited Evidence**
Date: 6/22/2004, 9:32 AM
From: Elena Ruth Sassower <judgewatchers@aol.com>
To: Daniel Okrent <public@nytimes.com>
Organization: Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc.

Dear Mr. Okrent,

Thank you for your prompt -- albeit incomprehensible -- June 21st e-mail, purporting that the "very serious" allegations of CJA's June 17, 2004 complaint lack "evidence".

Please confirm, by a signed letter, that you ACTUALLY READ the complaint, whose SECOND PARAGRAPH opens with the words: "In substantiation, enclosed is the Center for Judicial Accountability's May 24, 2004 memo to Gerry Mulaney, Deputy Metro Edito for Politics..."

Please also confirm that you ACTUALLY READ CJA's June 11, 2003 memorandum-complaint to the Editorial Board, as likewise CJA's June 19, 2003 letter to Allan Seigal and subsequent correspondence with Jill Abramson and Bill Keller based thereon -- whose significance in establishing The Times' "multitudinous conflicts of interest" was summarized by ALL SIX PAGES of the June 17, 2004 complaint.

On June 19th, "hard copies" of the foregoing were hand-delivered to The Times to assist you. Did you receive that hand-delivery?

Finally, please confirm that you ACTUALLY REVIEWED the "Paper Trail" of politically-explosive *primary source* documents on which CJA's June 17, 2004 complaint and prior correspondence explicitly rest, conveniently posted on the homepage of CJA's website, *www.judgewatch.org*. Do you deny or dispute that these *primary source* documents evidentiarily establish the corruption of federal judicial selection/confirmation -- and Senator Schumer's pivotal role therein -- and that this warrants Times' coverage by ANY OBJECTIVE STANDARD?

Thank you.

Elena Ruth Sassower, Coordinator
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
(914) 421-1200

****

Daniel Okrent wrote on 6/21/2004, 11:16 AM:

> Dear Ms. Sassower,
>
> I regret that I cannot provide you any comfort. The accusations you make are very serious, but do not remotely connect to any evidence you have provided in your correspondence. To suggest that any paper that chooses not to cover what you wish it to cover is therefore suppressing the news because of conflict of interest is to suggest that any complaint at all requires coverage.
>
> I do not accept this premise, nor am I convinced by the evidence you present that The Times has erred.
>
> Yours sincerely,