

## Center for Judicial Accountability

---

**From:** Center for Judicial Accountability <elena@judgewidth.org>  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 25, 2015 10:23 AM  
**To:** 'tim.phelps@latimes.com'  
**Cc:** 'michael.memoli@latimes.com'; 'lisa.mascaro@latimes.com';  
'michael.mcgough@latimes.com'; David Lauter (david.lauter@latimes.com);  
jmcelhatton@washingtontimes.com  
**Subject:** Is Loretta Lynch's Confirmation a Reprise of the Clarence Thomas Fiasco -- But Worse?

Dear Mr. Phelps,

As the reporter who broke the Anita Hill-Clarence Thomas fiasco, have you examined the “vetting” of Loretta Lynch’s nomination as Attorney General? It’s not about race, or sex, or her political views. It’s about the 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.

The deficiencies of the “vetting” of Ms. Lynch, both pre- and post-nomination – beginning with a March 23, 2001 complaint of professional misconduct filed against her with the Justice Department’s Office of Professional Responsibility, which Ms. Lynch was duty-bound to disclose and as to which she may have perjured herself on the “confidential” portion of her Senate Judiciary Committee questionnaire – 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).

The first letter, e-mailed to the Senate Judiciary Committee on December 17, 2014, was not posted on the Committee’s website until two days ago, Friday, January 23th, shortly before 6 pm – and only then, most likely, because of inquiries from Washington Times reporter Jim McElhatton recited at the end of his January 22<sup>nd</sup> 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, 19 days later, and with less than 3 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 up 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](http://www.judgewatch.org), accessible *via* the prominent homepage link: “CJA’s Citizen Opposition to Senate Confirmation of U.S. Attorney Loretta Lynch as 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 in opposition at the confirmation hearing? And who has the Committee already “invited” to testify in opposition? Did those “invited” witnesses not submit letters of opposition requesting to testify? Why aren’t their letters of opposition posted on the Committee’s webpage for the confirmation? Or are there going to be 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](mailto:elena@judgewatch.org)