

**Elena Ruth Sassower**


---

**From:** Dahlia Lithwick [Dahlia.Lithwick@slate.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 19, 2007 10:55 AM  
**To:** Elena Ruth Sassower  
**Subject:** RE: PRESS RELEASE "How Does the U.S. Supreme Court Handle Misconduct Complaints against its Staff?"

Elena

I've read this over and don't see the story for me here. I understand that you disagree with me on this, but I am asking that you respect my judgment about my job just as I have always respected yours. Thanks for your patience with my travel schedule late last week.

Best  
Dahlia

---

**From:** Elena Ruth Sassower [mailto:elena@judgewatch.org]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 19, 2007 10:20 AM  
**To:** Dahlia Lithwick; tmauro@alm.com  
**Cc:** tschoenberg@alm.com; mmcquilken@alm.com  
**Subject:** PRESS RELEASE "How Does the U.S. Supreme Court Handle Misconduct Complaints against its Staff?"

Dear Dahlia & Tony,

Attached is the finalized press release, which will be shortly posted under "Latest News" on CJAs' website, [www.judgewatch.org](http://www.judgewatch.org) and sent to Supreme Court "beat" reporters and other journalists who write about the Court.

Please let me hear from you, as soon as possible, as to whether you will be reporting on this story.

TONY, I am most disappointed to have received no return calls or e-mails from you about this story. I left a voice message for you at about 1:30 p.m. on Friday, as likewise for Tom – now Legal Times' Executive Editor, without response from either of you. This is particularly surprising as the Legal Times regarded me and the "disruption of Congress" case as sufficiently newsworthy in 2004 that it ran FIVE pieces

- a front-page feature article, published on the eve-of-trial (4/12/04);
- an item during the trial (4/19/04);
- an item upon my conviction (4/26/04);
- an article upon my incarceration (7/5/04).

Each of these was written by Tom, who sat in on a substantial portion of the trial.

This was then capped by an entry in Legal Times' year-end round-up (12/20/04) under the heading "*It Was Not Their Year: Investigated, Attacked, Defeated. Jailed. The players who'd like to forget 2004*", where I was featured, with a picture, next to the picture and entry for John Edwards.

Is it your view that Legal Times readers would not be interested – and do not deserve to know -- the extraordinary continuation of the story at the D.C. Court of Appeals and in the U.S. Supreme Court?

Adding to this, the Legal Times is part of the story at the Supreme Court, having published, on March 29, 1993, the article "*Riding the Coattails of the Solicitor General*", written by the same John Roberts as is now Chief Justice. As you know, I called you and Tom in August for assistance in obtaining the article – and Tom had Legal Times' editorial assistant Marisa McQuilken send it to me so that I could use it in my September 17, 2007 motion to compel the U.S. Solicitor General's response to my cert petition. It is also cited in my rehearing petition, scheduled for tomorrow's Court conference.

TONY (& TOM), before I turn to other higher-ups at Legal Times, what is the problem here?

11/28/2007