

**Subject: Again, Awaiting Your Responses, Etc.**

**Date:** 10/8/2006, 9:42 AM

**From:** Elena Ruth <elenaruth@aol.com>

**To:** "Jochowitz, Jay" <JJochowitz@TimesUnion.com>

**cc:** "Odato, Jim" <JOdato@TimesUnion.com>, "Benjamin. Elizabeth" <EBenjamin@TimesUnion.com>, "Karlin, Rick" <RKarlin@TimesUnion.com>

Dear Mr. Jochowitz:

Please advise whether, in responding as you did by your October 4th e-mail, you bothered to read my September 28th letter to Rick Karlin -- and are satisfied with his coverage of the Senate Judiciary Committee "hearing" to confirm Justice Pigott's nomination to the New York Court of Appeals.

Please further advise whether it is your view that Times Union reporters working under YOUR SUPERVISION should not be examining the records in office of public officers running for re-election, higher office, or vying for powerful political appointments.

As succinctly stated at page 3 of my letter -- and herein *reduced to 37 words* -- **Senator John DeFrancisco is running, *virtually unopposed*, for reelection because the press has NOT scrutinized his record as Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman with respect to judicial selection and discipline issues -- a record warranting his prosecution for corruption.**

Similarly -- and herein *reduced to 33 words* -- **the press has NOT scrutinized the records of Senator Malcolm Smith as the Senate Judiciary Committee's Ranking Member and Senator Eric Schneiderman as a Committee Member -- records likewise warranting their prosecution for corruption.** Senators Smith and Schneiderman were identified by my letter (at p. 3) as jockeying to be appointed Senate Minority Leader, a position which has since gone to Senator Smith.

**MOST IMPORTANTLY**, as for the record in office of Attorney General Spitzer, my story proposal -- *reduced to 25 words* -- **concerns the hoax of his "public integrity unit", covering up systemic governmental corruption -- including corruption within the attorney general's own office and involving Mr. Spitzer personally**. Such was appropriately summarized at pages 3-4 of my letter to Mr. Karlin -- and you have long had the relevant particulars, which I discussed with you "several years ago", as likewise the fact that Mr. Spitzer's corruption in office is *readily-verifiable* from the casefile of my public interest lawsuit against the Commission on Judicial Conduct, a significant portion of which I provided you, reporter Andrew Tilghman, and Editorial Page Editor Howard Healy. To refresh your recollection as to the absolute "clarity" of it all, I refer you to my past correspondence, posted on CJA's website, [www.judgewatch.org](http://www.judgewatch.org), accessible via the sidebar panel "Press Suppression - Albany Times Union". Specifically, I refer you to my **June 26, 2002 and September 25, 2002 letters to you**, each bearing the title of CJA's story proposal, "The REAL Attorney General Spitzer -- NOT the P.R. Version" -- the SAME story proposal as is referred to by my letter to Mr. Karlin (at p. 4) as being annexed to CJA's June 20, 2006 memo-letter to the candidates for attorney general.

You plainly have NOT read that annexed story proposal "The REAL Attorney General Spitzer -- NOT the P.R. Version" -- or its accompanying pages of corroborating documentation: (1) Mr. Spitzer's 1998 campaign policy paper about his "public integrity unit"; (2) the stenographic transcript of my public exchange with Mr. Spitzer on January 27, 1999 when he publicly announced his establishment of the "public integrity unit", (3) CJA's \$3,000 public interest ad, "*Restraining 'Liars in the Courtroom' and on the Public Payroll*", NYLJ, 8/27/97, and (4) my Letter to the Editor "*An Appeal to Fairness: Revisit the Court of Appeals*", NY Post, 12/28/98. Nor does it appear from your October 4th e-mail that you read CJA's 3-1/4 page June 20, 2006 memo-letter to the attorney-general candidates, which summed it all up

CJA's June 20, 2006 memo-letter to attorney general candidates Andrew Cuomo & Jeanine Pirro -- and follow-up September 1, 2006 memo-letter to them, CJA's June 26, 2006 letter to gubernatorial candidate John Faso, and CJA's February 3, 2006 letter to senatorial candidate John Spencer not only concisely identify the corruption in office of Attorney General Spitzer and Senator Clinton, but reflect upon the unfitness of the other candidates as well. All four letters are conveniently posted on our "Elections 2006: Informing the Voters" webpage -- along with the certified mail/rrr, e-mail, and fax receipts of their transmittal to the candidates. If it is your position that neither you, Mr. Karlin, Mr. Odatto, or Ms. Benjamin have the time to read these relatively short, straight-forward *primary source* documents -- or, as is the case of Ms. Benjamin, to return my phone calls (Aug 31, Sept. 27) germane to her blog entries wherein I identified that, by contrast to the Ethics Commission's dismissal of Mr. Suozzi's complaint against Mr. Spitzer, it has not dismissed the ethics complaints we filed against Mr. Spitzer from 1999 onward, which remain pending, AND that the same legal authority by which Mr. Spitzer purported to set up his "public integrity unit" gives him authority to investigate Mr. Hevesi -- please provide me with the names of your superiors at the Times-Union so that I can immediately take it up with them.

PLEASE LET ME HAVE YOUR RESPONSE BY TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10th. That should give all four of you sufficient time to read these four letters and plan your questions to the candidates about them.

Thank you.

Elena Sassower, Director  
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)  
Tel: 914-421-1200  
Direct E-Mail: [judgewatchers@aol.com](mailto:judgewatchers@aol.com)

\*\*\*\*\*

Jochowitz, Jay wrote on 10/4/2006, 2:07 PM:

Dear Ms. Sasower,

As the state editor, I would appreciate it if you would address all correspondence to me, not my reporters, unless I assign a story involving you to one of them.

As we discussed several years ago, we simply do not have the time to read the voluminous material you send on the promise that it contains readily verifiable proof of something that I have yet to hear you define with any clarity.

Again, if you care to make a case for a story, please do so in writing under the following guidelines: In 50 words or less, provide me a clear, simple statement of even one thing you believe someone has done wrong, what law or ethical code has been violated, and what tangible proof you have. If I believe it is worth a story, I will contact you further.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jay Jochowitz  
State Editor  
Times Union

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Elena Ruth [<mailto:elenaruth@aol.com>]