

# CENTER *for* JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY, INC.

Post Office Box 8101  
White Plains, New York 10602

Tel. (914)421-1200

E-Mail: [mail@judgewatch.org](mailto:mail@judgewatch.org)  
Website: [www.judgewatch.org](http://www.judgewatch.org)

## BY E-MAIL & BY HAND<sup>1</sup>

May 18, 2025

TO: New York Times Publisher A.G. Sulzberger

FROM: Elena Sassower, Director  
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)

RE: Being True to Your May 13, 2025 New York Times Opinion Column  
“*A Free People Needs a Free Press*” by Confronting Evidence & a News Lead

Your May 13, 2025 opinion column “[\*A Free People Need a Free Press\*](#)” states:

“Our loyalty is to the truth and to a public that deserves to know it. That is the distinct role that independent news organizations like The Times play in our democracy.”

If you actually believe that The Times is true to its “mission to follow the facts and bring the public the true stories”, that it furnishes “the flow of trustworthy news and information the public needs to make decisions”, “asks the tough questions and exposes the hidden truths that enable the public to hold powerful interests accountable”, in other words, that The Times fulfills the responsibilities for which the First Amendment grants it freedom, you have been kept in the dark, totally, as to how The Times has been operating – and how other “independent news organizations” have been operating – including with respect to conflicts-of-interest, not mentioned as such by your lengthy opinion column.

Here's some illustrative evidence, sent to The Times and other “independent news organizations”:

**EXAMPLE #1:** my [March 20, 2025 e-mail entitled “The NYS Budget – & the 6 Legislators Running for NYC Mayor, NYC Public Advocate, Manhattan Borough President, & NYC Council”](#), which I sent to six of New York City’s “independent news organizations” – The Times, New York Post, Daily News, New York Law Journal, Wall Street Journal, and Associated Press, with the specific Times’ recipients being its metro desk, its editorial board, and its three reporters listed on the roster of the Albany Legislative Correspondents Association (LCA): Benjamin Oreskes, Jay

---

<sup>1</sup> This letter is best read electronically so as to access the substantiating evidentiary hyperlinks. It is posted on CJA’s webpage of 2025 correspondence to The Times: <https://www.judgewatch.org/web-pages/press-suppression/nyt/2025-nyt.htm>.

Root, and Grace Ashford. In pertinent part, the e-mail read:

“Have you read what the New York State Constitution says about how the state budget is to be fashioned and enacted? It is [Article VII, §§1-7](#) – and you need only read its [§4](#) to see that the budget is ‘OFF THE CONSTITUTIONAL RAILS’, as it mandates that the Governor’s appropriation bills – other than for the legislative and judiciary budgets – ‘shall...be a law immediately without further action by the governor’ once the Senate and Assembly reconcile their separate amendments of those bill, limited to striking out or reducing items of appropriation. In other words, New York has a financially constrained, ROLLING BUDGET – with most of the budget NEVER going back to the Governor.

Since 2013, our non-partisan, non-profit citizens’ organization, Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA) has proven that the state budget violates a multitude of constitutional, statutory, and legislative rule provisions in a ‘grand larceny’ of billions of dollars in taxpayer monies, including for ‘false instrument’ pay raises. We have done this by correspondence, testimony, complaints, and lawsuits, all fully documented and establishing, additionally, that the Legislature is NOT functioning at a constitutional level, remotely. This year, for three separate legislative budget hearings, we submitted written testimony: (1) [for ‘local government officials/general government’](#); (2) [for ‘public protection’](#), and (3) [for ‘higher education’](#).

Elections are a time of accountability. What do the six state legislators running in this year’s elections for New York City’s highest offices have to say about this written testimony?...

...

I am *cc*’ing the six candidates so that they can further ready themselves for your inquiries – and am available to answer questions, including under oath. Are they? Let them start with [Article VII, §4.](#)” (hyperlinking, capitalization, and underlining in the original);

I received not a single response from [The Times](#) or from the five other New York City “independent news organizations”.

**EXAMPLE #2:** my [April 7, 2025 e-mail entitled “ALERT: NYS Budget is violating the NYS Constitution, statutes, & legislative rules to steal taxpayer money & corrupt governance by policy changes”](#), which I sent to the LCA roster of more than four dozen reporters, including [The Times](#)’ three. In pertinent part, it read:

‘Why does your reporting on the New York State budget conceal that it is ‘OFF THE CONSTITUTIONAL RAILS’, rife with constitutional, statutory, and legislative rule violations – and that it is massively-larcenous?’

Have you not read [Article VII, §§1-7](#) – whose [§4](#) mandates that the Governor’s appropriation bills – other than for the legislative and judiciary budgets – ‘shall...be a law immediately without further action by the governor’ once the Senate and Assembly reconcile their separate amendments of those bills, limited to striking out or reducing items of appropriation. Do you dispute that New York has a financially constrained, ROLLING BUDGET – with most of the budget NEVER going back to the Governor.

How is the behind-the-closed doors, ‘three-men-in-a-room’ budget dealmaking of Governor Hochul, Temporary Senate President Stewart-Cousins, and Assembly Speaker Heastie, that you have been reporting on for the past three weeks, remotely constitutional?

And what about the Senate and Assembly one-house budget resolutions – each respectively purporting that the [Senate](#) and [Assembly](#) amended the same eight budget bills. This is fraud. NONE of those eight bills were ever amended, in fact. There are NO votes by ANY senators and ANY assembly members on a single one of them.

And what about Governor Hochul’s five so-called ‘Article VII’ bills that contain policy? Here, too, these are fraud. Governor Hochul NEVER introduced any of these five bills, in fact. Rather, she submitted them to the Legislature, as draft bills, requiring Senate and Assembly sponsors. How did they then each mysteriously morph into actual bills, without Senate and Assembly sponsors, falsely stating that they were introduced by the Governor?

Here’s [CJA’s FOIL requests pertaining to the FY2025-26 state budget](#), from which you can verify the TRUTH about the ten budget bills comprising Governor Hochul’s executive budget. Start with:

- [CJA’s February 7, 2025 FOIL request](#) entitled ‘FY 2025-26 State Budget – for records reflecting: (1) how Governor Hochul’s five proposed ‘Article VII Bills’ each became actual bills, allegedly submitted by her ‘pursuant to article seven of the Constitution’; (2) why these actual bills are not posted on her Division of the Budget’s website; and (3) findings of fact and conclusions of law made with respect to CJA’s March 18, 2020 letter to Governor Cuomo’;

- [CJA's March 21, 2025 FOIL request](#) entitled 'Records reflecting how & where the Senate & Assembly 'amended' 8 of the Governor's FY2025-26 budget bills'.

Will you be investigating and reporting this – and the billions and billions of dollars of larcenies of taxpayer monies contained in the Governor's ten budget bills, including for 'false instrument' pay raises – whose cumulative cost, since 2012, is itself on the order of a billion dollars. If not, please explain why – and IMMEDIATELY forward this e-mail to your editors and to managerial levels of your publications, including your legal counsel, so that there is no question as to culpability for your *knowingly* false journalism, having NO First Amendment protection and entitling the defrauded public to massive compensatory and punitive damages against all involved. ..." (underlining, capitalization, hyperlinking, italics in the original).

I received not a single response from the LCA roster of reporters, including from The Times' three.

**EXAMPLE #3:** my [April 18, 2025 e-mail entitled "Fact-Checking Your Journalism – & Now Some New Facts"](#), which I also sent to the LCA roster of reporters, including The Times' three. In pertinent part, it read:

"I have received NO responses from you to my below April 7<sup>th</sup> e-mail, supplying you, yet again, with primary-source, documentary EVIDENCE that the NYS budget is unconstitutional, unlawful, fraudulent, and massively larcenous. Meanwhile, your pack-journalism continues to identically conceal ALL four – as, likewise, their direct relevance to this year's elections, including to the TOP New York City offices that are on the ballot.

**Who is fact-checking your journalism? Here are some new facts for you and your fact-checkers:**

The [February 18<sup>th</sup> majority decision of the Court of Appeals in \*Cuomo v. COELIG\*](#), rejecting former Governor Cuomo's challenge to the constitutionality, *as written*, of the 'ethics commission reform act of 2022' replacing JCOPE with COELIG – that you uniformly reported, as if legitimate – is a fraudulent cover-up of the unconstitutionality of the state budget and, specifically, the **inclusion of policy in the budget, unconnected with taxes and revenue** – and was so-demonstrated and proven by the [December 16<sup>th</sup> motion](#) I made to file an *amicus curiae* brief in the case to prevent 'fraud on the court', to which I alerted you by my [January 4<sup>th</sup> e-mail](#).

Unlike Cuomo who did NOT move to reargue the Court of Appeals Feb 18<sup>th</sup> decision – although many of you reported his spokesman’s statement at the time that he would – I yesterday made a [reargument motion to the Court](#) highlighting the fraudulence of that decision and of the Court’s [January 9<sup>th</sup> order](#) denying my *amicus curiae* motion. This, at [pages 19-21](#) of its Exhibit B ‘legal autopsy’/analysis of [the Court’s March 18<sup>th</sup> order](#) in [CJA v. JCOPE, et al.](#) and [CJA v. Commission on Legislative, Judicial and Executive Compensation...Wilson, Zayas, et al.](#) – the two monumental appeals of right, brought ‘on behalf of the People of the State of New York & the Public Interest’, whose records – like that of [CJA v. Cuomo...DiFiore](#) preceding them – establish CJA’s open-and-shut, prima facie entitlement to summary judgment on ALL causes of action, **bringing down the ENTIRETY of the state budget and the ‘false instrument’ salary increases it embeds.**

When will you be reporting on these **three fully-documented cases whose records are a ‘perfect paper trail’ of ‘false filings’ by AG Letitia James, rewarded by fraudulent judicial decisions, utterly corrupting state governance and so profoundly injuring New York’s 20 million people.**

If you have not – as my below April 7<sup>th</sup> e-mail to you requested – forwarded it to ‘your editors and to managerial levels of your publications, including your legal counsel, so that there is no question as to culpability for your *knowingly* false journalism, having NO First Amendment protection and entitling the defrauded public to massive compensatory and punitive damages against all involved’, please now forward this e-mail to them. ...” (capitalization, underlining, hyperlinking, bold, italics in the original).

Again, I received not a single response from the LCA roster, including [The Times’](#) three.

Finally, and pertaining to the national scene, whose roots are in New York:

**EXAMPLE #4:** my [March 25, 2025 e-mail entitled “NEWS TIP – ALERT: Behind-the-Scenes of Tomorrow’s House DOGE Subcommittee Hearing on NPR & PBS Bias” sent to Times Media Reporter Benjamin Mullin at 7:10 am.](#) It replicated an e-mail I had sent shortly before midnight on March 24<sup>th</sup> to the [Associated Press](#), the [Daily Caller](#), and an electronic message to the [National Review](#) – and which I would send on March 25<sup>th</sup> to “independent news organizations” that included [The Washington Post](#), [Washington Examiner](#), [Axios](#), [Bloomberg](#), [New York Post](#), [Breitbart News](#), [The Atlantic](#), [Columbia Journalism Review](#).<sup>2</sup> It read:

“Why are the NPR and PBS presidents [the only witnesses scheduled to testify at Wednesday’s DOGE Subcommittee hearing on NPR and PBS bias?](#) What about the

---

<sup>2</sup> The webpage of my outreach to the press prior to the March 26, 2025 hearing is [here](#).

NPR and PBS public editors, each responsible for complaints, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's Inspector General, also responsible for complaints. And what about complainants who have filed complaints with all of them?

The importance of this was the subject of my above-attached [February 18<sup>th</sup> letter](#) to DOGE Subcommittee Chair Marjorie Taylor Greene and FCC Chair Brendan Carr entitled "Defunding NPR, PBS – & Firing the CPB's Inspector General, for starters". It opened with these two sentences:

"I am director and co-founder of the New York-based non-partisan, non-profit citizens' organization [Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. \(CJA\)](#) and applaud your efforts to expose the truth about NPR and PBS.<sup>fn1</sup> I suggest you do so by examining how they handle complaints of biased and *knowingly* false journalism – and that you also examine how the Corporation for Public Broadcasting's Inspector General handles complaints about NPR's and PBS' handling of complaints." (italics in the original).

Nine EVIDENCE-FILLED pages later– including as to the collusion of NPR, PBS, and other media in the corruption of New York state governance involving its massive, policy-filled state budget, pay raises, NY Attorney General Letitia James, and NY District Attorney Alvin Bragg – the letter concluded, stating:

"I am available to answer questions – including under oath. I would be honored to testify at such hearings as you will be holding. In any event, I ask that this statement be submitted for the record of the hearings. I affirm it all to be true, under penalties of perjury.

Kindly forward the letter to all who are committed to establishing the truth about NPR, PBS, and their collusion with other media in 'election interference' and other violations of First Amendment responsibilities. There is much defunding, firing, and prosecutions that need to take place.<sup>fn8</sup>"

Three times I e-mailed the letter to the majority office of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and to FCC Chair Carr – [February 18<sup>th</sup>](#), [February 28<sup>th</sup>](#), and [March 19<sup>th</sup>](#) – *without response*. Why was that? And was the letter forwarded to DOGE Subcommittee Chair Greene and to all the Subcommittee members? Who else? Was it forwarded to U.S. Attorney General Pam Bondi, as requested? How about to the NPR and PBS presidents and public editors and to the CPB Inspector General, for their written responses. Will it be part of the record, as requested? Will it be the subject of questioning, at all, at Wednesday's hearing?

The three transmitting e-mails are also below. CJA's EVIDENTIARY webpage for the letter is [here](#).

I am available to answer your questions, no matter how early or late. Please call."

I received no response from Mr. Mullin, or anyone else. Nor did I receive responses to e-mails and electronic messages that I sent after the hearing to "independent news organizations" and journalists pertaining to the hearing on the subject of "Fraud & Posturing by ALL Sides". Among these, The Free Press and, specifically, Uri Berliner and Bari Weiss, CNN and, specifically, Brian Stelter, Vanity Fair, and again, Breitbart, National Review, and Axios.<sup>3</sup>

How do you explain this? These e-mails were not about partisanship or ideology. They were about flagrant unconstitutionality and unlawfulness of governance, about failed safeguards of our democracy, and about posturing, fraudster politicians of all persuasions – fully substantiated by evidentiary proof. Where were The Times and the other "free press" celebrated by your column with phrases like:

"independent news organizations";

"independent journalists who dare to provide the public with truthful reporting about the actions of those in power";

"journalists willing to ask tough questions and inform the public honestly";

"the free press...designed to be a watchdog".

As for The Times' contemporaneous reporting about the subject matter and politicians embraced by these e-mails – and I purchased a digital subscription of The Times solely for purposes of being able to examine same<sup>4</sup> – the comparison reveals the legitimacy of President Trump's "fake news New York Times" moniker and that The Times and its self-aggrandizing ilk are – to use President Trump's words that your decry – "the enemy of the people", committing "treason" by their journalism.

Your column concludes:

"Democracy assigns different roles to all of us. The role of the press is to arm everyone else with the information and context they need to understand and meet the moment.

---

<sup>3</sup> The webpages of my outreach to the press after the March 26, 2025 hearing begin [here](#).

<sup>4</sup> Illustrative Times reporting is posted on CJA's webpage of 2025 correspondence with The Times on which this letter is posted (see fn. 1, *supra*).

Without a free press, how will people know if their government is acting legally and in their interest? How will people know if their leaders are telling the truth? How will people know if their institutions are acting to the benefit of society? How will people know if their freedoms are being sustained, defended and championed – or eroded by forces that seek to replace truth and reality with propaganda and misinformation?

A strong and independent press is essential to self-rule, to personal liberty, to national greatness. That once radical insight, made law in the First Amendment, anchored a centuries-long, bipartisan tradition of supporting the rights of journalists. If broken, a free and independent press won't be easy to rebuild.

As the free press and democracy more broadly face this period of pressure, I'd urge you to support both by seeking out news sources worthy of your trust. News sources that produce original, independent reporting in the public interest and that have a record of challenging power, no matter who wields it. Make room for this kind of journalism in your lives and routines. Read. Listen. Watch. Engaging in the news is one of the simplest, most essential acts of citizenship. This is not the time to tune out."

By this letter, I am fulfilling the critical role that our democracy assigns to citizens *vis-à-vis* the press, namely, to alert it to what must be investigated and reported, if our democracy is to be preserved. This is what I have been faithfully doing for over 35 years – always with evidence for independent verification. As relates to The Times, that record of citizenship extends back to 1989 – and is posted on CJA's website, [here](#), from which you can additionally access the full record of my lawsuit against The Times in vindication of the First Amendment. Brought expressly for "The Public" and expressly to establish a cause of action for "journalistic fraud", the [March 21, 2006 verified complaint](#) opened, as follows:

"The First Amendment goes beyond protection of the press... '...it is the right of the [public], not the right of the [media], which is paramount,' ...for 'without the information provided by the press most of us and many of our representatives would be unable to vote intelligently or to register opinions on the administration of government generally,' ..." *Cohen v. Cowles Media Co.*, 501 U.S. 663, 678 (1991), Justice Souter, writing in dissent with Justices Marshall, Blackmun, and O'Connor, citing cases culminating in *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 278-279 (1964), cited in '*Journalistic Malpractice: Suing Jayson Blair and the New York Times for Fraud and Negligence*', 14 Fordham Intellectual Property, Media & Entertainment Law Journal 1, footnote 62 and 156 (2003)."

My [February 18, 2025 letter to DOGE Subcommittee Chair Greene and FCC Chair Carr](#) (at p. 7), by its quoting of my [June 4, 2021 “Dear Mr. Trump” website message](#), links to that [landmark lawsuit against The Times](#) and to my [comparable lawsuit against Gannett](#), stating that they were “aimed at securing media accountability” and that “both were ‘thrown’ at trial and appellate levels by fraudulent judicial decisions of NY’s state courts because there was no legitimate defense to either lawsuit.”

I look forward to assisting your review of the foregoing. I invite you to call me and would welcome meeting with you for an honest discussion as to how to best move forward. At issue are not First Amendment-protected good faith mistakes and errors, promptly rectified – which is the only press shortcoming to which your column concedes, in stating:

“Even the best news organizations – the ones with the highest standards, the most rigorous processes, the best track record of putting the public interest first – don’t always get it right. At The Times we run a daily corrections section for good reason. And in our long history, you’ll find we’ve made our share of bigger mistakes, as well.

But independent journalism is designed to be self-correcting. We constantly ask the same questions of ourselves that we hear from our critics. Were we open-minded enough to unexpected facts? Were we skeptical enough of prevailing narratives? ... Were we too soft? Too tough? Did we double-check, triple-check, then check again? When we make mistakes, we try to own them, learn from them and do better.”

Before you is the opportunity to model the “self-correct[ion] of independent journalism” – starting with my above four e-mails to [The Times](#). Comparing them to [The Times](#)’ contemporaneous journalism reveals [The Times](#)’ 100% adherence to “prevailing narratives”, with ZERO “skept[ic]ism”, and ZERO “open-minded[ness]”, concealing, IN TOTO, the rebutting primary-source documentary evidence those e-mails furnished.

Meantime – and as part of that “self-correct[ion]” – here’s the LEAD as to what’s happening behind-the-scenes at the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, reflected by my [May 16, 2025 e-mail](#), sent to its executive vice president/general counsel, entitled “STATUS? – CPB’s Stewardship of Taxpayer Monies – Halting Funding to Poynter Institute, NPR, PBS, & NY’s Local ‘Public Media’, & Firing the CPB Inspector General – All Mandated by CJA’s February 18, 2025 Letter”.

Thank you.

s/Elena Ruth Sassower

cc’s on next page

cc: Metro Desk  
Editorial Board  
Albany Reporters Benjamin Oreskes, Grace Ashford, Jay Root  
Media Reporter Benjamin Mullin