

CENTER for JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY, INC.

P.O. Box 69, Gedney Station
White Plains, New York 10605-0069

Tel. (914) 421-1200
Fax (914) 428-4994

E-Mail: judgewatch@aol.com
Web site: www.judgewatch.org

Elena Ruth Sassower, Coordinator

BY FAX: 518-465-9619 (22 pages)

July 17, 2002

Bill Hammond
The New York Sun
Albany, New York

RE: "Scooping" the Competition: Exposing the
Real Attorney General Spitzer-- *not* the P.R.
version

Dear Mr. Hammond:

Following up our phone conversation, enclosed is the 1989 Comptroller's report on the New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct, "*Not Accountable to the Public: Resolving Charges against Judges is Cloaked in Secrecy*", as well as its accompanying press release.

It will take no more than an hour's time for you to verify, *with your own brain and eyes*, that in three separate lawsuits the Commission on Judicial Conduct has been the beneficiary of FIVE fraudulent judicial decisions -- without which it would not have survived.

Mr. Spitzer will NOT be able to deny or dispute such *readily-verifiable* fact in an interview with you -- or any of a host of other incriminating facts, *readily-verifiable* from the file of my public interest lawsuit against the Commission -- a copy of which I am ready to supply you.

At your request, enclosed is the Supreme Court decision in Mr. Mantell's lawsuit against the Commission, published in the lawbooks and accessible on the internet. This contrasts with the Supreme Court decisions in my mother's lawsuit and in my own, neither of which has been published in lawbooks or accessible from the internet. So that you can *readily* see the hoax of the Supreme Court decision in *Mantell*, pretending that the law pertaining to the Commission's investigation of complaints received from outside sources is comparable to that pertaining to investigation of *sua sponte* complaints of its

Administrator, enclosed is Judiciary Law §§44.1 and 44.2, as well as the pertinent text from the Court of Appeals' decision in *Matter of Nicholson* reinforcing the Commission's mandatory duty under Judiciary Law §44.1 in distinction to Judiciary Law §44.2. This is summarized by my analysis of the decision, which is part of the record in my lawsuit. Copies of the pertinent pages are enclosed.

Also enclosed are the Appellate Division, First Department decisions in *Mantell* and my case (my mother's case never having been appealed) – which Mr. Spitzer must be asked to reconcile with *Matter of Nicholson* – as they are *irreconcilable*. Likewise, Mr. Spitzer should be asked to account for the single sentence in each appellate decision, *unsupported* by discussion of law or facts, that there is NO standing to sue the Commission for its dismissal of judicial misconduct complaints – thereby insulating the Commission from judicial review.

Needless to say, I would be happy to provide you with a list of powerful questions for Mr. Spitzer about his unlawful and fraudulent defense of the Commission, both in my lawsuit and in Mr. Mantell's, and the hoax of his "public integrity unit", etc.

Yours for a quality judiciary
and electorally-meaningful reporting,



ELENA RUTH SASSOWER, Coordinator
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)

Enclosures