

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: 202-887-1050 16 pages

January 15, 1999

David Savage, Supreme Court Correspondent
Los Angeles Times
202-861-9237

RE: Impeachment complaint against Chief Justice William Rehnquist & the media-unreported story about how the House Judiciary Committee handles the hundreds of impeachment complaints it receives against federal judges

Dear Mr. Savage:

Of course, it makes sense that you want to do "one impeachment at a time". However, **DIRECTLY** relevant to the current impeachment proceedings against the President is the *official* misconduct of the key players at the trial, the presiding Chief Justice AND the House Judiciary prosecuting team, and, particularly, when that *official* misconduct involves the *very* issues involved in the President's impeachment: their duty to uphold the "rule of law" and "the integrity of the judicial process.

Enclosed is the Center for Judicial Accountability's press release. To assist you in assessing the **DIRECT AND IMMEDIATE** significance of our 4-page impeachment complaint against the Chief Justice, it is enclosed -- and with it the rehearing petition which is part of it.

As reflected by these documents, the case from which the Chief Justice's impeachable *official* misconduct arises is *Doris L. Sassower v. Hon Guy Mangano et al.*, a §1983 civil rights action in which high-ranking New York State judges and the New York State Attorney General were sued for corruption¹. The Supreme Court docket number of the case is #98-106.

Please **examine** the Court's file. Beginning with the **petition for rehearing**, I would urge you to review the two most pertinent documents reprinted in its appendix: the disqualification/disclosure application presented to the justices [RA-6] and the judicial misconduct complaint against them [RA-52]. The Court has concealed both these documents from its docket of the case.

¹ The allegations of the federal complaint are reflected by CJA's \$20,000 public interest ad, "*Where Do You Go When Judges Break the Law?*" (The New York Times, 10/26/94, Op-Ed page; and New York Law Journal, 11/1/94, p. 9) -- reprinted in the appendix of the cert petition [A-269].

As to the cert petition and supplemental brief, may I direct your attention to the following:

In the cert petition, the FIRST "Question Presented" is the supervisory and ethical duty of the Supreme Court and its justices. This is discussed at pp. 21-23, "Reasons for Granting the Writ" and pp. 23-26, Point I: "This Court's Power of Supervision is Mandated" and "This Court has a Duty to Make Disciplinary and Criminal Referrals". Such pages detail that, absent Supreme Court review, there is NO remedy, within the Judicial Branch, for the corrupt conduct of the lower federal judiciary, demonstrated by the cert petition.

In the supplemental brief, pages 1-3 and 7-10 further underscore the mandatory duty of Supreme Court review -- demonstrating the complete breakdown of all checks on judicial misconduct, in the Legislative and Executive Branches, such that:

"the constitutional protection restricting federal judges' tenure in office to 'good behavior' does not exist because all avenues by which their official misconduct and abuse of office might be determined and impeachment initiated (U.S. Constitution, Article II, §4 and Article III, §1 [SA-1] are corrupted by political and personal self-interest. The consequence: federal judges who pervert, with impunity, the constitutional pledge to 'establish Justice', (Constitution, Preamble [SA-1]) and who use their judicial office for ulterior purposes." [supplemental brief, at p. 2]

In substantiation, two submissions were "lodged" with the Clerk's office: (1) the documentary compendium to CJA's June 1998 statement to the House Judiciary Committee [printed at SA-17] and (2) the exhibits to our July 27, 1998 criminal complaint to the Justice Department's Public Integrity Section [printed at SA-47].

I would point out that CJA's FIVE-YEAR correspondence with the House Judiciary Committee, which is referred to in our press release, is part of the documentary compendium. That correspondence chronicles our "voyage of discovery" as to the true facts about the House Judiciary Committee -- and about the federal judiciary's subversion of 28 U.S.C. §372(c), BOTH concealed by the methodologically flawed and dishonest 1993 Report of the National Commission on Judicial Discipline. For an overview of what we discovered, may I recommend that you read CJA's published article, "*Without Merit: The Empty Promise of Judicial Discipline*" (*The Long Term View*, Vol 4. No. 1, summer 1997) -- which is reprinted in the appendix to the cert petition [A-207], as well as included in the documentary compendium to our June 1998 statement [R-5].

Upon request, I would be pleased to transmit to you copies of any and all of the submissions that comprise the record before the Court in *Sassower v. Mangano, et al.* (#98-106) -- all substantiating our impeachment complaint.

Yours for a quality judiciary,

