

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: 202-833-8069

20 pages

January 6, 1999

Mr. Stuart Taylor, Jr.
National Journal/Newsweek
Washington, D.C.

RE: BEATING THE "1 IN 10,000" ODDS

Dear Mr. Taylor:

Thank you for your return call. But for the unfortunate interruption of our phone conversation, you would have learned the extraordinary particulars that increases the "1 in 10,000" odds of your coverage. However, I am heartened by your promise to READ the Center for Judicial Accountability's November 6, 1998 impeachment complaint against Justice Rehnquist -- which is more serious, by far, than the impeachment articles against the President.

Filed with the House Judiciary Committee two months ago, the complaint was also provided it to the Justices of the Supreme Court in conjunction with their consideration of the petition for rehearing in the case of *Doris L. Sassower v. Hon. Guy Mangano, et al.* (#98-106) -- a case about the annihilation of the rule of law by lower federal judges, whose decisions were shown to be outright judicial frauds, falsifying the record in *every* material respect. Such judicial perjury and obstruction of justice by the lower federal judiciary was to protect state judges, who were defendants in *Sassower v. Mangano*, sued for corruption¹. **The petition for rehearing, which is expressly part of the impeachment complaint (at p. 3), particularizes, in narrative form -- and by specific reference to the simultaneously-occurring impeachment proceedings against the President -- the basis for the Justices' impeachment "under the most stringent definition of impeachable offenses".**

¹ The basis for the federal suit against the state judges may be gleaned from CJA's \$20,000 public interest ad, "*Where Do You Go When Judges Break the Law?*" -- which ran in the New York Times (Op-Ed page, 10/26/94) and The New York Law Journal (p. 9, 11/1/94). A copy is enclosed, as is a copy of our subsequent \$3,000 public interest ad, "*Restraining 'Liars in the Courtroom' and on the Public Payroll*" (NYLJ, 8/27/97) -- whose closing paragraphs give highlights of the federal district judge's corruption of the federal judicial process.

Also enclosed is the recent New York Observer column by Joe Conason about the Chief Justice's insensitivity to conflict-of-interest and disqualification issues. The 1972 case cited by Mr. Conason in which Justice Rehnquist failed to recuse himself, is described at page 7 of the rehearing petition as part of the legislative history of the 28 U.S.C. §455 -- "the principal disqualification statute in the federal system". The rehearing petition details how that statute, which requires federal judges to disqualify themselves in cases where their impartiality might reasonably be questioned -- or to disclose the relevant facts -- was subverted by Chief Justice Rehnquist and the other Justices -- by their *wilful failure* to adjudicate a formal application based, *inter alia*, on their long-standing, personal and professional relationships with the lower federal judges, whose corrupt conduct was the subject of the *Sassower v. Mangano* case.

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT THERE IS MORE THAN ONE STORY HERE. There's yet another important story -- completely overlooked by all the media, namely, how the House Judiciary Committee handles its OTHER impeachment duties, i.e. -- the hundreds of impeachment complaints against federal judges it receives from citizens². Although Chairman Hyde publicly professes the importance of "the rule of law" to our constitutional system, likening it to a "three-legged stool", whose first leg is "an honest judge, these hundreds of impeachment complaints are not only NOT investigated by the House Judiciary Committee, they are *not* even acknowledged or referred. Instead, they fall into a "black hole" -- with the House Judiciary Committee NOT even statistically recording the numbers of such complaints it receives each Congress in its "Summary of Activities"³, as it is supposed to do -- and further concealing the complaints by withholding public access to them, despite the fact that they are supposed to be available upon request [*Cf.* Report of the National Commission on Judicial Discipline and Removal, at p. 35].

CJA has an extraordinary FIVE-YEAR CORRESPONDENCE with the House Judiciary Committee, documenting how it has wholly jettisoned its constitutional duties *vis-a-vis* impeachment complaints against federal judges. That correspondence is part of an evidentiary compendium to CJA's written statement to the House Judiciary Committee for inclusion in the record of the Committee's June 11, 1998 "oversight" hearing of the federal judiciary, which is accessible from our website: www.judgewatch.org. The published article "*Without Merit: The Empty Promise of Judicial Discipline*" [The Long-Term View (Massachusetts School of Law) Vol. 4, No. 1, summer 1997] -- to which our statement refers and which summarizes the House Judiciary Committee's cover-up of

² As you may know, the three judicial impeachments in the 1980's were the result of criminal prosecutions by the Justice Department, leading to the conviction of two judges and, as to the third, a referral by the federal judiciary. Seemingly, this has lulled the media into assuming that there is a functioning process at the House Judiciary Committee, rather than doing *any* investigation on the subject.

³ Last available figures are for the 101st and 102nd Congresses, when the House Judiciary Committee's "Summary of Activities" respectively reported that 141 and 120 complaints against federal judges were received.

Mr. Stuart Taylor, Jr.

Page Three

January 6, 1999

impeachment complaints against federal judges -- is also on our website. All of these were part of what was before the Chief Justice in the extraordinary and fully-documented *Sassower v. Mangano* case -- and is before the House Judiciary Committee in support of the impeachment complaint against him.

Upon request, I would be pleased to send you a copy of the *Sassower v. Mangano* cert papers -- including the documentary compendium -- substantiating the impeachment complaint.

Having so admired your courageous reporting and opinion pieces, I surely hope to hear from you soon.

Yours for a quality judiciary,



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

Enclosures: As indicated & CJA's informational brochure