

Elena Ruth Sassower

From: Elena Ruth Sassower [elena@judgewidth.org]
Sent: Monday, November 19, 2007 10:20 AM
To: 'Dahlia.Lithwick@slate.com'; 'tmauro@alm.com'
Cc: 'tschoenberg@alm.com'; 'mmcquilken@alm.com'
Subject: PRESS RELEASE "How Does the U.S. Supreme Court Handle Misconduct Complaints against its Staff?"
Attachments: 11-19-07-press-release.pdf

Dear Dahlia & Tony,

Attached is the finalized press release, which will be shortly posted under "Latest News" on CJAs' website, www.judgewidth.org and sent to Supreme Court "beat" reporters and other journalists who write about the Court.

Please let me hear from you, as soon as possible, as to whether you will be reporting on this story.

TONY, I am most disappointed to have received no return calls or e-mails from you about this story. I left a voice message for you at about 1:30 p.m. on Friday, as likewise for Tom – now Legal Times' Executive Editor, without response from either of you. This is particularly surprising as the Legal Times regarded me and the "disruption of Congress" case as sufficiently newsworthy in 2004 that it ran FIVE pieces

- a front-page feature article, published on the eve-of-trial (4/12/04);
- an item during the trial (4/19/04);
- an item upon my conviction (4/26/04);
- an article upon my incarceration (7/5/04).

Each of these was written by Tom, who sat in on a substantial portion of the trial.

This was then capped by an entry in Legal Times' year-end round-up (12/20/04) under the heading "*It Was Not Their Year: Investigated, Attacked, Defeated. Jailed. The players who'd like to forget 2004*", where I was featured, with a picture, next to the picture and entry for John Edwards.

Is it your view that Legal Times readers would not be interested – and do not deserve to know – the extraordinary continuation of the story at the D.C. Court of Appeals and in the U.S. Supreme Court?

Adding to this, the Legal Times is part of the story at the Supreme Court, having published, on March 29, 1993, the article "*Riding the Coattails of the Solicitor General*", written by the same John Roberts as is now Chief Justice. As you know, I called you and Tom in August for assistance in obtaining the article – and Tom had Legal Times' editorial assistant Marisa McQuilken send it to me so that I could use it in my September 17, 2007 motion to compel the U.S. Solicitor General's response to my cert petition. It is also cited in my rehearing petition, scheduled for tomorrow's Court conference.

TONY (& TOM), before I turn to other higher-ups at Legal Times, what is the problem here?

Thanks.

Elena
914-421-1200

From: Elena Ruth Sassower [mailto:elena@judgewidth.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2007 12:12 PM
To: 'Dahlia Lithwick'
Subject: For You I Will Wait, etc! -- RE: UPDATE: Laying Bare the "Internal Operations and Culture" of the Supreme Court & Its Clerk's Office -- & Its Legal Office

11/19/2007

P R E S S R E L E A S E

November 19, 2007

How Does the U.S. Supreme Court Handle Misconduct Complaints against its Staff?

Two misconduct complaints, now before Chief Justice John Roberts, provide a rare window into the Supreme Court's internal operations, showcasing lawlessness, lack of professionalism, and invidiousness by the Court's Clerk's Office, covered-up by the Court's Legal Office.

The first complaint, against the Court's Clerk and his staff, details how they shielded the Government from accountability by improperly withholding from the Chief Justice, as Circuit Justice for the District of Columbia, a motion to compel the Government's response to a petition for a writ of certiorari in a politically-explosive "disruption of Congress" case (#07-228). They did this without citing any legal authority, which they refused to provide. Such misconduct resulted in the Court's denying the cert petition – and was the basis for a second motion, seeking recall/vacatur of the denial order and, additionally, clarification by the Chief Justice of his remarkable decision, as D.C. Circuit Justice, in *Boumediene v. George W. Bush*, 127 S.Ct. 1725 (2007), being misused by the Clerk's Office. This second motion disappeared in the Clerk's Office, as if in "a black hole", with the Clerk and his staff refusing to give any information as to its status.

This first complaint was sent to the Chief Justice in his administrative capacity. The response was a three-sentence letter from the Court's Legal Office, by its counsel. Ignoring all the facts, law, and legal argument presented by the complaint, the letter baldly purported that the actions of the Clerk's Office were "consistent with Court rules and policies" and that there would be "No response...to further correspondence on these issues."

This has led to the second complaint – against counsel for his flagrant cover-up. The complaint notes that the letter from the Legal Office did not indicate that a copy was being provided to the Chief Justice and asks the Chief Justice whether he endorses and approves of counsel's handling of the complaint against the Clerk and his staff and, if not, what steps he will take. It also requests the Chief Justice to distribute the eight enclosed copies of the complaint to the Associate Justices because they "share responsibility for the proper functioning of the Court's Clerk's Office and Legal Office" and because it bears upon their consideration of the petition for rehearing in the "disruption of Congress" case, calendared for the Court's November 20, 2007 conference. The Clerk's Office misconduct is the first ground for rehearing in that petition. The second ground is the Chief Justice's September 19, 2007 speech at Syracuse University on judicial independence, the First Amendment, and the rule of law – the very issues presented by the cert petition.

This story is easy to verify – and explosive. The two complaints to the Chief Justice, dated October 26, 2007 and November 14, 2007, and the substantiating underlying Supreme Court submissions are all posted on the Center for Judicial Accountability's website, www.judgewatch.org, via the sidebar panel "'Disruption of Congress' – The Appeals". Indeed, the website posts the full record of the case, establishing that two levels of the District of Columbia judiciary, as well as the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia, utterly trashed the rule of law to cover-up the corruption of federal judicial selection involving the Senate's most influential members – Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton, among them. Such record of judicial and prosecutorial lawlessness is the basis upon which both the cert petition and rehearing petition assert that the Court's review of the case is mandatory, compelled by its supervisory and ethical responsibilities.

* The **Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc.** (CJA) is a national, non-partisan, non-profit citizens' organization dedicated to ensuring that the processes of judicial selection and discipline are effective and meaningful.