

Does Mr. Okrent Deny or Dispute the Evidentiary Significance of the "Paper Trail" -- Warranting Times Coverage by ANY OBJECTIVE...

Subject: Does Mr. Okrent Deny or Dispute the Evidentiary Significance of the "Paper Trail" -- Warranting Times Coverage by ANY OBJECTIVE STANDARD

Date: 6/22/2004, 10:48 AM

From: Elena Ruth Sassower <judgewatchers@aol.com>

To: Public <public@nytimes.com>

Organization: Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc.

Dear Mr. Bovino,

It is for Mr. Okrent -- *not you* -- to make the professional judgment as to whether CJA's serious and substantial June 17, 2004 complaint -- for which FULL evidentiary support was provided -- entitles us to a signed response, as my today's e-mail addressed to him requested. This includes Mr. Okrent's signed response to the DISPOSITIVE questions which your "responding" e-mail conspicuously does not even purport to answer: "Do you deny or dispute that [the "Paper Trail" of *primary source* documents posted on CJA's homepage], evidentiary establish the corruption of federal judicial selection/confirmation -- and Senator Schumer's pivotal role therein -- and that this warrants Times' coverage by ANY OBJECTIVE STANDARD?"

In the event you do not even open this message, these DISPOSITIVE unanswered questions are summarized on the subject line of this e-mail.

We will await Mr. Okrent's signed letter. Meantime, the otherwise unbelievable e-mail exchange between us will be posted on CJA's website, accessible *via* the sidebar panel, "Press Suppression".

Thank you.

Elena Ruth Sassower, Coordinator
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
(914) 421-1200

200-13