

“The Loretta Lynch Hearing: A Showcase of Right-Wing Media Regulars”,
Media Matters for America, January 27, 2015, (Timothy Johnson, Sergio Munoz, & Brian Powell)
<http://mediamatters.org/blog/2015/01/27/the-loretta-lynch-hearing-a-showcase-of-right-w/202283>

DELETED Comment #3: Posted at 9:06 a.m. on Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Why do my previous posts on media cover-up of the true facts pertaining to Lynch's qualifications & “vetting”, which I twice posted, because they disappeared the first time, not appear? Is it because the media fabrications and concealments are by BOTH the liberal and conservative media? See www.judgewatch.org – “CJA’s Citizen Opposition to Senate Confirmation of US Attorney Lynch as US Attorney General?”

Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
914-421-1200
elena@judgewatch.org

DELETED Comment #2: Posted at 5:49 a.m. on Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Your praise of Loretta Lynch's “record” is misplaced, as likewise reliance on the praise of those “across the political spectrum”. That you do so is the product of media, liberal and conservative both, that not only REFUSES to report on her corruption in office as U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, but REFUSES to report on the corruption of appropriate “vetting” of Ms. Lynch, pre-nomination by the White House/Justice Department and post-nomination by the Senate Judiciary Committee, both the democratic and republican sides, including their collusive exclusion from the witness list of anyone -- such as myself -- having DISPOSITIVE EVIDENCE of her corruption as U.S. Attorney.

Will you report it? The press alert that I widely circulated to the media just two days ago -- unreported by it -- is entitled “Is Loretta Lynch’s Confirmation a Reprise of the Clarence Thomas Fiasco -- But Worse?”. It is posted on the website of our non-partisan, non-profit citizens’ organization, Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA), accessible via our homepage, www.judgewatch.org, by its prominent link “CJA’s Citizen Opposition to Senate Confirmation of U.S. Attorney Loretta Lynch as U.S. Attorney General”.

Elena Sassower, Director
Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA)
914-421-1200
elena@judgewatch.org

DELETED Comment #1: Posted at 5:21 a.m. on Wednesday, January 28, 2015

Your praise of Loretta Lynch's "record" is misplaced, as likewise reliance on the praise of those "across the political spectrum". That you do so is the product of media, liberal and conservative both, that not only REFUSES to report on her corruption in office as U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, but REFUSES to report on the corruption of appropriate "vetting" of Ms. Lynch, pre-nomination by the White House/Justice Department and post-nomination by the Senate Judiciary Committee, both the democratic and republican sides, including their collusive exclusion from the witness list of anyone -- such as myself -- having DISPOSITIVE EVIDENCE of her corruption as U.S. Attorney. Will you report it? Here's the Press Alert I widely circulated to the media just two days ago:

IS LORETTA LYNCH'S CONFIRMATION A REPRIS OF THE CLARENCE THOMAS FIASCO -- BUT WORSE?

It's not about race, or sex, or her political views. It's about irrefutable evidence of her corruption as U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, both in her first and second terms, as to which NO senator can vote to confirm her for Attorney General.

U.S. Attorney Lynch's corruption, covering up high-level public corruption by New York's highest public officers and key state oversight entities -- and the deficiencies of her "vetting", both pre- and post-nomination -- are the subject of two FULLY-DOCUMENTED letters to the Senate Judiciary Committee from our non-partisan, non-profit citizens' organization, Center for Judicial Accountability, Inc. (CJA).

Each highlight, in the first instance, the March 23, 2001 complaint of professional misconduct against her that we filed with the Justice Department's Office of Professional Responsibility, which she was duty-bound to disclose as part of her "vetting". Did she disclose it? Or did she perjure herself on the "confidential" portion of her Senate Judiciary Committee questionnaire, in response to its question:

"Have you ever been the subject of a complaint to any court, administrative agency, bar association, disciplinary committee, or other professional group for breach of ethics, unprofessional conduct or violation of any rule of practice? If so, please provide full details."

The first letter, e-mailed to the Senate Judiciary Committee on December 17, 2014, was not posted on the Committee's webpage for the confirmation until Friday, January 23th, shortly before 6 pm [<http://www.judiciary.senate.gov/nominations/executive/pn2136-113>] -- and only then, most likely, because of inquiries from Washington Times reporter Jim McElhatton recited at the end of his January 22nd article "Senate urged to ask AG nominee Loretta Lynch about stock fraud case"

[<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/jan/22/senate-urged-to-ask-loretta-lynch-about-stock-frau/?page=all#pagebreak>].

The second letter, e-mailed to the Senate Judiciary Committee on January 6, 2015, has not been posted. It enclosed CJA's January 5, 2015 letter to President Obama and expressly invited the Committee's response to what it recited about the Committee's "vetting and hearing procedures", including, specifically, its statement:

'...the press has yet to report to the American People – that the Senate Judiciary Committee's own vetting is a fiction and its confirmation hearings essentially rigged to ensure confirmation, which it does by excluding opposition testimony from members of the public have dispositive evidence of nominee unfitness, such as corruption and ethics breaches.

At bar, NO Senator can vote for U.S. Attorney Lynch's confirmation based on the evidence here presented.'" (capitalization in the original).

In support, this January 6, 2015 letter identified that we had "yet to receive any response" from the Senate Judiciary Committee to our December 17, 2014 letter "other than a generic, automated e-mail acknowledgment of receipt, which was solely from the then minority Republican side."

Today, 20 days later, and with only 2 days until the Senate Judiciary Committee's hearing on Ms. Lynch's confirmation as this nation's highest law enforcement officer is scheduled to begin, we still have "yet to receive any response" from the Senate Judiciary Committee to our December 17, 2014 letter – or to our January 6, 2015 letter. This includes to my request to testify in opposition at the confirmation hearing, as to which I left a phone message for Senate Judiciary Committee Chief Nominations Counsel Ted Lehman at 10:40 am on January 23rd.

You can readily judge – within minutes – the duty of Senate Judiciary Committee counsel and investigators to have long ago called me to be interviewed, including under oath, so that the Committee could reject Ms. Lynch's nomination, without necessity of a hearing. Both CJA's December 17, 2014 and January 6, 2015 letters – and the dispositive evidence supporting them– are posted on our website, www.judgewatch.org, accessible via the prominent homepage link: "CJA's Citizen Opposition to Senate Confirmation of U.S. Attorney Loretta Lynch as U.S. Attorney General". Here's the direct link: <http://www.judgewatch.org/web-pages/searching-federal/lynch/2014-opposition-lynch-ag.htm>.

Is the Senate Judiciary Committee going to "invite" me to testify at the confirmation hearing in opposition? What is its criteria for opposition witnesses and who has the Committee already "invited" to testify in opposition? Didn't those opposition witnesses write letters to the Committee requesting to testify in opposition – and, if so, why are their letters not posted on the Committee's webpage for the confirmation? Or are there no opposition witnesses?