

Harvard Club – Box 126
27 West 44th Street
New York, NY 10036
john@johnkarls.com
June 15, 2011

(Please send questions
(or comments by e-mail
(since itinerary is fluid

Ms. Gwen Ifill
The PBS News Hour
1700 Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22206

(This is a copy of a letter sent to each of 43 news media superstars.)

Dear Ms. Ifill:

**Re: \$84 Billion Legally Pledged For Education of American Inner-City
Children Rapidly Slipping Away Due To Judicial Improprieties –
EQUAL PROTECTION BY THE MEDIA URGENTLY NEEDED!!!**

You may not recall the attached letter of May 18, 2010, which was sent to you and 42 of your colleagues. It requested your assistance in providing “Equal Protection By The Media” – that is, the same kind of publicity for a Petition for Certiorari that would be filed by June 14, 2011, in *Karls v. The Bank of New York, et al.*, that is routinely provided for the lawsuits of David Boies.

As trumpeted by various members of the media last August in providing coverage of David Boies’ Proposition 8 litigation, the Supreme Court justices do not live in a vacuum – they are influenced by media reporting in deciding whether an issue is so important that the Court should accept an appeal.

This is particularly important following the retirement of Justice John Paul Stevens, since none of the other justices even reads any of the Petitions for Certiorari – each is read and summarized solely by a single Supreme Court Clerk, all of whom are pooled for this purpose.

The Petition in *Karls v. The Bank of New York, et al.*, has now been filed and its “Question Presented For Review” was:

“Can state court judges order their decisions which they know are diametrically-opposed to well-settled law, not to be published or cited (a strategy labeled “the segregated toilet” in correspondence with 51-inner city clergy who represent the 10 million inner-city children who have been disclosed from the outset as the “real parties at interest” in this law suit) in order to flush away the rights of the 10 million inner-city children without disturbing the rights of first-class American citizens – without violating the “Equal Protection of the Law” requirement of the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution?”

[The entire petition is quite long – 42 pages plus 61 pages of appendices. Accordingly, it can be down-loaded, as usual, by going to www.ReadingLiberally-SaltLake.org where, if you scroll down to the third section labeled “Possible Topic for Fall 2011,” you can find it as the first item in that section.]

Your cooperation in providing “Equal Protection Of The Media” is urgently requested. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

John S. Karls
JD, Harvard Law School, 1967
Who’s Who in American Law, 1988-2003
Who’s Who in America, 1988-2003
Who’s Who in the World, 1994-2003

cc: 51 Inner-City Clergy From Los Angeles, San Francisco and Oakland CA
21 Governmental Officials
U.S. Senator Christopher A. Coons
Mr. David M. Axelrod – Certified Return Receipt
Mr. David Plouffe – Certified Return Receipt

Harvard Club – Box 126
27 West 44th Street
New York, NY 10036
john@johnkarls.com
May 18, 2011

(Please send questions
>>>>> (or comments by e-mail
(since itinerary is fluid

Ms. Gwen Ifill
The PBS News Hour
1700 Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22206

(This is a copy of a letter sent to each of the 43 news media superstars.)

Dear Ms. Ifill:

**Re: \$84 Billion Legally Pledged For Education of American Inner-City
Children Rapidly Slipping Away Due To Judicial Improprieties –
EQUAL PROTECTION BY THE MEDIA URGENTLY NEEDED!!!**

As you may recall, the attached letter was sent to you on September 2, 2010. Its third paragraph from the end stated that it was following up on a more detailed letter (which comprised 9 pages including the list of recipients that appear on the next page):

“On August 16, 2010, you and 42 of your colleagues who are also prominent in the American media were requested to provide coverage of this imbroglio so that, like David Boies and his Prop 8 litigation, we are able to bring the plight of the 10 million inner-city children trying to escape the American permanent underclass directly to the attention of the U.S. Supreme Court justices.”

The letter of August 16, 2010 (whose “Re” had the same three lines as appear above) began:

“Virtually all of the media have been reporting constantly since August 4th about the Proposition 8 decision of the U.S. District Court (N.D. Cal.) *and how the case will ultimately be decided by the U.S. Supreme Court*. ¶-With regard to the latter point, CNN’s reporting on August 4th trumpeted that the Supreme Court justices do not live in a vacuum – that they are influenced by media reporting in deciding whether an issue is so important that the Court should accept an appeal. ¶-David Boies agrees, as is obvious from his providing frequent interviews for the media and his participation on prestigious nationwide television programs. ¶-On September 27, 2010, the U.S. Supreme Court is scheduled to decide whether to hear the appeal in the referenced matter. ¶-Before the Ninth Circuit reached its decision earlier this year, Messrs. Marcus Brauchli (The Washington Post), Bill Keller (The New York Times), Jim Lehrer (The PBS Newshour), Robert J. Thomson (The Wall Street Journal), Ward H. Bushee (San Francisco Chronicle) and Russ Stanton (The Los Angeles Times) were all provided with detailed information about what was at stake with a David Boies-style request to cover the cases. ¶-No coverage ever occurred. No replies were received except from the PBS Newshour which reported that it will not cover the matter until it is final. It is respectfully submitted for your consideration that an obituary is not what the situation requires.”

Unfortunately, just like the 8 prestigious editors who refused to provide any coverage of the cases in the Ninth Circuit, there was no response to the two requests to you and 42 of your colleagues to provide coverage of the Certiorari Petition (request to accept an appeal) to the U.S. Supreme Court. On September 27, 2010, the Petition was denied.

However, as described more fully in the enclosed letter to 51 inner-city clergy from Los Angeles, San Francisco and Oakland CA and in the FAQ’s attached to the enclosed letter to U.S. Senator Christopher Coons, two of the cases that remained in the California state court system are still active because California law does not permit consideration of cases, such as last year’s federal court cases, in which the losing party never received “a fair day in court.”

In oral argument on appeal in the two state-court cases, opposing counsel admitted that the state trial court (as well as the federal courts which were involved in last year’s cases and which were supposed to be following state law) were wrong. Nevertheless, the state appellate court in a decision following the infamous practice described in the fifth paragraph of the enclosed letter of a court’s specifying that its decision cannot be published or cited, affirmed the state trial court’s decision even though it was diametrically opposed to one of the appellate court’s own recent decisions (which was held inapplicable with no explanation) and recent decisions of two other appellate courts (which were disingenuously claimed to provide the opposite of what they in fact had provided).

On June 14, 2011, a Petition for Certiorari will be filed with the U.S. Supreme Court that the decision of the California state courts violated the U.S. Constitutional Requirements of “due process” and “equal protection.”

Your assistance in providing publicity is once again requested. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

John S. Karls
JD, Harvard Law School, 1967
Who’s Who in American Law, 1988-2003
Who’s Who in America, 1988-2003
Who’s Who in the World, 1994-2003