

A Few Reasons Why an Independent Commission - With No Connection to the Alaska Department of Law, Bar, or Court System - Must Publicly Investigate Alaska's Judicial Corruption

April 2006: The Alaska Commission on Judicial Conduct (ACJC) receives a complaint that a judge, while presiding over a trial, had out-of-court contacts with the key witness. To justify dismissal, the ACJC's sole investigator of judges (Marla Greenstein) stated she contacted the judge, trial witness, and all four independent witnesses identified in the complaint. Then Greenstein stated that all denied the out-of-court contacts. (attached)

April 2010: The Alaska Superior Court re-investigated. The four independent witnesses were contacted to verify that Greenstein had in fact contacted them during her investigation. All four swore out affidavits that Greenstein had never contacted them, and each swore they personally seen the out-of-court contacts between the judge and witness – in exact opposition to what Greenstein testified to justify her dismissal. (attached)

July 2010: The Superior Court ordered Greenstein/ACJC to produce the records of their judge investigation so the records could be examined “*in camera*”. Greenstein/ACJC refused to comply with the Superior Court order. So the Superior Court certified the evidence it had of corruption and sent it to the ACJC, Bar, Ombudsman, and Department of Law. (attached) Not a single entity or person investigated.

January 2011: A Bar complaint was filed against Greenstein (A lawyer, conducting all 8000 plus Alaskan judge investigations since 1989 to present.) Greenstein doubled-down, now stating in a certified written Bar response that she even interviewed a fifth independent witness that was not named in the original complaint. (attached)

September 2011: This fifth independent witness was deposed and swore that Greenstein had never contacted him either, and also testified witnessing the judge's out-of-court contact with her trial witness. (attached) This additional evidence of perjury by Greenstein was given to the Bar, who still did nothing. A criminal complaint, supported by the above evidence, was filed against Greenstein. On February 6, 2012 **Clint Campion**, the Chief Assistant Attorney General for the Department of Law, exonerated Greenstein without investigating. (attached)

April 2012: The judge swore out an affidavit denying she had out-of-court contact with her witness. (attached)

July 2022: Widespread public protests of corruption finally result in a Kenai Grand Jury being impaneled solely to investigate the above. The Jury obtained the judge's 2012 affidavit, took testimony from all five witnesses, and compelled the judge's testimony. (attached) When subpoenaed, Greenstein lawyered-up to avoid testifying.

Then the Grand Jury subpoenaed the records of Greenstein's/ACJC's judge investigation. (The same records Greenstein/ACJC refused to give to the Superior Court.) On April 28, 2023 the Grand Jury indicted the judge for lying to them under oath, only *after* it found, in the Greenstein/ACJC records, “*a letter she [the judge] had written to the ACJC in 2006.*” (attached) The Grand Jury also issued a report and recommendation on what else it found. The Jury couldn't indict Greenstein because she didn't testify – so Jurors were told they didn't have evidence of a crime that occurred within the statute of limitations.

Because of her 2012 affidavit, it is clear that in the judge's testimony to the Grand Jury she denied the out-of-court contact with her trial witness. It is now clear the judge's 2006 written letter to the ACJC was in opposition to this – meaning she originally told the truth to the ACJC and admitted to out-of-court contact with her witness.

This in turn means that Greenstein/ACJC had to coerce, blackmail, and/or threaten the judge in some manner so she would change her story and lie. And to do so under oath, a class B felony. For the judge could not possibly change her story after admitting the truth in writing to the agency tasked with ensuring the honesty of Alaska's judges. Unless the agency itself decided the story must change.

As unlikely as this seems, it appears the sole government entity responsible for ensuring the integrity and honesty of every Alaskan judge is instead coercing, blackmailing, and/or threatening judges to commit crimes.

But this isn't the only evidence of wholesale corruption: Soon after the Grand Jury started investigating the ACJC and Marla Greenstein, it fired the Department of Law attorney helping them (Chief Assistant Attorney General Jenna Gruenstein) and asked for “independent counsel”. It was then provided private attorney **Clint Campion, who never told the Grand Jury he used to work for the Department of Law as its Chief Assistant**

Attorney General and while in this position completely exonerated Greenstein and the ACJC from the same exact evidence he was now “helping” the Grand Jury investigate. (If the Grand Jury found corruption now, it indicates Campion must have corruptly covered it up a decade earlier.)

January 2023: Campion is recorded stating: *“The system wants this to go away and they pushed it to me because they thought I would be a conduit to kill this.”* This confirms the Kenai Grand Jury was intentionally given conflicted counsel who would sabotage the Grand Jury’s efforts. And means the entire Kenai Grand Jury investigation was a **FRAUD ON THE ALASKAN PUBLIC**, proven when the judge’s indictment was dismissed because Campion had written it defectively vague, refused to try re-indicting the judge with a properly written indictment, and let the court system permanently seal the Grand Jury’s report and recommendation, even though he admitted the Grand Jury intended them for the public.

But this isn’t the only evidence of wholesale corruption: In the middle of the Kenai Grand Jury investigation (immediately after the Jury subpoenaed Greenstein), the Alaska Supreme Court changed rules 6 and 6.1 to allow judges and prosecutors to bar Grand Juries from their constitutionally protected right (Article 1, Section 8) to effectively investigate and address corrupt government officials. (attached – SCO 1993) Then evidence came to light that the Supreme Court bypassed the required oversight of its own “Rules Committee” to do so, even after protests by the Rules Committee. (attached – SCO 1993 History) Campion stated that this evidence of the Supreme Court violating its own rules to unconstitutionally stop the Grand Jury investigation was *“explosive”*.

But this isn’t the only evidence of wholesale corruption: Court filings prove only 12 Kenai Grand Jurors were impaneled to investigate the judicial corruption, with no alternates, when court rules require 18 to be impaneled, without counting alternates, 6 of which are impaneled on all other Alaskan Grand Juries, for a total of 24. And immediately after the Grand Jury voted to indict the judge, one Juror went missing (see court filings - still missing to this day) and so the Grand Jury no longer had the required minimum of 12 to continue their work of investigating and indicting corrupt government officials. (attached – AK Judicial Corruption Timeline, page 6) The missing Juror and lack of quorum was also cited as a reason to dismiss the indictment against the judge.

So *“the system”* violated its own rules to impanel the bare minimum of Grand Jurors and may have got rid of one Juror to stop the Grand Jury when it got close to exposing corruption in *“the system”*. And Alaskans wonder what the indicted judge would have presented as her defense, had she gone to trial and faced 10 years in prison. Is it possible she would have presented evidence (as it looks like she has in her possession) that Marla Greenstein and the Alaska Commission on Judicial Conduct had coerced, blackmailed, and/or threatened her so she would lie under oath – even to the Kenai Grand Jury? Could this explain the bizarre acts *“the system”* took to make sure the judge would never, ever, go to trial – *“the system”* didn’t want to be exposed?

There is far more evidence of corruption, but the above is all we can likely cover in the 1.5 hours the Department of Law allotted for our February 12 meeting: direct evidence against Deputy Attorney General John Skidmore (attached - email thread); dozens of additional complaints that Greenstein falsified other judge investigations; Borough Resolutions ignored (attached); and Alaskans realizing the statute of limitations has not run because the corruption and fraud “tolled” it from running. ↴

New York City’s 1994 Mollen Commission (Public Investigation Initiated by Mayor Dinkins) *To cover up their corruption, officers created even more: they falsified official reports and perjured themselves to conceal their misdeeds. In the face of this problem, the Department allowed its systems for fighting corruption virtually to collapse. It had become more concerned about the bad publicity that corruption disclosures generate than the devastating consequences of corruption itself. As a result, its corruption controls minimized, ignored and at times concealed corruption rather than rooting it out. Such an institutional reluctance to uncover corruption is not surprising. No institution wants its reputation tainted – especially a Department that needs the public’s confidence and partnership to be effective. Since no entity outside the Department was responsible for reviewing the Department’s success in policing itself, years of self-protection continued unabated until this Commission commenced its independent inquiries.*