

October 6, 2012, Dreger to Larkin and Meadows:

Dear Andrea and Mark,

For ELi, I'm working on another piece about the 54B district court judge race. Please respond to the following:

1. Have there been any charges of improprieties or ethics violations made against you in your professional capacity (as lawyers, and in Mark's case as an elected representative as well) in the last 10 years?
2. If so, please enumerate all of them (whether or not you feel they were legitimate).
3. How was each resolved (or are any not resolved)?

Thanks. I would appreciate a response by Wednesday this week.

Alice Dreger
editor-in-chief of Eli

October 7, 2012, Larkin to Dreger:

No, I have never had an ethics or impropriety charge made against me.

October 8, 2012, Dreger to Meadows:

Dear Mark,

Just a reminder:

For ELi, I'm working on another piece about the 54B district court judge race. Please respond to the following:

1. Have there been any charges of improprieties or ethics violations made against you in your professional capacity (as lawyers, and in Mark's case as an elected representative as well) in the last 10 years?
2. If so, please enumerate all of them (whether or not you feel they were

legitimate).

3. How was each resolved (or are any not resolved)?

Thanks. I would appreciate a response by Wednesday this week.

Alice Dreger
editor-in-chief of Eli

October 10, 2012, Meadows to Dreger:

Glad to answer, Alice. But I have to be assured that you will print my answer without editing and in its entirety.

Mark

October 10, 2012, Dreger to Meadows:

Mark,

Assuming it answers the questions I asked, I am happy to run your answer as an attachment for the article so that people can see the whole thing.

Alice

October 10, 2012, Meadows to Dreger:

Have you changed your format? You have been listing your questions, then our answers, then your commentary. Why would it need to be an attachment?

msm

October 10, 2012, Dreger to Meadows:

Mark,

Sure, I'll provide an article that lists the question and then your answers. If you like, I'll also reproduce all these emails from you about how you want it formatted.

Alice

October 10, 2012, Meadows to Dreger:

All these emails about how I want it formatted? I did not ask you to format in a particular way. I asked if you had changed the way you were formatting the questions and answers. You said you were going to attach the answers. That is not the way you formatted the prior questions.

msm

October 10, 2012, Dreger to Meadows:

Mark,

I await your reply to the questions. I realize you are probably not accustomed to professional reporters who work for non-commercial venues, so I apologize if this experience is causing you some consternation.

Alice

October 10, 2012, Meadows to Dreger:

Sorry Alice, you are not a reporter unless you ask questions and report the answers. You are not assuring me that you will do that. Based on your last set of questions and answers, you did "report". But you are now indicating that you are writing an article and will then refer readers to the actual answers if they choose to read them and if you decide the answers actually address the question! That is not the format you began with and not the way you represented you would be operating when you first contacted Andrea and me and asked us to participate. You even provided us with a link to City Council Candidate questions and answers as a demonstration of how you would report our answers. Of course, you did not exactly follow that format with your last "report" and I understand that you want to comment on the answers, but you have already admitted your bias in your last "report" and my answer then becomes meaningless. You addressed this "ethics" issue in the Public Response letter you published a couple of months ago. You

are not reporting; you are publishing your opinion and it is pointless for me to continue to participate.

msm

October 10, 2012, Dreger to Meadows:

Mark,

As I've said before, I am happy to reproduce in full your answers to the questions. It is always my practice to do as much background checking as I can on candidates' responses so that I can judge whether or not they are giving us the full and true answers. You will note that in my reporting of the candidates' answers to the conflicts of interest question, I reported that, although Andrea had not reported it to me, she had obtained a campaign contribution from Vic Loomis. I also reported therein that you had been endorsed by some members of Council.

You surely cannot expect me to stick only to candidates' statements in my reporting, so I find it hard to believe you are shocked that I might be looking into what I can find out about ethics charges against you, independent of what you're willing to say in your answers to my questions.

Regardless, since you say you don't want to answer the questions, I will just reproduce our exchange for the public in lieu of your answers to the original questions, so they can judge the exchange.

I will then do an article regarding what I've been able to find out on my own. Thanks.

Alice

Meadows then added another paragraph onto his previous message and resent it as shown here:

Sorry Alice, you are not a reporter unless you ask questions and report the answers. You are not assuring me that you will do that. Based on your last set of questions and answers, you did "report". But you are now indicating that you are writing an article and will then refer

readers to the actual answers if they choose to read them and if you decide the answers actually address the question! That is not the format you began with and not the way you represented you would be operating when you first contacted Andrea and me and asked us to participate. You even provided us with a link to City Council Candidate questions and answers as a demonstration of how you would report our answers. Of course, you did not exactly follow that format with your last "report" and I understand that you want to comment on the answers, but you have already admitted your bias in your last "report" and my answer then becomes meaningless. You addressed this "ethics" issue in the Public Response letter you published a couple of months ago. You are not reporting; you are publishing your opinion and it is pointless for me to continue to participate directly since I can never be assured that you will actually publish my answers.

However, I will continue to answer your questions on my Meadows For Judge Report. I will add you to the listserv and you are free to refer your readers to my report for my answer to your questions.

October 10, 2012, Dreger to Meadows:

Mark, you seem to have a habit of hitting send before you feel you are done. I answered your last message already. As I said, I'll reproduce our exchange and write my own article. Thanks.

Alice

About 2 hours later, Meadows sent out to his supporters the message contained in the second PDF attached to this article.

From: Mark Meadows for Judge <meadowsforjudge@gmail.com>
Date: October 10, 2012 2:57:34 PM EDT
To: editorofeli@gmail.com
Subject: **Ethics**
Reply-To: meadowsforjudge@gmail.com

Having trouble viewing this email? [Click here](#)
Mark Meadows for Judge

You may [unsubscribe](#) if you no longer wish to receive our emails.

Dear Friends,

Recently, an East Lansing resident, Alice Kreger, contacted my opponent and me and indicated that she would be reporting on the 54B District Court race. Although she had supported my opponent in the primary, she asked some pertinent questions, and I decided to participate in her report. She reported the answers in her blog a couple of weeks ago. This week she contacted my opponent and me and asked three questions regarding "ethics" which could only apply to me since my opponent has never been elected to office. Based on an e-mail conversation I had with her, I have declined to continue to participate with her blog except through this report. She is free to publish my answers or use them in any way she wants. Here are her questions:

"1. Have there been any charges of improprieties or ethics violations made against you in your professional capacity (as lawyers, and in Mark's case as an elected representative as well) in the last 10 years.

2. If so, please enumerate all of them (whether or not you feel they were legitimate).

3. How was each resolved (or are they not resolved)."

Below is the complete e-mail conversation followed by my answer to the questions:

Glad to answer, Alice. But I have to be assured that you will print my answer without editing and in its entirety.

Mark,

Assuming it answers the questions I asked, I am happy to run your answer as an attachment for the article so that people can see the whole thing.

Alice

Have you changed your format? You have been listing your questions, then our answers, then your commentary. Why would it need to be an attachment?

msm

Mark,

MSU Homecoming
Parade
Friday, October 12th
6:00 pm

Los Tres Amigos
Fundraiser
Wednesday, October
17th
5:30 pm - 7:00 pm

Mark Meadows for Judge
P.O. Box 1443
East Lansing, MI 48826

Sure, I'll provide an article that lists the question and then your answers. If you like, I'll also reproduce all these emails from you about how you want it formatted.

Alice

All these emails about how I want it formatted? I did not ask you to format in a particular way. I asked if you had changed the way you were formatting the questions and answers. You said you were going to attach the answers. That is not the way you formatted the prior questions.

msm

Mark,

I await your reply to the questions. I realize you are probably not accustomed to professional reporters who work for non-commercial venues, so I apologize if this experience is causing you some consternation.

Alice

Sorry Alice, you are not a reporter unless you ask questions and report the answers. You are not assuring me that you will do that. Based on your last set of questions and answers, you did "report". But you are now indicating that you are writing an article and will then refer readers to the actual answers if they choose to read them and if you decide the answers actually address the question! That is not the format you began with and not the way you represented you would be operating when you first contacted Andrea and me and asked us to participate. You even provided us with a link to City Council Candidate questions and answers as a demonstration of how you would report our answers. Of course, you did not exactly follow that format with your last "report" and I understand that you bias in your last "report" and my answer then becomes meaningless. You addressed this "ethics" issue in the Public Response letter you published a couple of months ago. You are not reporting; you are publishing your opinion and it is pointless for me to continue to participate directly since I can never be assured that you will actually publish my answers.

However, I will continue to answer your questions on my Meadows For Judge Report. I will add you to the listserv and you are free to refer your readers to my report for my answer to your questions.

Mark,

As I've said before, I am happy to reproduce in full your answers to the questions. It is always my practice to do as

much background checking as I can on candidates' responses so that I can judge whether or not they are giving us the full and true answers. You will note that in my reporting of the candidates' answers to the conflicts of interest question, I reported that, although Andrea had not reported it to me, she had obtained a campaign contribution from Vic Loomis. I also reported therein that you had been endorsed by some members of Council.

You surely cannot expect me to stick only to candidates' statements in my reporting, so I find it hard to believe you are shocked that I might be looking into what I can find out about ethics charges against you, independent of what you're willing to say in your answers to my questions.

Regardless, since you say you don't want to answer the questions, I will just reproduce our exchange for the public in lieu of your answers to the original questions, so they can judge the exchange.

I will then do an article regarding what I've been able to find out on my own. Thanks.

Alice

My answer to all three questions:

Not as an attorney. As a State Representative, In September of 2011 the Speaker of the House, Jase Bolger, alleged that I violated House Rules when I sent out an email in mid-August thanking Susan Schmidt for all the work she had done for the citizens of the 69th District and urged her to run for my seat. There is no due process procedure to dispute the Speaker's allegation. In fact, the Speaker never spoke to me about the allegation and made the claim while I was out of the country. While denying any rule violation, I did confirm that some House Business Office guidelines were violated because I also quoted from a trade publication in that email (on another issue addressed in the email). I also pointed out that I had apparently violated these guidelines previously when I wished my constituents Merry Christmas, wrote about members of my family, and quoted from articles in the New York Times and other trade publications. Frankly I had no idea that these guidelines applied to emails. I believed that they applied to mailed communications (booklets, etc printed by House Communications).

After the resolution of the House matter, the Republican Party filed a claim with the Secretary of State alleging that the email violated the campaign finance laws. That claim has never been resolved and has sat in the Secretary of State's office since it was filed. It is a bogus claim.

This is the only charge I am aware of. When I became the

Chair of the House Democratic Caucus Campaign Committee, I expected things like this to occur. This type of activity was directed at the prior chair as well.

That is all for now,

Mark



[Forward this email](#)

This email was sent to editorofeli@gmail.com by meadowsforjudge@gmail.com | [Update Profile/Email Address](#) | Instant removal with [SafeUnsubscribe™](#) | [Privacy Policy](#).
Paid for by Mark Meadows for Judge | P.O. Box 1443 | East Lansing | MI | 48826