

IT'S NOT ALBERTO GONZALES' FAULT THAT RACHEL PAULOSE IS AN AUTHORITARIAN NUT, REALLY

A couple of you pointed out the news that Office of Special Counsel had concluded that Rachel Paulose acted improperly when she demoted the guy who busted her for mishandling classified information:

Today, the Office of Special Counsel (OSC) announced the settlement of a prohibited personnel practice complaint filed by John Marti, an Assistant United States Attorney (AUSA) in the District of Minnesota. Mr. Marti previously served as the First Assistant United States Attorney (FAUSA) to the former U.S. Attorney, Rachel K. Paulose. He alleged that in April 2007, Ms. Paulose demoted him to a staff attorney position because he had reported to officials within the Department of Justice that she had mishandled classified material. OSC's investigation showed that Ms. Paulose retaliated against Mr. Marti for making whistleblower disclosures in violation of the Whistleblower Protection Act.

[snip]

Based on considerable evidence of intent, animus, and motive, OSC concluded that Ms. Paulose constructively demoted Mr. Marti.

Today, OSC issued a second press release clarifying yesterday's news:

The Office of Special Counsel (OSC)

announced yesterday the settlement of a prohibited personnel practice complaint filed by John Marti, an Assistant United States Attorney (AUSA) in the District of Minnesota. Mr. Marti previously served as the First Assistant United States Attorney (FAUSA) to the former U.S. Attorney, Rachel K. Paulose. He alleged that in April 2007, Ms. Paulose demoted him to a staff attorney position because he had reported to officials within the Department of Justice that she had mishandled classified material.

In yesterday's press release, OSC did not note that **the settlement agreement reached between Mr. Marti and the U.S. Attorneys' Office for the District of Minnesota was entered into by the Department of Justice as a no-fault agreement and was not to be construed as an admission of liability by DOJ.** The settlement agreement specifically states this. [my emphasis]

Gosh, it was just a few weeks ago that we learned that Alberto Gonzales is sticking taxpayers with the bill for his defense against suits that he allowed partisan considerations to unfairly influence hiring and firing decisions.

The Justice Department has agreed to pay for a private lawyer to defend former Attorney General Alberto Gonzales against allegations that he encouraged officials to inject partisan politics into the department's hiring and firing practices.

Now why do you suppose OSC was so quick to point out that this "evidence of intent, animus, and motive" doesn't mean Alberto Gonzales bears any liability for the fact that a hand-picked "loyal Bushie" was using her position as US Attorney like a personal fiefdom?

And now that we're talking admissions of
liability (or not), do you suppose Rachel
Paulose is still burrowing in somewhere at DOJ?