

ROGER AILES TO BE INDICTED?!?

Whoo boy. Think back to how loudly the mighty wurlitzer argued that Scooter Libby should not be indicted for lying. And imagine how much louder it will be if Roger Ailes—a cornerstone of Republican success—were indicted for telling Judith Regan to do the same?

That's what Barry Ritholtz claims is about to happen.

Someone I spoke with claimed that Ailes was scheduled to speak at their event in March, but canceled. It appears that Roger's people, ostensibly using a clause in his contract, said he "cannot appear for legal reasons." I asked *"What, precisely, does that mean?"*

The response: *"Roger Ailes will be indicted – probably this week, maybe even Monday."*

The NYT broke the underlying story on Thursday:

It was an incendiary allegation – and a mystery of great intrigue in the media world: After the publishing powerhouse Judith Regan was fired by HarperCollins in 2006, she claimed that a senior executive at its parent company, News Corporation, had encouraged her to lie two years earlier to federal investigators who were vetting Bernard B. Kerik for the job of homeland security secretary.

[snip]

Now, court documents filed in a lawsuit make clear whom Ms. Regan was accusing of urging her to lie: Roger E. Ailes, the powerful chairman of Fox News and a longtime friend of Mr. Giuliani. What is more, the documents say that Ms. Regan

taped the telephone call from Mr. Ailes in which Mr. Ailes discussed her relationship with Mr. Kerik.

Frankly, I'm skeptical. After all, Obama's DOJ doesn't like to indict any MOTUs. Besides, they're too busy trying to prevent Scott Bloch from doing any time for having lied to Congress. And to think his DOJ (presumably former Chuck Schumer aide Preet Bharara, who is US Attorney for SDNY) would indict one of the most important players in the Republican party?

I doubt it.

But just on the off chance it's true, I'm popping popcorn.

Update: It seems, they'd have a hard time indicting for the request that she lie itself: that took place in 2004, and presumably the statute of limitations would have expired in 2009. It'd be hard to say no one knew about the conversation given that it was front page news.