



Roth & Company LLP

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS AND CONSULTANTS

1428 36th Street • Suite 200 • Brooklyn, New York 11218

Telephone: (718) 236-1600 • Fax: (718) 236-4849

E-mail: info@rothcocpa.com

December 24, 2003

James A. Kahl Esq.
Deputy General Counsel
Federal Election Commission
999 E Street
Washington, DC 20463

Dear Mr. Kahl:

Re: MUR 5180
Dear 2000, Inc.

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION
OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL
2003 DEC 29 A 10:46

I received your letter dated November 14, 2003 with the attached General Counsel's Brief.

I find it extremely frustrating dealing with this agency. I feel that my letter of May 6, 2003 to the Commission in reference to this matter has been totally ignored and that the General Counsel's Brief presents information in a manner that is very unfair.

Now for the issues:

1. No one working for the committee had the authorization to incur expenses on behalf of the committee without my permission, (except for minor items like stationery, small advertisements and the like) whoever authorized the Jewish Press to place these ads did it without authority, totally on his own; he can claim whatever he wants but I did not authorize it. On *page 4 note 1* on the bottom, you are taking my testimony out of context. I clearly did not get involved in advertisements that costs a couple of hundred dollars but advertisements that costs thousands of dollars I definitely did get involved. As a matter of fact I stopped a number of ad campaigns because I felt that the cost was not warranted, which is a clear indication that my authorization was necessary.

2. On *page 6 the brief states* "In addition, Committee treasurer Abraham Roth met with the Jewish Press' chief executive officer, Jerry Greenwald, and attorney, Dennis Rapps, to discuss the advertisements, the invoices, and the debt. Thus, the Committee either knew of or received the invoices, was aware that the Jewish Press was seeking payment for the advertisements, did not pay for the advertisements, and did not disclose its newspaper debt." This is pure deception. This meeting happened after the "MUR" was issued, of course I was aware, "the MUR" made me aware! The way the brief presents it, it makes it look like I met with the Jewish Press before the "MUR" was

issued and that I was aware all along regarding the invoices and that I am just lying. The author of the brief could have presented the Commission with all of the relevant information, but apparently chose not to do so.

3. On page 2 of the brief it states "Although the Committee placed the advertisements and knew that the Jewish Press sought payment, it did not undertake any efforts to pay for the advertisements. Nor did the Committee ever formally acknowledge that it owed a debt to the Jewish Press or assert that it disputed the debt by reporting it in accordance with the Commission's regulations". Again by using the word "committee", it makes it sound that I knew about the advertisement and that I did not acknowledge the debt and I that I did not make any effort to pay it. I made it very clear numerous times that I had no knowledge about the advertisement, so of course I could not acknowledge the debt, and of course I could not pay the debt. By continuously stating this in this deceptive way; the brief wants to turn unconfirmed theory into fact.

4. Mr. Greenwald from the Jewish Press is a very intelligent man he knew that this committee had a treasurer why did he not contact me? As you could see in the Greenwald affidavit mentioned on *page 4*, Mr. Greenwald claims that Mr. Dear assured the newspaper that it would be paid. I don't see my name there!

5. *On page 6* it states that the Jewish Press sent invoices to the committees address at 4702 16th Avenue, Brooklyn, New York, again this is not my address and obviously if I did not receive these invoices from the people that worked for the committee there was no way of me knowing about these invoices. I mentioned a number of times; if I did not know of the invoices existence, how then could I have paid for the invoices!. It is also interesting to note that Mr. Leitstein does not say he gave me the invoices.

In summary, I strongly disagree with the General Counsel's Brief in reference to the:

- (a) **committee:** because I believe no one had the authority to incur this large an expense without my approval
- (b) **Abraham Roth as treasurer:** there isn't one truthful piece of evidence, not from the Jewish Press, not from the people who worked for the committee or from any other source that in any way indicates that I had any knowledge of these advertisements or any invoices associated with these advertisements until the MUR was issued

Sincerely,



Abraham Roth
cw/AR