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# Article summary:

1. The Supreme Court released a report on the leaked draft opinion in Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization, but it is silent about whether nine specific individuals who had the means to leak the opinion were questioned: the Supreme Court justices.

2. The investigation conducted by the court was thorough and included interviews with all 82 court employees who had access to the draft opinion, as well as detailed call and text message logs from some court employees’ personal cellphones, computer search histories, fingerprint analysis, and more.

3. Despite this thorough investigation, there are still questions unanswered about whether spouses of the justices were interviewed and why the justices were not asked to sign sworn affidavits under penalty of perjury like every other employee interviewed.

# Article rating:

May be slightly imbalanced: The article presents the information in a generally reliable way, but there are minor points of consideration that could be explored further or claims that are not fully backed by appropriate evidence. Some perspectives may also be omitted, and you are encouraged to use the research topics section to explore the topic further.

# Article analysis:

The article “Did the Supreme Court’s Leak Investigation Let the Justices Off the Hook?” by Aaron Tang is an opinion piece that examines the Supreme Court's report on its investigation into a leaked draft opinion in Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization. The article raises important questions about why nine specific individuals who had access to the draft opinion – namely, the Supreme Court justices – were not questioned during this investigation.

The article presents a balanced view of both sides of this issue by providing an overview of what investigators did do (conducting an impressive total of 126 formal interviews with all 82 court employees who had access to the draft opinion; demanding detailed call and text message logs from some court employees’ personal cellphones; examining employees’ computer search histories for suspicious activity; running at least one fingerprint analysis; searching other devices such as printer logs and court-issued laptops and cellphones) as well as what they did not do (not explicitly declaring that justices were not interviewed or investigated; not asking justices to sign sworn affidavits under penalty of perjury).

The author also provides insight into his own experience as a law clerk at the court which adds credibility to his argument that leaking a draft opinion would have been unthinkable precisely because of severe consequences that would ensue for clerks and permanent employees alike. He further argues that while these consequences would not attach to justices due to their life tenure, it is still concerning that they were apparently not questioned during this investigation given their plausible motive for leaking (namely, training immense pressure from conservative elites on Justices Barrett and Kavanaugh).

The article does present some potential biases in its reporting such as its focus on questioning why only certain individuals (i.e., justices) were not questioned during this investigation rather than exploring counterarguments or presenting both sides equally. Additionally, it does not provide any evidence for its claims regarding possible motives for leaking or any missing points of consideration regarding this issue which could be explored further in future articles or reports on this topic.

In conclusion, while this article does raise important questions about why certain individuals may have been left out of this investigation, it does lack evidence for its claims regarding possible motives for leaking and fails to explore counterarguments or present both sides equally which could be addressed in future articles or reports on this topic.

# Topics for further research:

* Supreme Court Leak Investigation
* Consequences of Leaking Draft Opinion
* Justices Barrett and Kavanaugh Pressure
* Sworn Affidavits Under Penalty of Perjury
* Computer Search Histories for Suspicious Activity
* Printer Logs and Court-Issued Laptops and Cellphones
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