

DuCharme, Seth (OAG)

From: DuCharme, Seth (OAG)
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2019 10:02 AM
To: Durham, John (USACT); (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (USACT)
Subject: See you at 11

Sent from my iPhone

Rabbitt, Brian (OAG)

From: Rabbitt, Brian (OAG)
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2019 5:09 PM
To: Amundson, Corey (OPR); Horowitz, Michael E.(OIG); Durham, John (USACT)
Cc: O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG); Moran, John (OAG)
Subject: FW: Letter regarding "Russia collusion" matter
Attachments: 2019.08.16 Letter to AG.pdf; 2019.07.03 FBI subpoena (signed).pdf; 2019.07.26 Tuohy Letter.pdf

For your awareness that this was also sent to OAG, and in case the August 16 email below did not reach you.

From: Ty Clevenger <tyclevenger@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 21, 2019 4:07 PM
To: Rabbitt, Brian (OAG) <brrabbitt@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Moran, John (OAG) <jomoran@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Cc: Bissex, Rachel (OAG) <rbissex@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Subject: Fw: Letter regarding "Russia collusion" matter

Mr. Rabbitt and Mr. Moran,

I've attached a letter that was mailed to General Barr last week. Per that letter, the FBI appears to be blocking discovery (and a FOIA request) related to the Russia collusion hoax. I plan to file a motion to compel, but I thought your office might be interested.

Ty Clevenger

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Ty Clevenger <tyclevenger@yahoo.com>
To: (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) John Durham DOJ Email; (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) John Durham DOJ Email; michael.e.horowitz@usdoj.gov
<michael.e.horowitz@usdoj.gov>; corey.amundson@usdoj.gov <corey.amundson@usdoj.gov>
Sent: Friday, August 16, 2019, 11:25:36 AM EDT
Subject: Letter regarding "Russia collusion" matter

Mr. Durham, General Horowitz, and Mr. Amundson,

I represent Edward Butowsky of Plano, Texas in federal litigation concerning the "Russian collusion" matter, and I have attached a letter and two supporting documents for your consideration. I can be reached on my cell (b) (6) if you have any questions. Thanks for your consideration.

Ty Clevenger

TY CLEVINGER

P.O. Box 20753
Brooklyn, New York 11202 0753

telephone: 979.985.5289
facsimile: 979.530.9523

tyclevenger@yahoo.com
Texas Bar No. 24034380

August 16, 2019

The Hon. William Barr, Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

The Hon. John H. Durham, U.S. Attorney
District of Connecticut
157 Church Street, Floor 25
New Haven, Connecticut 06510

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Michael E. Horowitz, Inspector General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 4706
Washington, DC 20530
michael.e.horowitz@usdoj.gov

Corey Amundson
U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Professional Responsibility
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 3266
Washington, DC 20530
corey.amundson@usdoj.gov

Re: *Edward Butowsky v. David Folkenflik, et al.*, Case No. 4:18-cv-00442
(E.D.Tex.) and *Edward Butowsky v. Michael Gottlieb, et al.*, Case No.
4:19-cv-180 (E.D.Tex.)

General Barr, Mr. Durham, and General Horowitz, and Mr. Amundson:

I represent Edward Butowsky in both of the cases identified above, and I write concerning the FBI's ongoing efforts to conceal information related to the "Russia collusion" hoax. In addition to the cases filed on behalf of Mr. Butowsky, I filed an overlapping FOIA lawsuit against the FBI in New York. *See Ty Clevenger v. U.S. Department of Justice, et al.*, Case No. 18-cv-1568 (E.D.N.Y.). The FBI appears to be withholding information in bad faith, both in response to the FOIA case and in response to subpoenas from Mr. Butowsky's cases.

In the FOIA case, we already have proof that the FBI made redactions under false pretenses, and for the purpose of saving powerful people from embarrassment. *See Joe Hoft, The Gateway Pundit*, July 31, 2019, <https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2019>

[/07/exclusive-transcripts-obtained-of-former-fbi-chief-of-staff-james-rybicki-testifying-russia-conspiracy-came-from-obamas-white-house/](#). In all three cases, I am seeking documents from the FBI regarding the Russian government's alleged involvement in hacking the Democratic National Committee's web servers.

The identical *Folkenflik* and *Gottlieb* subpoenas sought information regarding whether DNC emails published by Wikileaks were leaked internally versus hacked by the Russian government. (I have attached a copy of the *Gottlieb* subpoena to this letter). Additionally, the subpoenas sought information regarding what role former DNC employee Seth Rich played, if any, in transferring DNC emails to Wikileaks. The FBI has refused to comply with the subpoenas in any way.

In the FOIA litigation, the FBI claimed that it conducted an “index search” for Mr. Rich and found nothing. I asked the FBI to search the Washington Field Office and, somewhat to my surprise, the FBI complied. The FBI later informed me that the WFO had offered assistance to the Metropolitan Police Department regarding Mr. Rich's murder, but the MPD declined the offer of assistance. Nonetheless, the FBI never produced any documents (*e.g.*, texts, emails, or phone records) documenting these communications.

I then learned that my client, Mr. Butowsky, had spoken with a government official who had seen documents that the FBI extracted from Seth Rich's electronic devices. According to that official, the documents were extracted by the FBI's Computer Analysis and Response Team (“CART”) and stored on CART's servers. I asked the FBI to search CART and it flatly refused, claiming any responsive documents would have shown up during the “index search.” I noted that the FBI had previously admitted in my FOIA case (as well as many other cases) that the indexing system does not cover all documents. Nonetheless, the FBI still refused to search CART.

As set forth in the *Gottlieb* lawsuit (*see* <http://lawflog.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/2019.07.15-Amended-complaint-stamped.pdf>), we believe former FBI Deputy Director Andrew McCabe directed FBI personnel to exclude information regarding Seth Rich from the bureau's indexing system. That question cannot be resolved, however, until someone searches CART for responsive records.

I should note that I sent a *Tuohy* letter to the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Texas, and I have attached a copy with this letter. When I spoke with AUSA Bob Wells about that letter, I asked whether he consulted with main Justice about the subpoenas, particularly insofar as they relate to the “Russia collusion” hoax. Mr. Wells indicated that his office had no intention of doing that, but would instead confer directly with the FBI.

I respectfully request that General Barr overrule the FBI and the USAOs, directing them to fully comply with the subpoenas and the FOIA requests. I further request that Mr. Durham, General Horowitz, and Mr. Amundson investigate why the FBI is still concealing information relating to the “Russia collusion” hoax.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ty Clevenger', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ty Clevenger

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the
Eastern District of Texas

Edward Butowsky)	
<i>Plaintiff</i>)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 4:19-cv-0180-ALM-KPJ
Michael Gottlieb, et al.)	
<i>Defendant</i>)	

**SUBPOENA TO PRODUCE DOCUMENTS, INFORMATION, OR OBJECTS
OR TO PERMIT INSPECTION OF PREMISES IN A CIVIL ACTION**

To: Custodian of Records
Federal Bureau of Investigation

(Name of person to whom this subpoena is directed)

Production: YOU ARE COMMANDED to produce at the time, date, and place set forth below the following documents, electronically stored information, or objects, and to permit inspection, copying, testing, or sampling of the material: The items and things described in the attached addendum.

Place: 4965 Preston Park Boulevard Suite 100 Plano, TX 75093	Date and Time: 08/08/2019 10:00 am
--	---

Inspection of Premises: YOU ARE COMMANDED to permit entry onto the designated premises, land, or other property possessed or controlled by you at the time, date, and location set forth below, so that the requesting party may inspect, measure, survey, photograph, test, or sample the property or any designated object or operation on it.

Place:	Date and Time:
--------	----------------

The following provisions of Fed. R. Civ. P. 45 are attached – Rule 45(c), relating to the place of compliance; Rule 45(d), relating to your protection as a person subject to a subpoena; and Rule 45(e) and (g), relating to your duty to respond to this subpoena and the potential consequences of not doing so.

Date: 07/02/2019

CLERK OF COURT

OR



/s/ Ty Clevenger

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Attorney's signature

The name, address, e-mail address, and telephone number of the attorney representing *(name of party)* Edward Butowsky, who issues or requests this subpoena, are:

Ty Clevenger / P.O. Box 20753, Brooklyn, NY 11202 / tyclevenger@yahoo.com / 979-985-5289

Notice to the person who issues or requests this subpoena

If this subpoena commands the production of documents, electronically stored information, or tangible things or the inspection of premises before trial, a notice and a copy of the subpoena must be served on each party in this case before it is served on the person to whom it is directed. Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(a)(4).

Civil Action No. 4:19-cv-0180-ALM-KPJ

PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 45.)

I received this subpoena for *(name of individual and title, if any)* _____
on *(date)* _____.

I served the subpoena by delivering a copy to the named person as follows: _____

_____ on *(date)* _____; or

I returned the subpoena unexecuted because: _____

Unless the subpoena was issued on behalf of the United States, or one of its officers or agents, I have also
tendered to the witness the fees for one day's attendance, and the mileage allowed by law, in the amount of
\$ _____.

My fees are \$ _____ for travel and \$ _____ for services, for a total of \$ _____ 0.00.

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: _____

Server's signature

Printed name and title

Server's address

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc.:

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45 (c), (d), (e), and (g) (Effective 12/1/13)

(c) Place of Compliance.

(1) *For a Trial, Hearing, or Deposition.* A subpoena may command a person to attend a trial, hearing, or deposition only as follows:

- (A) within 100 miles of where the person resides, is employed, or regularly transacts business in person; or
- (B) within the state where the person resides, is employed, or regularly transacts business in person, if the person
 - (i) is a party or a party's officer; or
 - (ii) is commanded to attend a trial and would not incur substantial expense.

(2) *For Other Discovery.* A subpoena may command:

- (A) production of documents, electronically stored information, or tangible things at a place within 100 miles of where the person resides, is employed, or regularly transacts business in person; and
- (B) inspection of premises at the premises to be inspected.

(d) Protecting a Person Subject to a Subpoena; Enforcement.

(1) *Avoiding Undue Burden or Expense; Sanctions.* A party or attorney responsible for issuing and serving a subpoena must take reasonable steps to avoid imposing undue burden or expense on a person subject to the subpoena. The court for the district where compliance is required must enforce this duty and impose an appropriate sanction which may include lost earnings and reasonable attorney's fees on a party or attorney who fails to comply.

(2) *Command to Produce Materials or Permit Inspection.*

(A) *Appearance Not Required.* A person commanded to produce documents, electronically stored information, or tangible things, or to permit the inspection of premises, need not appear in person at the place of production or inspection unless also commanded to appear for a deposition, hearing, or trial.

(B) *Objections.* A person commanded to produce documents or tangible things or to permit inspection may serve on the party or attorney designated in the subpoena a written objection to inspecting, copying, testing, or sampling any or all of the materials or to inspecting the premises or to producing electronically stored information in the form or forms requested. The objection must be served before the earlier of the time specified for compliance or 14 days after the subpoena is served. If an objection is made, the following rules apply:

- (i) At any time, on notice to the commanded person, the serving party may move the court for the district where compliance is required for an order compelling production or inspection.
- (ii) These acts may be required only as directed in the order, and the order must protect a person who is neither a party nor a party's officer from significant expense resulting from compliance.

(3) *Quashing or Modifying a Subpoena.*

(A) *When Required.* On timely motion, the court for the district where compliance is required must quash or modify a subpoena that:

- (i) fails to allow a reasonable time to comply;
- (ii) requires a person to comply beyond the geographical limits specified in Rule 45(c);
- (iii) requires disclosure of privileged or other protected matter, if no exception or waiver applies; or
- (iv) subjects a person to undue burden.

(B) *When Permitted.* To protect a person subject to or affected by a subpoena, the court for the district where compliance is required may, on motion, quash or modify the subpoena if it requires:

- (i) disclosing a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information; or

- (ii) disclosing an unretained expert's opinion or information that does not describe specific occurrences in dispute and results from the expert's study that was not requested by a party.

(C) *Specifying Conditions as an Alternative.* In the circumstances described in Rule 45(d)(3)(B), the court may, instead of quashing or modifying a subpoena, order appearance or production under specified conditions if the serving party:

- (i) shows a substantial need for the testimony or material that cannot be otherwise met without undue hardship; and
- (ii) ensures that the subpoenaed person will be reasonably compensated.

(e) Duties in Responding to a Subpoena.

(1) *Producing Documents or Electronically Stored Information.* These procedures apply to producing documents or electronically stored information:

(A) *Documents.* A person responding to a subpoena to produce documents must produce them as they are kept in the ordinary course of business or must organize and label them to correspond to the categories in the demand.

(B) *Form for Producing Electronically Stored Information Not Specified.* If a subpoena does not specify a form for producing electronically stored information, the person responding must produce it in a form or forms in which it is ordinarily maintained or in a reasonably usable form or forms.

(C) *Electronically Stored Information Produced in Only One Form.* The person responding need not produce the same electronically stored information in more than one form.

(D) *Inaccessible Electronically Stored Information.* The person responding need not provide discovery of electronically stored information from sources that the person identifies as not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or cost. On motion to compel discovery or for a protective order, the person responding must show that the information is not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or cost. If that showing is made, the court may nonetheless order discovery from such sources if the requesting party shows good cause, considering the limitations of Rule 26(b)(2)(C). The court may specify conditions for the discovery.

(2) *Claiming Privilege or Protection.*

(A) *Information Withheld.* A person withholding subpoenaed information under a claim that it is privileged or subject to protection as trial-preparation material must:

- (i) expressly make the claim; and
- (ii) describe the nature of the withheld documents, communications, or tangible things in a manner that, without revealing information itself privileged or protected, will enable the parties to assess the claim.

(B) *Information Produced.* If information produced in response to a subpoena is subject to a claim of privilege or of protection as trial-preparation material, the person making the claim may notify any party that received the information of the claim and the basis for it. After being notified, a party must promptly return, sequester, or destroy the specified information and any copies it has; must not use or disclose the information until the claim is resolved; must take reasonable steps to retrieve the information if the party disclosed it before being notified; and may promptly present the information under seal to the court for the district where compliance is required for a determination of the claim. The person who produced the information must preserve the information until the claim is resolved.

(g) *Contempt.*

The court for the district where compliance is required and also, after a motion is transferred, the issuing court may hold in contempt a person who, having been served, fails without adequate excuse to obey the subpoena or an order related to it.

For access to subpoena materials, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(a) Committee Note (2013).

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION**

**Edward Butowsky, in his personal and
professional capacities,**

Plaintiff,

v.

Michael Gottlieb, et al.,

Defendants

Case No. 4:19-cv-180

SUBPOENA ADDENDUM

The Plaintiff's subpoena commands the production of the following items, and the Plaintiff requests that any such production occur electronically either via email to Plaintiff's Counsel at tyclevenger@yahoo.com or by mailing an electronic storage device to 4965 Preston Park Blvd #100, Plano, TX 75093:

1. Produce all data downloaded from all electronic devices that belonged to Seth Conrad Rich (born on or about January 3, 1989) as well as all data, documents, records or communications indicating how the devices were obtained and who was responsible for downloading the information.
2. Produce all data, documents, communications, records or other evidence indicating whether Seth Conrad Rich (hereinafter "Seth Rich"), his brother Aaron Rich, or any other person or persons were involved in transferring data from the Democratic National Committee to Wikileaks, either directly or through intermediaries.
3. Produce all documents, communications, records or other evidence reflecting orders or directions (whether formal or informal) for the handling of any evidence pertaining to Seth Rich's or Aaron Rich's involvement in transferring data from the Democratic National Committee to Wikileaks.
4. Produce all documents, records, or communications exchanged with any other government agencies (or representatives of such agencies) since July 10, 2016 regarding (1) Seth Rich's murder or (2) Seth Rich's or Aaron Rich's involvement in

transferring data from the Democratic National Committee to Wikileaks.

5. Produce all recordings, transcripts, or notes (*e.g.*, FD-302 forms) reflecting any interviews of Aaron Rich or any other witness regarding (1) the death of Seth Rich or (2) the transfer of data from the Democratic National Committee to Wikileaks.
6. In an August 13, 2018 letter from Assistant U.S. Attorney Kathleen Mahoney (EDNY) to Ty Clevenger pertaining to *Ty Clevenger v. U.S. Department of Justice, et al.*, Case No. 18-CV-01568 (EDNY), Ms. Mahoney wrote that she had conferred with the FBI (her client) regarding whether it assisted the Seth Rich investigation:

I subsequently ascertained from the FBI that as part of the search that it conducted in response to your FOIA request, the Washington, D.C. Field Office was contacted. They responded that they did not open a case or assist in the investigation and have no records.

In an August 22, 2018 letter from Assistant U.S. Attorney Kathleen Mahoney (EDNY) to Magistrate Judge Lois Bloom in the same case, Ms. Mahoney wrote as follows:

Plaintiff then inquired by email on August 16, whether the FBI had searched for records with the Computer Analysis and Response Team ("CART"). On August 20, the undersigned responded by email that the FBI had advised that it did not reach out to CART because the FBI had not assisted in the investigation (the D.C. police declined the FBI's assistance) but that the searches that the FBI did conduct would have located any CART records.

Produce all records, documents, data, or communications (*e.g.*, text messages or telephone records) identifying the person or persons who offered FBI assistance and the person or persons who declined it on behalf of the D.C. police. Also produce the full contents of any such communications wherein the offer of assistance was made or rejected.

7. Produce all data, documents, records or communications obtained by the FBI's Computer Analysis and Response Team ("CART") regarding Seth Rich and/or Aaron Rich.
8. Produce all data, documents or records (including texts or emails) that reflect any meetings or communications from July 10, 2016 until July 10, 2017 between former FBI Deputy Director Andrew McCabe and any and all of the following: (1) Seymour Myron "Sy" Hersh (born on or about April 8, 1937); (2) Washington, D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser; and/or (3) former Democratic National Committee Interim Chairwoman Donna Brazile.

TY CLEVENGER

P.O. Box 20753
Brooklyn, New York 11202 0753

telephone: 979.985.5289
facsimile: 979.530.9523

tyclevenger@yahoo.com
Texas Bar No. 24034380

July 26, 2019

Mr. Joshua M. Russ, Asst. U.S. Attorney
Eastern District of Texas
110 N. College Avenue, Suite 700
Tyler, Texas 75702

Via facsimile and email
(903) 892-2792

Re: *Edward Butowsky v. David Folkenflik, et al.*, Case No. 4:18-cv-00442-ALM (E.D. Tex.) and *Edward Butowsky v. Michael Gottlieb, et al.*, Case No. 4:19-cv-00180-ALM-KPJ (E.D. Tex.)

Mr. Russ:

I write in response to your letter dated July 23, 2019 regarding the subpoenas issued from the two cases identified above. The subpoenas seek information regarding whether Seth Rich or his brother, Aaron Rich, played a role in leaking emails from the Democratic National Committee to Wikileaks in 2016. As you are probably aware, Seth Rich's alleged role in the leaks became a national news story after he was murdered in Washington, D.C. on July 10, 2016.

My client, Ed Butowsky has said publicly since 2017 that the Rich brothers (rather than Russian hackers) were responsible for transferring embarrassing emails from the DNC to Wikileaks. Since that time, Mr. Butowsky has been portrayed as a liar and a conspiracy theorist, and he has filed defamation claims against multiple defendants who accused him of fabricating the story about the Rich brothers. These claims are found in *Folkenflik* and *Gottlieb*.

Mr. Butowsky tells me that he was informed by someone with access to FBI records that the FBI's Computer Analysis and Response Team ("CART") took custody of Seth's electronic devices and downloaded evidence from those devices. He was further told that the evidence included communications between Mr. Rich and Wikileaks.

Both the *Folkenflik* case and the *Gottlieb* case are centered on the same key question: whether the Rich brothers were responsible for transferring emails to Wikileaks. See *Folkenflik* Original Complaint (<http://lawflog.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/2018.06.21-Original-complaint-stamped.pdf>) and *Gottlieb* First Amended Complaint (<http://lawflog.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/2019.07.15-Amended->

[complaint-stamped.pdf](#)). Requests No. 1-7 on the previously-submitted subpoenas are targeted to this central question.

Request No. 8 seeks information about what role former FBI Deputy Director Andrew McCabe played in concealing information about the Rich brothers. That information is pertinent to Paragraphs 43 and 57 of the *Gottlieb* FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT. Paragraph 43 alleges that Mr. McCabe consulted with Washington, D.C. Mayor Muriel Bowser and former DNC Interim Chair Donna Brazile about concealing the role of the Rich brothers, while Paragraph 57 alleges that journalist Sy Hersh obtained pertinent information from Mr. McCabe.

Earlier this year, President Donald Trump gave Attorney General William Barr the authority to declassify documents related to allegations that the President or his aides “colluded” with Russia. *See* Armonstrong Williams, “Giving Barr Declassification Authority is a Needed Ray of Sunshine (<https://www.dailysignal.com/2019/06/06/giving-barr-declassification-authority-is-a-needed-ray-of-sunshine/>). If any of the requested information is classified, I request that it be declassified pursuant to General Barr's authority. All of the information requested in our subpoenas falls within the purview of the Russian collusion investigation, specifically whether Russian hackers (versus the Rich brothers) were responsible for transferring DNC emails to Wikileaks.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ty Clevenger', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ty Clevenger

DuCharme, Seth (OAG)

From: DuCharme, Seth (OAG)
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 9:01 PM
To: Durham, John (USACT)
Subject: Re: Booking.com: Hotels in (b) (6) Book your hotel now!

Thanks!

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jun 26, 2019, at 8:49 PM, Durham, John (USACT) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) > wrote:

>

> (b) (6)

>

>

> Sent from my iPhone

DuCharme, Seth (OAG)

From: DuCharme, Seth (OAG)
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2019 11:46 PM
To: Durham, John (USACT)
Subject: Re: The 30 best hotels near (b) (6)
[REDACTED]

Thanks, John (b) (6) [REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jun 25, 2019, at 11:30 PM, Durham, John (USACT) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] > wrote:

>

> Seth-

> There are a number of motels right there at (b) (6) [REDACTED] If none of those at the below website don't fit the bill, let me know and I'll get some alternatives to you.

> (b) (6) [REDACTED]

> JHD

>

> (b) (6) [REDACTED]

>

>

> Sent from my iPhone

DuCharme, Seth (OAG)

From: DuCharme, Seth (OAG)
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2019 7:06 PM
To: Durham, John (USACT); (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (USACT); (b) (6), (b) (7)(C))
Subject: 5B3394EC-BA49-4A9F-961A-F40788022A61
Attachments: (b) (5) ATT00001.txt

Possible Model

DuCharme, Seth (OAG)

From: DuCharme, Seth (OAG)
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2019 11:05 AM
To: Lasseter, David F. (OLA)
Cc: Durham, John (USACT); Moran, John (OAG)
Subject: Re: OLA Review Letter.docx

John just called me and gave me some very helpful suggestions, which I will incorporate into next draft and recirculate

Sent from my iPhone

On May 30, 2019, at 7:50 PM, Lasseter, David F. (OLA) <dlasseter@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

Thanks Seth. Will await any additional comments from John.

Yes I concur that (b) (5) [REDACTED].

dfi

David F. Lasseter

On May 30, 2019, at 18:29, DuCharme, Seth (OAG) <sducharme@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

David,

Per your request, I took a stab at drafting a letter to congress explaining the Review that John (cc'd) is leading.

Please consider this a rough draft, (b) (5) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Thanks,
Seth

<OLA Review Letter.docx

<OLA Review Letter.docx>

DuCharme, Seth (OAG)

From: DuCharme, Seth (OAG)
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2019 10:25 AM
To: Lasseter, David F. (OLA)
Cc: Durham, John (USACT); Moran, John (OAG); (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (USACT)
Subject: Re: OLA Review Letter.docx

After reviewing it again this morning, I would probably (b) (5).

John, do you or (b) (6) have any comments or concerns? I'm available for a call in a little while if there's anything you want to talk through.

Thanks,
Seth

Sent from my iPhone

On May 30, 2019, at 7:50 PM, Lasseter, David F. (OLA) <dlasseter@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

Duplicative Records

DuCharme, Seth (OAG)

From: DuCharme, Seth (OAG)
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2019 10:00 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (USACT)
Subject: Fwd: OLA Review Letter.docx
Attachments: OLA Review Letter.docx; ATT00001.htm

FYSA

Still waiting for comments from John, he may be in transit

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "DuCharme, Seth (OAG)" <sducharme@jmd.usdoj.gov>

Date: May 30, 2019 at 6:29:38 PM EDT

Duplicative Records

Durham, John (USACT)

From: Durham, John (USACT)
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2019 7:29 PM
To: DuCharme, Seth (OAG)
Subject: Re: contact info

Thanks!

Sent from my iPhone

On May 30, 2019, at 7:13 PM, DuCharme, Seth (OAG) <sducharme@jmd.usdoj.gov<mailto:sducharme@jmd.usdoj.gov>> wrote:

Tel (b) (6)

Sent from my iPhone

On May 30, 2019, at 7:09 PM, DuCharme, Seth (OAG) <sducharme@jmd.usdoj.gov<mailto:sducharme@jmd.usdoj.gov>> wrote:

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

(b) (7) (A)

DuCharme, Seth (OAG)

From: DuCharme, Seth (OAG)
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2019 6:06 PM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Cc: Durham, John (USACT)
Subject: Re: We're going to be with BB for a while. 6:00ish?

I'm still here but moving towards food. Call my cell as needed.

Sent from my iPhone

> On May 28, 2019, at 5:27 PM, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
wrote:
>
> Seth is trying to take off soon but gave me a quick rundown. (b) (7)(A) ?
>
>
>> On May 28, 2019, at 4:30 PM, Durham, John (USACT) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) > wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>> Sent from my iPhone

DuCharme, Seth (OAG)

From: DuCharme, Seth (OAG)
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2019 11:57 AM
To: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (USACT)
Cc: Durham, John (USACT)
Subject: Re: Schedule

Yes heading down

Sent from my iPhone

> On Apr 16, 2019, at 11:44 AM, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (USACT) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) wrote:

>
> Are you available to meet now in the cafeteria? We will be there.

>
> Sent from my iPhone

>
>> On Apr 16, 2019, at 11:01 AM, DuCharme, Seth (OAG) <sducharme@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

>>
>> Thanks want to meet for quick lunch before (b) (7)(A)

>>
>> Sent from my iPhone

>>
>>> On Apr 16, 2019, at 10:24 AM, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (USACT) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) > wrote:

>>>
>>> We met with (b) (7)(A) . We will try to connect with you after that meeting. Thanks

>>>
>>> Sent from my iPhone

Hovakimian, Patrick (ODAG)

From: Hovakimian, Patrick (ODAG)
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2019 2:04 PM
To: Kupec, Kerri (OPA); O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG)
Cc: Lofthus, Lee J (JMD); Moran, John (OAG); Durham, John (USACT); Durham, John H. (JMD)
Subject: RE: Outstanding Durham & SCO questions for Senate Minority CJS

Lee – We are working on a letter to SJC/HJC chairmen, which I understand is (b) (5). Ed and OPA have cleared the language of your response and once OAG does we should be good to send it, but can (b) (5). Thanks.

From: Kupec, Kerri (OPA) <kkupec@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2019 1:05 PM
To: O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG) <ecocallaghan@jmd.usdoj.gov>
Cc: Lofthus, Lee J (JMD) <llofthus@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Moran, John (OAG) <jomorán@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Hovakimian, Patrick (ODAG) <phovakimian4@jmd.usdoj.gov>; Durham, John (USACT) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C); Durham, John H. (JMD) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)
Subject: Re: Outstanding Durham & SCO questions for Senate Minority CJS

Looks good.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 5, 2019, at 1:00 PM, O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG) <ecocallaghan@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

Fine here

Edward C. O'Callaghan
202-514-2105

On Jun 5, 2019, at 12:56 PM, Lofthus, Lee J (JMD) <llofthus@jmd.usdoj.gov> wrote:

OAG and ODAG Gentlemen: we received the questions below from Hill CJS staff. Any concerns/edits with the answers? John Durham (copied here) is OK on his Q&A, and SCO is fine with theirs. We're getting pinged, so trying to close these out. Thks Lee cc: Kerri FYSA

Durham review questions:

Q: Is Mr. Durham continuing to serve as the USA for D/CT during this investigation or has someone stepped in as Acting USA until this investigation is completed?

A: (b) (5)

Q: Is he conducting the investigation from Connecticut or will he be based in DC?

A: (b) (5) [REDACTED]

Q: From what account/component are costs being covered/billed for travel, TDY, etc?

A: (b) (5) [REDACTED]

Q: How many other individuals from DOJ are working on this investigation and from what components? Are there non-DOJ personnel working on this investigation and if so, from what agencies and what DOJ components are they billing any investigation-related costs?

A: (b) (5) [REDACTED]
(b) (5) [REDACTED]

Special Counsel Questions:

Q: What Special Counsel staff are still working?

A: (b) (5) [REDACTED]

Q: Was the Special Counsel or any SCO staff provided with a protective detail?

A: (b) (5) [REDACTED]

Q: When will the next financial expenditure report be issued?

A: (b) (5) [REDACTED]
(b) (5) [REDACTED]

O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG)

Subject: Durham

Start: Wednesday, April 24, 2019 4:00 PM
End: Wednesday, April 24, 2019 4:30 PM

Recurrence: (none)

Meeting Status: Meeting organizer

Organizer: O'Callaghan, Edward C. (ODAG)