

Senator Dick Durbin
Ranking Member, Senate Judiciary Committee
Written Questions for Stanley Edmund Woodward, Jr.
Nominee to be Associate Attorney General of the United States
May 28, 2025

1. Under Assistant Attorney General Dhillon, the Civil Rights Division is moving away from its decades long mission of enforcing laws that prohibit discrimination in hiring, housing, and voting rights. To date, the Division has lost approximately 70 percent of its personnel, which amounts to more than 250 lawyers who worked to enforce the nation's civil rights laws. The Division has historically enjoyed bipartisan support and has been described as the "crown jewel" of the Department.

If confirmed, you would oversee the Civil Rights Division. How will you ensure the Division to vigorously enforces the nation's civil rights laws with this dramatically downsized workforce?

Response: If confirmed, I am committed that the Department, including the Civil Rights Division, will have the people and resources needed to accomplish our mission.

2. On April 22, the Department of Justice's (DOJ) Office of Justice Programs (OJP or Office) notified hundreds of grant recipients across the country, without warning, that their funding had been terminated, effective immediately. According to *Reuters*, a DOGE staffer advised the Justice Department to terminate approximately \$811 million worth of grants administered by OJP. The report notes that this staffer created the list without consulting program managers at the Office, yet the White House claimed that all of his actions were approved by DOJ leadership.

- a. **As Counselor to Attorney General Bondi, what was your role in terminating the grant for \$8.3 million to the National Policing Institute, which funds rural police departments and district attorneys' offices?**

Response: While I was generally aware that a review of existing grants was underway, I was not involved in the process and did not advise the Attorney General on any awards.

- b. **As Counselor to Attorney General Bondi, what was your role in terminating a grant for \$2 million to the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys, which would have been used to train prosecutors to investigate child abuse in juvenile detention facilities, youth correctional facilities, or group homes?**

Response: While I was generally aware that a review of existing grants was underway, I was not involved in the process and did not advise the Attorney General on any awards.

3. Abruptly slashing this public-safety funding undermines the Department’s “core mission,” as Attorney General Bondi has described it, “of keeping Americans safe and vigorously enforcing the law.” Impacted programs include those that support victims of crime, combat sexual assault and abuse in prisons, assist people with mental health disorders, reduce and prevent violence, support successful post-incarceration reentry, and more.

How can the Department of Justice fulfill its commitment to fostering public safety while terminating hundreds of grants dedicated to supporting these types of programs across the country?

Response: The Department of Justice is committed to combatting waste, fraud, and abuse. To that end, the Department terminated discretionary grants that no longer effectuate the Department’s priorities. The Department is reviewing all grant awards on an ongoing basis. After any appeals have been exhausted, the balance of funds will be reallocated with the unobligated amounts from the terminated grant awards used for purposes supporting current Departmental priorities.

4. Zealous advocacy is a key tenet of our profession, whether it was John Adams representing British soldiers during the Boston Massacre trials or public defenders representing indigent defendants. Yet, President Trump has issued executive orders that go to the heart of this issue—targeting law firms who represent litigants he disapproves of or disagrees with.

- a. **As an attorney who has represented a variety of controversial defendants, do you agree with President Trump’s decision to issue executive orders targeting these law firms?**

Response: I’m aware that the President has issued executive orders directed at law firms. Because those orders are or may be subject to litigation, it would not be appropriate for me to comment on those orders.

- b. **Since January 2025, you have served as Assistant to the President and Senior Counselor to the President. With respect to the executive orders targeting law firms, please describe your involvement in:**

- i. **Deciding which firms to target with executive orders;**

Response: Given the Department of Justice’s responsibility to provide confidential legal advice to officials throughout the government, it would be inappropriate for me to discuss whether or not I have had internal deliberative conversations within the Justice Department or with White House officials about any particular matter.

- ii. **Crafting executive orders that targeted these law firms; and**

Response: Please see my response to Question 4.b.i.

- iii. **Negotiating with law firms that sought to avoid being the subject of these executive orders, including but not limited to A&O Shearman; Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft; Kirkland & Ellis; Latham & Watkins; Milbank; Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison; Simpson Thacher & Bartlett; Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom; and Willkie Farr & Gallagher.**

Response: Please see my response to Question 4.b.i.

- 5. You have served as Assistant to the President and Senior Counselor to the President since January 2025 and as Counselor to Attorney General Bondi since April 2025. During this time period, the Justice Department has taken a number of controversial actions. Please describe in detail the role you played, if any, in the following:

- a. **Forcing out senior career DOJ officials or assigning them to work on immigration enforcement;**

Response: Given the Department of Justice's responsibility to provide confidential legal advice, to officials throughout the government, it would be inappropriate for me to discuss whether or not I have had internal deliberative conversations within the Justice Department or with White House officials about any particular matter.

- b. **Firing prosecutors who worked on criminal investigations involving President Trump;**

Response: Please see my response to Question 5.a.

- c. **Creating the Weaponization Working Group at the Justice Department;**

Response: Please see my response to Question 5.a.

- d. **Seeking to dismiss the corruption charges against New York City Mayor Eric Adams;**

Response: Please see my response to Question 5.a.

- e. **Disbanding a task force focusing on seizing money from Russian oligarchs;**

Response: Please see my response to Question 5.a.

- f. **Reducing enforcement of the Foreign Agent Registration Act;**

Response: Please see my response to Question 5.a.

- g. Firing the Pardon Attorney after she refused to recommend reinstating gun ownership rights for actor Mel Gibson;**

Response: Please see my response to Question 5.a.

- h. Declining to investigate the use of the commercial messaging app Signal by senior Trump Administration officials to discuss sensitive military information;**

Response: Please see my response to Question 5.a.

- i. Granting pardons to approximately 1,500 January 6 rioters, including those who assaulted police officers;**

Response: Please see my response to Question 5.a.

- j. Firing inspectors general from more than a dozen federal agencies, despite a 2022 law that requires the President to give Congress 30-days notice and explain his reasons for doing so; and**

Response: Please see my response to Question 5.a.

- k. Issuing the executive order that seeks to shut down the Department of Education.**

Response: Please see my response to Question 5.a.

- 6. According to your Senate Judiciary Questionnaire, you currently serve as Counselor to the President (January 2025-present) and the Attorney General of the United States (April 2025-present).

- a) Is it accurate that you currently hold both positions?**

Response: No. My role at the White House completed on March 31st, and I started my current role at the Department of Justice on April 1st. There was no overlap in the two roles.

- b) Are you aware of any post-Watergate precedent for simultaneously serving in senior roles in both the White House and the Department of Justice?**

Response: No.

- c) **Do you agree that serving in both of these roles simultaneously creates the appearance of improper political influence on the Justice Department?**

Response: Without further context, I do not believe it is appropriate for me to comment on the statements in this question as presented.

- d) **White House Counsel Warrington issued a memo on White House contacts with the Department of Justice which states, “DOJ exercises its investigatory and prosecutorial functions free from the appearance of improper political influence. ... The President, Vice President, Counsel to the President and a Deputy Counsel to the President are the only White House officials who may initiate a conversation with DOJ about a specific case or investigation, whether criminal or civil.” Have you been involved in any conversations about specific cases or investigations since the beginning of this Administration? If yes, please provide details.**

Response: I meet with many people within DOJ on many matters, but I can’t disclose whether or not I have had any discussions about a particular topic or any particular advice I gave or who I advised. If I disclose the fact of those conversations, it will chill the ability and willingness of people inside government reaching out to me for advice if they know I will disclose that advice in a public hearing.

**Nomination of Stanley Woodward Jr.
To be Associate Attorney General
Questions for the Record
Submitted May 28, 2025**

QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR WHITEHOUSE

Please answer each question and sub-question individually and as specifically as possible.

1. Under what circumstances, if any, could a federal government official legally defy a federal district court order issued in a case to which the official or the government was a party?

Response: Parties who are dissatisfied with a court order have the option to appeal the order to a higher court, up to and including the Supreme Court, and including the option to seek a stay of the court's order pending appeal.

- a. Under what circumstances, if any, could a federal government official legally defy a federal circuit court order issued in a case to which the official or the government was a party?

Response: Please see my response to Question 1.

- b. Under what circumstances, if any, could a federal government official legally defy a Supreme Court order issued in a case to which the official or the government was a party?

Response: I take issue with the premise of the question as the question poses a hypothetical. As stated in my testimony before the Committee, the President of the United States has been very clear that he will follow any order of the Supreme Court.

2. Do you agree that there are no circumstances under which a federal government official can legally defy a federal district, circuit, or Supreme Court order issued in a case to which the official or the government was a party? If your answer is not a simple "yes," please provide detailed reasoning.

Response: Please see my responses to Questions 1, 1.a. and 1.b. above.

3. What are your obligations to ensure, to the greatest extent possible, executive branch compliance with a court order, should you be confirmed as Associate Attorney General?

Response: Generally, I will advise a client, whether in private practice or in government, to comply with court orders.

4. What would be the appropriate action for a court to take in the event that the government or a public official defied a court order?

Response: A court has a number of different actions it can take should it decide a decision or order has not been complied with to the satisfaction of the court. It would depend on the facts and circumstances of any particular instance just what action would be appropriate.

5. As part of the confirmation process, have you been asked about your willingness to pursue certain criminal investigations or prosecutions? If yes, please describe.

Response: No.

- a. Has President Trump or any member of his team asked you to commit to pursue certain investigations or prosecutions? If yes, please describe.

Response: No.

6. Will you recuse from any matters where you represented President Trump's aides or allies?

Response: In any instance where a conflict of interest may potentially arise, I will consult with the Justice Department's career ethics lawyers and other officials to determine my ethical responsibilities and act accordingly.

7. On February 5, AG Bondi established a "Weaponization Working Group." Are you part of this group? If yes, what have you done as part of this group?

Response: No.

8. Have you had conversations with anyone at DOJ about investigating former Special Counsel Jack Smith? If yes, please describe.

Response: No.

9. Multiple career officials across DOJ have been reassigned or fired since January 20. Were you aware of any personnel moves before they occurred? Have you had any communications with the White House about these personnel moves? With other DOJ officials? If yes, please describe.

Response: Given my responsibility to provide confidential legal advice to officials throughout the government, it would be inappropriate for me to discuss whether or not I have had internal deliberative conversations within the Justice Department or with White House officials about any particular matter.

10. In December 2024, the Department of Justice Office of the Inspector General published a report entitled, *Review of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Handling of Its Confidential Human Sources and Intelligence Collection Efforts in the Lead Up to the January 6, 2021 Electoral Certification*.

- a. Do you have any reason to doubt the Office of the Inspector General's conclusion that it "found no evidence . . . showing or suggesting that the FBI had undercover employees in the various protest crowds, or at the Capitol, on January 6?" If yes, please describe.

Response: I have not read the DOJ OIG report referenced in this question and therefore I have no basis to make any judgment about its conclusions.

- b. Do you have any reason to doubt the Office of the Inspector General's conclusion that none of the FBI's Confidential Human Sources in Washington on January 6, 2021, was "directed by the FBI to encourage others to commit illegal acts on January 6?" If yes, please describe.

Response: Please see my response to Question 10.a.

11. On October 21, 2022, Steve Bannon was sentenced to four months in prison after the Department of Justice charged him with criminal contempt of Congress for defying a congressional subpoena. Do subjects of a lawfully issued congressional subpoena have a legal obligation to comply with such a subpoena?

Response: I cannot comment on any pending litigation.

12. In December 2024, the Department of Justice Office of the Inspector General published a report summarizing its investigation into the Department's use of compulsory process to obtain communications records of Member of Congress, congressional staff, and members of the news media.

- a. Do you agree with the Inspector General's conclusion that "[t]he use of compulsory process to obtain records of members of the news media and congressional personnel may implicate separate and important constitutional considerations?"

Response: Please see my response to Question 10.a.

- b. If confirmed, will you ensure that each of the recommendations included in the Inspector General's report is fully implemented?

Response: I have not read the DOJ OIG report referenced in this question. If confirmed, I will follow all Department of Justice policies including, timely review and consideration of recommendations made by the DOJ OIG.

13. Did Joe Biden win the 2020 presidential election?

Response: Former President Joseph Biden was certified as the winner of the 2020 presidential election and sworn in as the 46th President on January 20, 2021.

14. Was the U.S. Capitol attacked by a violent mob on January 6, 2021? Were violent rioters who were convicted of assaulting police officers on January 6 political prisoners?

Response: I served as defense counsel for some of the accused from the events on January 6, 2021. As a consequence, it would be inappropriate for me to broadly characterize the events that took place that day.

15. Does the 22nd Amendment permit a president to be elected more than twice?

Response: The text of the 22nd Amendment to the United States Constitution speaks for itself.

Senate Judiciary Committee
Hearing on the Nomination of Stanley Edmund Woodward, Jr
to be Associate Attorney General
May 21, 2025
Questions for the Record
Senator Amy Klobuchar

1. There is bipartisan consensus that our country has a monopoly power problem. Assistant Attorney General Slater has continued to prosecute antitrust actions in cases like the ones brought against Google, Live Nation, Ticketmaster, Apple, and RealPage.

Will you commit to ensuring that the Antitrust Division continues to have the resources it needs to pursue antitrust enforcement actions like the ones referenced above?

Response: Yes.

- Do you agree that antitrust enforcement actions should be based only on the facts and the law and pressure from the White House will play no role in cases investigated or brought?

Response: Yes.

2. Last month, the Office of Justice Programs notified hundreds of grant recipients across the country that their funding had been terminated, effective immediately, including to organizations that provide victim services, law enforcement training and other public safety services. In Minnesota, this included \$5.4 million in public safety grants.

- Will you commit to expeditiously reviewing all grants that were cut off and continue funding to these organizations that advance public safety.

Response: The Department of Justice terminated discretionary grants that no longer effectuate the Department's priorities. DOJ is reviewing all grant awards on an ongoing basis. After any appeals have been exhausted, the balance of funds will be reallocated with the unobligated amounts from the terminated grant awards used for purposes supporting current Departmental priorities.

3. Under the current Administration, the Civil Rights Division has completely turned away from its critical mission to enforce the Voting Rights Act. It has been reported that the lawyers in the Voting Section have been directed to dismiss all active voting cases.

- Given that the Supreme Court in *Allen v. Milligan* just reaffirmed Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, which prohibits states and localities from enacting laws or taking actions that have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on the basis of race, will you commit to vigorous enforcement of Section 2 of the *Voting Rights Act*, including Section 2?

Response: The right to vote is a central right in our system of government and must be protected. The Department of Justice will defend the right to vote.

**Nomination of Stanley Woodward to be Associate Attorney General for the
Department of Justice
Questions for the Record
Submitted May 28, 2025**

QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR COONS

1. At any point during the process that led to your nomination, did you have any discussions with anyone—including but not limited to individuals at the White House, at the Justice Department, or at outside groups—about your loyalty to President Trump? If so, please elaborate.

Response: No.

2. If President Trump asked you to do something you judged to be illegal or unethical, would you resign? Please answer yes or no.

Response: The question poses a hypothetical, which I do not believe would occur. If confirmed, I will always follow the law, as well as uphold my oath to support and defend the Constitution.

- a. If you would not resign, what would you do? Please explain.

Response: Please see my response to Question 2.

3. Is there ever a circumstance when an executive branch agency may choose not to comply with a federal court order, until such time as that order is stayed or vacated by a higher court?

Response: Generally, I will advise a client, whether in private practice or in government, to comply with court orders.

- a. What are the remedies available to a litigant who is dissatisfied with a court order?

Response: Parties who are dissatisfied with a court order have the option to appeal the order to a higher court, up to and including the Supreme Court, and including the option to seek a stay of the court's order pending appeal.

- b. Would you ever advise a client to disregard a court order?

Response: Please see my response to Question 3.

- c. If President Trump instructed you to disobey an order from a federal judge, how would you respond?

Response: Please see my response to Question 2.

- d. If Attorney General Bondi instructed you to disobey an order from a federal judge, how would you respond?

Response: Please see my response to Question 3.c.

- 4. The Associate Attorney General oversees the Office of Justice Programs (OJP). Without warning, DOJ recently terminated hundreds of grants totaling nearly \$1 billion—many of which were administered through OJP and directly supported law enforcement.

- a. Do you agree with the Trump administration's efforts to defund the police? Why?

Response: While I reject this question as posed, there is no effort to defund the police in this Administration.

- b. If confirmed, do you commit to reviewing the canceled grants and making your own determination about whether to restore funding?

Response: The Department is committed to harnessing its resources effectively and efficiently and using those resources to accomplish the Department's priorities. The Department reviewed discretionary grant programs to ensure that each award aligns with and advances the priorities of the Trump Administration and the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice terminated discretionary grants that no longer effectuate the Department's priorities.

- c. What role do you think the federal government should play in overseeing local police forces? Please explain your answer.

Response: Local police departments throughout the country are governed by a wide variety of state and local laws as well as a variety of political management and oversight structures. In addition, there are federal laws that can be applied to many different aspects of the duties and responsibilities of law enforcement officials and the departments which employ them.

- 5. Among the terminated OJP grants, the Trump administration cut \$137 million in funding for programs to protect youth and safeguard children against abuse and neglect. These cancelled grants include funding to train and assist professionals in investigating, prosecuting, and treating child abuse in 13 states. The administration also cut funding to support training for judicial and court personnel on model practices for handling child abuse and neglect cases. Do you support these cuts? Why?

Response: Please see my response to Question 4.b.

6. Approximately 50 awards from the OJP's Office for Victims of Crime were also cut. Terminated grants include funding for services to support survivors of human trafficking and victims of sexual assault. Do you agree with this decision to cancel funding to support victims of crime? Why?

Response: Please see my response to Question 4.b.

7. The Trump administration has also eliminated OJP grants valued at approximately \$169 million to fund community safety and violence reduction programs. Among these canceled grants is Project Safe Neighborhoods, which promotes partnerships between law enforcement officers and prosecutors to effectively target local violent crime. Do you support cutting funding to community safety and violence reduction programs? Why?

Response: Please see my response to Question 4.b.

8. Do you agree that decisions to cancel DOJ-administered grants should be individually reviewed and approved by the Associate Attorney General or the head of OJP, and not made by members of the U.S. Department of Governmental Efficiency or any other entity outside of DOJ?

Response: If confirmed, I will work with other appropriate Department leadership to make decisions regarding the administration of the Department's grants.

- a. If confirmed, do you commit to ensuring that DOJ leadership and not non-DOJ entities are driving any future decisions to cut DOJ-administered grants?

Response: Please see my response to Question 8.

9. I am greatly concerned by indications that the protections of the *Privacy Act* may not have been followed throughout the federal government as data is being shared with the Department of Government Efficiency or other entities.

- a. Please describe your understanding of the *Privacy Act* and its importance.

Response: The Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, 5 U.S.C. § 552a, establishes a code of fair information practices that governs the collection, maintenance, use, and dissemination of information about individuals that is maintained in systems of records by federal agencies.

- b. If confirmed, do you commit to ensuring that the *Privacy Act* is scrupulously followed for all DOJ components that you oversee?

Response: If confirmed, I commit to ensuring that all applicable laws are followed.

10. I am concerned by how it appears senior administration officials have conducted official business on personal devices or on commercial messaging applications in ways that run afoul of executive branch responsibilities under the *Freedom of Information Act* and *Presidential Records Act*. I am especially concerned by indications that conversations may have occurred concerning classified information on devices not cleared for such use. Do you commit to ensuring that you will not conduct official business in such ways that fail to comply with the *Freedom of Information Act*, *Presidential Records Act*, or safeguarding the sensitivity of classified information?

Response: The *Freedom of Information Act* (FOIA) and the *Presidential Records Act* are two important tools for government accountability. If confirmed, I will, of course, comply with all legal obligations.

11. How would you respond if your role at the Department of Justice required you to pursue a policy directive that was unconstitutional?

Response: I do not expect that my role at the Department of Justice would require me to follow a directive that is unconstitutional. If confirmed, I will always follow the law, as well as uphold my oath to support and defend the Constitution.

12. What is the remedy if the President violates his constitutional duty to faithfully execute the laws?

Response: The question poses a hypothetical which I do not believe would occur. Without further context, I do not believe it is appropriate for me to comment on the statements in this question as presented.

13. As a DOJ lawyer, when is it appropriate to refuse to follow a directive from the President?

Response: Without further context, I do not believe it is appropriate for me to comment on the statements in this question as presented.

14. When is it appropriate for the DOJ to decide not to defend a federal law?

Response: The Attorney General has a duty to defend the validity of Congressional enactments when there are reasonable arguments available to do so. An exception exists in certain cases where there is a conflict between a federal statute and the President's Article II authority. If confirmed, I commit to following these principles.

15. Do you agree that it can be appropriate, in the interest of justice, to charge a criminal defendant with a lesser offense than the one the facts may support? Explain.

Response: If confirmed, I will review each case that comes before me on its own merits.

16. Do you agree that the DOJ has an independent obligation to evaluate the legality of the President's policy proposals?

Response: The Department's works closely with its client agencies to limit the potential for litigation and to prevent unfavorable outcomes should cases proceed in court.

17. What is your understanding of the DOJ's contact policy regarding interactions between the DOJ and White House officials?

Response: If confirmed, I will comply with all applicable Justice Manual provisions and other guidance issued by the Attorney General regarding communication with the White House.

18. The DOJ has long played a role in advising the President in his use of the clemency power and recommending cases for pardons to him.

- a. Do you think it would be appropriate for the DOJ to recommend clemency for an individual based on who the individual supported or contributed to in a political election?

Response: Article II, Section 2, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution grants the President power to grant pardons and reprieves for offenses against the United States. Clemency is a core Article II power.

- b. If confirmed, do you commit to not basing any clemency recommendations that you might be a part of on political considerations?

Response: Please see my response to 18.a.

19. Since President Trump took office, his administration has discredited judges, even calling for their impeachment. Elon Musk took to social media to call federal judges "corrupt" and "evil." Do you think high-level government officials disparaging judges improves or reduces their safety? Please explain your answer.

Response: Without further context, I do not believe it is appropriate for me to comment on this question as presented.

20. In a memo to all DOJ employees, Attorney General Pam Bondi stated that Department attorneys who refuse to advance arguments "deprive[] the President of the benefit of *his* lawyers." I want you to focus on the part of this statement that references Department attorneys as President Trump's lawyers.

- a. Do you agree with this characterization of Department attorneys by Attorney General Bondi?

Response: The Department of Justice represents the United States in litigation, and in lawsuits in which the President is named as a defendant, the Department represents the President in his official capacity.

21. Section 702 of the *Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act* (FISA) is up for reauthorization this year. Do you think the Constitution requires that law enforcement obtain a warrant before accessing Americans' communications collected pursuant to Section 702?

Response: It is my understanding that Section 702 is not up for reauthorization until April 2026. In my view, Section 702 is an incredibly valuable tool to protecting against threats to our national security. At the same time, we have an obligation to protect civil liberties of Americans. If I am confirmed, I would talk to the experts in the National Security Division to get a better understanding of this issue and with the Deputy Attorney General and the Attorney General to determine what additional steps should be taken to protect civil liberties.

22. Under what circumstances may the President declare an invasion, pursuant to the *Alien Enemies Act*, and what role does Congress play in any such determination?

Response: I have not had the opportunity in my legal practice to consider this question. Should I be confirmed and if the question were to arise I would consult the applicable law and court cases and consult with attorneys in the Department of Justice to understand the issue and develop legal options and strategies.

**Nomination of Stanley Edmund Woodward, Jr. to be the
Associate Attorney General of the U.S. Department of Justice
Questions for the Record
Submitted May 28, 2025**

QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR CORY A. BOOKER

1. Do you believe that involvement in the federal criminal investigations and prosecutions of President Trump alone, without other evidence of wrongdoing, misconduct, or unsatisfactory job performance, is grounds for the demotion, reassignment, or termination of Department of Justice (DOJ) personnel?

Response: Any disciplinary actions towards current or former Department of Justice personnel should be undertaken based on the facts of each specific situation in a manner consistent with Department policies, applicable law, and the Constitution.

2. Do you believe that involvement in investigations or prosecutions of individuals related to the January 6 Capitol riot alone, without other evidence of wrongdoing, misconduct, or unsatisfactory job performance, is grounds for the demotion, reassignment, or termination of DOJ personnel?

Response: Please see my response to Question 1.

3. Do you believe that political affiliation alone, without other evidence of wrongdoing, misconduct, or unsatisfactory job performance, is grounds for the demotion, reassignment, or termination of DOJ personnel?

Response: Please see my response to Question 1.

4. If President Trump directs you to take an illegal action, how would you respond?

Response: The question poses a hypothetical which I do not believe would occur. If confirmed, I will always follow the law, as well as uphold my oath to support and defend the Constitution.

5. If any official in the Department of Justice directs you to take an illegal action, how would you respond?

Response: Please see my response to Question 4.

6. If any member of the Administration directs you to take an illegal action, how would you respond?

Response: Please see my response to Question 4.

7. President Trump has said, “I have absolute right to do what I want to do with the Justice Department.”¹ Do you agree that a sitting president has absolute power? If yes, please explain the legal basis for this position.

Response: Without further context, I do not believe it is appropriate or possible for me to comment on the statements in this question as presented.

- a. If not absolute, how much power do you believe the President has over the Department?

Response: Please see my response to Question 7.

8. Do you believe that there was any basis for the Department of Justice’s investigations and prosecutions of President Trump?

Response: Without further context, I do not believe it is appropriate for me to comment on this question as presented.

9. Please provide your understanding of the Hatch Act.

Response: I understand that the Hatch Act prohibits certain political activities by federal employees. Should a matter arise that implicates the Hatch Act or any other federal statute, I would roll up my sleeve to generate an informed view of that statute.

- a. Do you believe that asking DOJ personnel their views about investigations or prosecutions to assess their political leaning is a violation of the Hatch Act?

Response: Employees who are regulated by the Hatch Act should abide by its provisions. Whether a question to any Department of Justice official constitutes a prohibited act under that or any other statute would turn on the facts surrounding that circumstance.

10. Will you commit to consulting with career officials at DOJ regarding your potential conflicts of interest?

Response: With regards to potential conflicts of interest and decisions on recusals, I will consult with appropriate officials and make decisions based on the facts and applicable law and policy.

11. Will you follow the guidance of career officials at DOJ regarding your potential conflicts of interest and recusals?

¹ Michael S. Schmidt & Michael D. Shear, *Trump Says Russia Inquiry Makes U.S. ‘Look Very Bad,’* N.Y. TIMES (Dec. 28, 2017), <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/28/us/politics/trump-interview-mueller-russia-china-north-korea.html>.

Response: With regards to potential conflicts of interest and decisions on recusals, I will consult with appropriate officials and make decisions based on the facts and applicable law and policy.

12. Have you spoken or corresponded with Elon Musk since November 2024? If yes, provide the dates, mode, and content of those discussions and communications.

- a. At any point, did you discuss DOJ or matters related to DOJ, including personnel matters?

Response: No.

- b. Did you ever discuss demotions, reassignments, or terminations of personnel, whether specific individuals or generally?

Response: No.

- c. Did you ever discuss potential personnel to be hired or appointed in any capacity at the DOJ?

Response: No.

13. You have substantial experience providing pro bono services to individuals facing eviction and experiencing serious and pervasive housing code violations in their homes. Please describe why you took on this pro bono legal work and the impact it has had on your legal practice and professional development.

- a. What benefits does pro bono legal work provide to the legal profession?

Response: I have long believed that as attorneys we have a duty of service to our community. To so many, the law is beyond understanding. And so, with the ability to learn the law comes the responsibility to use that gift for a greater good. Nowhere is this belief more poignant than at the Department of Justice. If confirmed, I pledge to seek justice for all.

- b. What benefits does pro bono legal work provide to those who cannot afford legal representation?

Response: One example of the benefits of pro bono legal work comes from my personal experience. Beginning in law school, I traveled to Biloxi Mississippi to volunteer in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. This trip profoundly changed my view of the role of the law.

We met with families living in trailers advising them of the federal assistance available to help them rebuild. While my colleagues would visit 10 or 12 homes a day, I often managed only to visit one in the morning and one in the afternoon. As I

sat on makeshift porches sipping homemade iced tea, I came to realize that if given the opportunity I would do good with my ability to understand the law.

It was, in part, this desire to serve my community that motivated me to found and lead the housing law practice at the firm where I worked for more than ten years. There, I led teams of attorneys in defending tenants with housing code violations facing eviction. That experience was equally enlightening for these clients could not be evicted under the law—but that simple concept was foreign to them because the law was foreign to them.

- c. Should attorneys who take on pro bono legal representation, including pro bono capital defense or immigration representation, be penalized or stigmatized merely for providing pro bono legal services?

Response: Without further information, I do not believe it is appropriate for me to comment on this question as presented.

14. During your tenure in private practice, you represented Kelly and Connie Meggs.

- a. How did the Meggs retain you as counsel?

Response: I cannot answer that question without violating the attorney-client privilege.

- b. How many hours did you bill on each matter related to the Meggs?

Response: Please see my response to Question 14.a.

- c. As a firm client, did the Meggs pay your standard billing rate?

Response: Please see my response to Question 14.a.

- d. As a firm client, did anyone other than the Meggs, whether an individual or other entity, pay for your legal services on his behalf? If yes, please provide the amount, the name of the individual or entity, and matter for the payment.

Response: Please see my response to Question 14.a.

15. In your capacity as legal counsel, have you ever learned that a client intended to provide or had already provided false testimony under oath? If yes, please explain the circumstances and any actions you took based on that knowledge.

Response: Please see my response to Question 14.a.

16. Under what circumstances would it be acceptable for an executive branch official to ignore or defy a federal court order?

- a. Should an executive branch official who ignores or defies a federal court order be held in contempt?

Response: Generally, I will advise a client, whether in private practice or in government, to comply with court orders.

- b. Can you unequivocally state that executive branch officials must comply with federal court orders?

Response: Please see my response to Question 16.a.

- c. Can you unequivocally state that executive branch officials must comply with temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions issued by federal district court judges?

Response: Please see my response to Question 16.a.

- 17. If you are confirmed as Associate Attorney General, you will serve as the third highest-ranking official in the Department of Justice, supervising several of DOJ's litigating and grant-making components, including DOJ's Office of Justice Programs (OJP).

In April 2025, OJP notified hundreds of grant recipients across the country, without warning, that their funding had been terminated effective immediately. Prosecutors, police and sheriff's departments, judges, mental health service providers, academics, and more depend on these grant programs to advance public safety. Among other public safety objectives, the affected grant programs provided support for victims of crime, assisted people with mental health disorders, supported successful reentry, and combated opioid and substance abuse.

- a. Did you participate in the decision to terminate these OJP grants? If yes, please describe your involvement in this decision and provide the names of the other individuals who participated in this decision.
 - i. How were the grants that were terminated chosen?

Response: The Department is committed to harnessing its resources effectively and efficiently and using those resources to accomplish the Department's priorities. The Department reviewed discretionary grant programs to ensure that each award aligns with and advances the priorities of the Trump Administration and the Department of Justice. The Department determined that certain awards do not effectuate the Department's priorities, and accordingly, were terminated.

- ii. What were the factors considered in making the determination to terminate?

Response: The Department determined that certain awards do not effectuate the Department's priorities, and accordingly, were terminated.

- iii. Where the affected grantees were state or local jurisdictions, did the political party of state or local officials in those jurisdictions influence the determination to terminate?

Response: No.

- iv. What is the legal basis for terminating grant funds that are statutorily required?

Response: Awards were terminated pursuant to the Department's authority under 2 C.F.R. § 200.340(a)(4).

- b. Did you have any knowledge that DOJ OJP was going to terminate these grants before the recipients were notified on April 22, 2025? If yes, please describe what you knew about the decision and how you learned of it. Please include the names of any individuals from whom you learned this information.

Response: While I was not involved in the specific decisions, I had general knowledge that a review of existing grants was underway.

- c. Did any White House officials review the grants to be terminated or otherwise have any involvement in the decision to terminate the grants? Provide their names.

Response: Not to my knowledge.

- d. Are you aware of any plans to terminate any other OJP grants in the future?

Response: At this time, I am unaware of any future plans to terminate grants, but a review is underway.

- e. If confirmed, will you commit to reviewing each of the terminated grants for reinstatement?

Response: There is already an appeals process in place.

- f. If confirmed, will you commit to ensuring that the decision to reinstate terminated grants of state or local jurisdictions will be made without regard to the political affiliation or party of state or local officials in those jurisdictions?

Response: Yes.

18. Since November 2024, have you discussed DOJ grant funding with anyone from Elon Musk's DOGE? If yes, provide names and the mode, date, and contents of all discussions.

Response: No.

19. Since November 2024, have you discussed DOJ grant funding with anyone from the White House? If yes, provide names and the mode, date, and contents of all discussions.

Response: Not that I recall.

20. Does the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution apply to non-citizens present in the United States?

Response: The Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution speaks for itself.

21. Is *Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479 (1965), binding precedent?

Response: *Griswold v. Connecticut* is binding precedent of the Supreme Court and entitled to respect as such.

22. Is *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558 (2003), binding precedent?

Response: *Lawrence v. Texas* is binding precedent of the Supreme Court and is entitled to such respect.

23. Is *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 576 U.S. 644 (2015), binding precedent?

Response: *Obergefell v. Hodges* is binding precedent of the Supreme Court and is entitled to such respect.

24. What considerations warrant changing the legal position of the United States advanced by a previous Administration in litigation?

Response: I suggest that a variety of factors would be under consideration when changing the legal position of the United States.

25. Do you believe that President Trump won the 2020 election?

Response: I acknowledge that President Joe Biden was certified and served as the 46th President of the United States.

26. The 22nd Amendment says that "no person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice."²

² U.S. CONST. amend. XXII.

- a. Do you agree that President Trump was elected to the office of the President in the 2016 election?

Response: Yes.

- b. Do you agree that President Trump was elected to the office of the President in the 2024 election?

Response: Yes.

- c. Do you agree that the 22nd Amendment, absent a constitutional amendment, prevents Trump from running for a third presidential term?

Response: The 22nd Amendment to the U.S. Constitution speaks for itself.

Senator Peter Welch
Senate Judiciary Committee
Written Questions for Stanley Woodward
Hearing on “Nominations”
Wednesday, May 21, 2025

1. Who won the 2020 presidential election?

Response: Former President Joseph Biden was certified as the winner of the 2020 presidential election and sworn in as the 46th President on January 20, 2021.

2. Do you believe fraud changed the outcome of the 2020 presidential election?

Response: As the Attorney General stated, many Americans continue to share concerns about the integrity of the 2020 election. If confirmed as Associate Attorney General, I will work to restore Americans’ confidence in our electoral processes.

3. Please provide your understanding of the Emoluments Clause?

Response: Article I, Section 9, of the Constitution states the Foreign Emoluments Clause: “No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.”

4. Do you believe there is a legal basis for a sitting President to accept a gift of an aircraft from a foreign state without the approval of Congress? If so, please provide your rationale.

Response: Without further context, I do not believe it is appropriate for me to comment on this question as presented.

5. Should a litigant ever disobey a lawful court order?

Response: Generally, I will advise a client, whether in private practice or in government, to comply with court orders.

6. Is the Executive Branch bound by Supreme Court precedent?

Response: As the highest court under the Constitution, the Supreme Court plays a critical role in our Nation’s system of government, and I would hope that all Americans would regard its decisions as legitimate and the law of the land.

7. Is the Executive Branch bound by precedent of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit when appearing before that circuit?

Response: Parties who are dissatisfied with a court order have the option to appeal the order to a higher court, up to and including the Supreme Court, and including the option to seek a stay of the court's order pending appeal.

8. Please describe your legal representation of Yuscil Taveras in relation to the Mar-A-Lago classified documents case?

Response: The information requested by this question is necessarily protected by the attorney-client privilege.

- a. Who paid for your legal representation of Mr. Taveras?

Response: Please see my response to Question 8.

- b. While you represented him, what did Mr. Taveras testify to before the federal grand jury investigating the Mar-A-Lago classified documents case?

- i. *Please note Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e) does not require your secrecy regarding testimony before a grand jury.*

Response: Please see my response to Question 8.

- c. Did Mr. Taveras provide a rationale for removing you as his lawyer?

Response: Please see my response to Question 8.

- d. To your knowledge, did Mr. Taveras's testimony to the federal grand jury investigating the Mar-A-Lago classified documents change after you ended your representation of him?

Response: Please see my response to Question 8.

- i. What did Mr. Taveras testify to before the federal grand jury investigating the Mar-A-Lago classified documents case *after* you ended your representation of him? *Please note Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e) does not require your secrecy regarding testimony before a grand jury.*

Response: Please see my response to Question 8.

- e. Are you aware that Mr. Taveras provided false testimony when he testified before the federal grand jury during your representation of him?

Response: Please see my response to Question 8.

- f. Did you, anyone who worked for you, or anyone you worked with coach Mr. Taveras on his testimony before he appeared at the federal grand jury for the first time?

Response: Please see my response to Question 8.

9. What ethical obligations are employees of the Department of Justice bound by?

Response: The Department of Justice employees are bound by the Standards of Conduct and the Department's supplemental regulations, found at 5 C.F.R. § 2635, 5 C.F.R. § 3801 and 28 C.F.R. § 45.

10. What repercussions should employees of the Department face if they violate those ethical obligations?

Response: Any disciplinary actions toward Department personnel would be undertaken based on the facts of each situation in a manner consistent with Department policies, applicable law, and the Constitution.

11. Is it appropriate to initiate criminal investigations and/or prosecutions based on activity protected by the United States Constitution?

Response: I will not speculate on a hypothetical investigation and/or prosecution, which will necessarily turn on the applicable facts and law.

12. Should there be repercussions for employees of the Department that initiate a criminal investigation and/or prosecution based on activity protected by the United States Constitution?

Response: Please see my response to Question 11.

13. On April 25, 2025, I submitted a letter to the Civil Rights Division at the Department of Justice regarding ongoing changes in the Division. Associate Attorney General Harmeet Dhillon, who heads that Division, will report directly to you. To date, I have not received a response to my letter. Will you ensure Ms. Dhillon provides a response in an expeditious fashion?

Response: If confirmed, I will consult with officials in the Department's Office of Legislative Affairs to ensure the Department responds to your requests, consistent with the Department's policies and principles.

- a. The letter requests a briefing of the Senate Judiciary Committee on the changes in the Division. Will you ensure Ms. Dhillon provides a briefing?

Response: Please see my response to Question 13.

14. More broadly, will you ensure that the divisions under your supervision provide timely responses and updates to Congress?

Response: Please see my response to Question 13.

Questions for the Record

Sen. Adam Schiff (CA)

Stanley Edmund Woodward, Jr., Nominee to be Associate Attorney General

1. Before or since the inauguration, has President Trump or any another official at the White House ever asked, suggested, or implied that you or anyone at the DOJ should open or undertake a review or an investigation of anyone or any entity?

Response: No.

2. Have you ever had a conversation with anyone at DOJ about investigations involving or related to President Trump or his associates?

Response: No.

3. Are you aware of anyone at the White House having conversations with current DOJ officials about investigations involving or related to President Trump?

- a. If so, please explain in specific detail those communications.

Response: It is my understanding that Attorneys General have issued memoranda governing Department officials' contacts with the White House. If confirmed as the Associate Attorney General, I would comply with any applicable memoranda from the Attorneys General, as well as all applicable laws and the Constitution.

4. Do you agree it would be improper for the President or the White House to direct, task, or otherwise provide input on whether DOJ should initiate or undertake an *investigation* of current or former U.S. government officials, other private citizens, or entities?

Response: I commit to following all governing memoranda from the Attorney General, including any addressing White House contacts. The President is bound by the terms of his oath, the Constitution, and applicable law.

5. Please guarantee in writing to this Committee that any and all decisions you make as Associate Attorney General during your tenure, if confirmed by the Senate, will be free from any political, partisan, financial, or personal motive, including your own.

Response: The Department's investigative and prosecutorial decisions should be based on the facts, the applicable law and policies, the admissible evidence, and the Principles of Federal Prosecution (*see* Justice Manual §9-27.000).

6. Please guarantee in writing to this Committee that any and all decisions you make as Associate Attorney General during your tenure, if confirmed by the Senate, will not be informed in any way by the desires or direction of President Trump, the White House, or any associates of President Trump.

Response: If confirmed, I will always uphold my oath to support and defend the Constitution, and I will follow the law.

7. Whistleblowers play a critical role in calling out waste, fraud, and abuse across government. If confirmed, do you commit to protecting and in no way adversely affecting, or retaliating against, the employment of any employees who report internal waste, fraud and abuse of authority by the Trump Administration, including any activity that may involve you, through the proper channels to DOJ management, to the DOJ Inspector General, and to Congress?

Response: Yes.

8. Have you used Signal or other commercially available messaging applications to communicate with individuals at the White House, DOJ, or FBI regarding ongoing or anticipated reviews or investigations, including law enforcement sensitive information?

Response: If confirmed, I will ensure that any communications comply with all applicable federal records retention laws and procedures

9. Do you commit not to use Signal or other commercially available messaging applications that do not comply with federal records retention laws and regulations to communicate with individuals at the White House, DOJ, or FBI regarding ongoing or anticipated reviews or investigations, including law enforcement sensitive information?

Response: Please see my response to Question 8.

10. You represented several January 6 defendants, including Kelly Meggs, a Florida chapter leader of the far-right organization Oath Keepers. In representing Mr. Meggs, you argued that he “was just someone who got carried away in the events of the day.”
 - a. Do you believe that any individuals who breached the Capitol on January 6, 2021, committed serious criminal offenses worthy of prosecution?

Response: Violence directed toward law enforcement officers is never acceptable. Without reference to any particular acts, as the Attorney General has stated, the Department of Justice will vigorously prosecute cases of violence against law enforcement consistent with all relevant facts and the law.

11. You also represented Waltine Nauta in the criminal investigation and prosecution of President Trump’s retention of classified documents, as well as the head of IT at Mar-a-Lago, Yuscil Taveras, who switched lawyers when it became clear you held an apparent conflict of interest in representing Mr. Nauta in the same case. Mr. Taveras even retracted the testimony he gave under your counsel and provided revised testimony, which ultimately helped form the basis of the superseding indictment against President Trump and your own client, Mr. Nauta.

- a. Did you knowingly allow your client, Mr. Taveras, to provide false testimony about Mar-a-Lago security footage while you represented him to the benefit of Mr. Nauta, who you also represented in the same probe?

Response: The information requested by this question is necessarily protected by the attorney-client privilege.

12. On July 21, 2021, then-Attorney General Garland issued a memorandum on the “Department of Justice Communications with the White House,” more commonly referred to as the White House Contacts policy. This policy governs all communications between the Justice Department and White House personnel and is critical to safeguarding the DOJ’s criminal and civil law enforcement decisions and legal judgements from partisan influences. According to public reports, the White House updated its own guidance to permit the President and select others to initiate conversations with DOJ about specific criminal or civil cases or investigations. This goes beyond even the first Trump administration, and now blesses, for the first time, the President’s engagement with DOJ on specific types of cases, whether criminal or civil.

- a. Do you commit to upholding the Department’s longstanding policy, as outlined in the 2021 memo, *not* to “advise the White House concerning pending or contemplated criminal or civil law enforcement investigations or cases unless doing so is important for the performance of the President's duties and appropriate from a law enforcement perspective?”

Response: I commit to following all governing memoranda from the Attorney General, including any addressing White House contacts.

13. On July 19, 2021, then-Attorney General Garland issued a memorandum on the “Use of compulsory process to obtain information from, or records of, members of the news media” to protect the press’ ability to investigate and report the news to the American public. On October 26, 2022, following a review completed by the then-Deputy Attorney General and consultation with relevant internal and external stakeholders, the then-Attorney General codified the provisions set forth in this memorandum in the Department's regulations at 28 CFR 50.10. Attorney General Bondi has since rescinded some of these critical protections of journalistic integrity.

- a. Do you agree that a free and independent press is vital to the functioning of our democracy?

Response: Yes.

- b. Do you commit to exhausting all other potential means of obtaining evidence before seeking information from, or records of, members of the news media, including from third parties?

Response: If confirmed, I will always uphold my oath to support and defend the Constitution and I will follow the law.

- c. Do you commit to not seeking compulsory legal processes such as subpoenas or court orders for the purpose of obtaining information from members of the news media acting within the scope of newsgathering, except in limited circumstances?

Response: Please see my response to Question 13.b.

- 14. Yes or no, do you believe it would ever be appropriate to ignore or contravene a district court order or opinion because you believe the Supreme Court will ultimately reverse the lower court's decision?

Response: Generally, I will advise a client, whether in private practice or in government, to comply with court orders.