Questions for the Record
Chairman Charles E. Grassley of Iowa
The Nomination of the Honorable Todd Blanche
to be Attorney General of the United States
July 17, 2026

1. At the hearing, you were asked about meeting with Epstein victims. In response, you indicated that you have "met with counsel for survivors, as ha[ve] many people in the Department of Justice." You quantified that there had been "over 30" of those such meetings, and you also listed the names of numerous "attorneys who represent victims" who DOJ has met with. Unfortunately, several Members of the Committee repeatedly interrupted you during these responses. For the record, please clarify the following:

   Since you were appointed as Deputy Attorney General, have you and other individuals at DOJ met with Epstein victims and/or counsel for Epstein victims?

   RESPONSE: Yes. Several meetings have occurred between DOJ staff and victims over the last 15 months including as recently as on July 16, 2026.

   Since you were appointed as Deputy Attorney General, how many such meetings have taken place?

   RESPONSE: In addition to previous meetings DOJ leadership and officials have had with victims and their counsel, I have met with victims of Jeffrey Epstein or their counsel, or both, twice, including on July 16, 2026, where Dani Bensky who testified at my confirmation hearing was present. I remain committed to engaging with victims of Jeffrey Epstein through appropriate legal channels.

2. At the hearing, in reference to meeting with Epstein victims, you stated: "If they're represented by counsel, I'm not allowed to meet with them directly, as you know. I assure you the FBI who are experts in this space, prosecutors who are experts in this space, and me if necessary, will absolutely meet with them. I promise you this." And you later reiterated that "if they were represented, I had to meet with them through counsel, but of course I can meet with them."

   This appears to reflect longstanding DOJ policy. Indeed, DOJ's Criminal Resource Manual Section 296 ("Communications with Represented Persons—Issues for Consideration") incorporates Rule 4.2 of the American Bar Association's Rules of Professional Conduct, which states: "a lawyer shall not communicate about the subject of the representation with a person the lawyer knows to be represented by another lawyer in the matter, unless the lawyer has the consent of the other lawyer or is authorized to do so by law or a court order." And Section 296 indicates that this "contact rule" applies—not only to "a defendant, a target, [or] a subject"—but also to "**a witness**" when "**the Department attorney knows that the person is represented**."

Nevertheless, many of my Democratic colleagues have publicly challenged your assertion that you and individuals at DOJ can only meet with Epstein victims who are represented by counsel when their counsel are present.

Can you please clarify the rules, policies, and any relevant authority that governs the manner in which you and other individuals at DOJ may meet with Epstein victims who are represented by counsel?

RESPONSE: DOJ meetings with victims, including those represented by counsel, are governed by the Crime Victims' Rights Act, the Attorney General Guidelines for Victim and Witness Assistance, Department policies on victim engagement, and ethical rules prohibiting *ex parte* communications with represented parties where applicable. Such interactions typically involve coordination through victims' counsel, victim-witness coordinators, or formal channels to respect attorney-client relationships and support. All actions comply with applicable law, privacy protections, and internal guidelines on victim-centered practices.

3. At the hearing, you were asked about meeting with the Epstein victims present at the hearing. In response, you indicated that you were willing to "get it done today." And you further stated "I can meet with them. My staff will meet with them. We have a staff member here today who specializes...." Unfortunately, several Members of the Committee repeatedly interrupted your responses to these questions. Press reports indicate that, on Thursday (July 16, 2026), you personally met with these victims.

   Can you please confirm whether that meeting took place?

   RESPONSE: I am confirming that the meeting on July 16, 2026, with the Epstein victims took place at the Department of Justice.

   Can you please clarify whether you and other individuals at DOJ remain committed to meet with Epstein victims and/or counsel for Epstein victims moving forward?

   RESPONSE: Everyone at the Department, including myself, remains committed to engaging with victims of Jeffrey Epstein through appropriate legal channels.

4. At the hearing, you were asked about DOJ's pursuit of investigative leads in the Epstein case. In response, you stated: "There are no closed investigations. If we learn today, if we learn next week, if we learn next month that there's an individual that we can investigate, indict, and prosecute out of the Epstein files, you better believe it, we will."

   Can you please confirm whether you and other individuals at DOJ remain committed to pursuing investigative leads in the Epstein case?

   RESPONSE: Yes, this Department remains steadfast in its commitment to pursue any and all investigative leads in the Epstein matter and all matters involving sex trafficking when there is evidence to suggest a federal crime occurred.

5. Since 1984, the Crime Victims Fund (CVF) has provided critical resources to support victims and survivors of crime through grants for programs such as domestic violence shelters, victim advocacy centers, victim legal assistance, and children advocacy centers. My oversight has revealed the Biden DOJ redirected portions of these funds elsewhere or failed to collect them for the CVF, including funds required to be deposited pursuant to the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) Fix.

   At the end of FY 2023, under the Biden administration, the balance of the CVF was $1.019 billion, the lowest in almost two decades. At the end of FY 2025, under your leadership, the balance of the CVF rose to $3.545 billion. Annual CVF deposits are similarly trending up and have increased from $1.386 billion in FY 2023, to $2.538 billion in FY 2024, to $3.157 billion at the end of FY 2025.

   If confirmed, will you commit to ensuring that DOJ collects and deposits all criminal fines and penalties into the CVF as required by law?

   RESPONSE: This Administration stands behind and supports victims of crime. We will continue to ensure victim interests are a top consideration and maintain the health of the Crime Victims Fund.

6. This Congress, I've written to DOJ about their dismissals of False Claims Act whistleblower cases. In some instances, those dismissals occurred **after** the Department initially declined to intervene. Late dismissals frustrate legitimate whistleblower claims.

   In circumstances where DOJ doesn't initially intervene in a False Claims Act case, if confirmed, will you commit to ensuring the DOJ doesn't unnecessarily dismiss cases?

   RESPONSE: The Department is committed to exercising its dismissal authority appropriately consistent with applicable law and the facts of each case.

7. During your testimony, you stated "in just the last four weeks, just the last month, we've paid $96 million in claims through the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program [PSOB] to eligible surviving families of fallen public safety officers, even while fewer law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty than in prior years." It's commendable that under your leadership, DOJ has focused its resources to swiftly process PSOB claims and ensure the program does right by our fallen and disabled public safety officers and their families. However, for decades the PSOB office has been plagued by poor administration and mismanagement. For example, at my request, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that PSOB officials have failed to make necessary improvements. PSOB management isn't collecting data or publishing reports as required by law. Claims are not processed consistently and in a timely manner. And applicants have informed my office that the PSOB office hasn't updated them on the status of their claims and applications. According to GAO, four out of the five recommendations they made to DOJ to improve the PSOB program remain unimplemented. Further, it appears that PSOB leadership, who have been at the helm since at least 2007, remain in that role, all while these deficiencies continue to plague the PSOB program.

If confirmed, will you commit to conducting a thorough review of the PSOB program and to hold management accountable for these shortcomings?

RESPONSE: Yes. Supporting law enforcement officers, firefighters, and other public safety officers and their families after a tragic line-of-duty death or catastrophic injury is one of our solemn responsibilities at the Department.

Will you also commit to providing my office with rolling status updates on DOJ's efforts to improve the PSOB program, including the implementation of GAO's recommendations?

RESPONSE: Over the last four weeks, the Department's Office of Justice Programs has finalized more than three times the number of Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program death claim determinations in comparison to the previous nine-month period providing over $96 million in benefits to eligible surviving families of fallen public safety officers. This Administration is committed to continuing to improve the PSOB program and provide Members of Congress, and their staff, with timely and accurate updates on their claims.

8. My oversight has revealed a pattern of weaponization by the Biden administration's DOJ and FBI carried out by personnel assigned to public corruption units. These units have improperly obtained congressional information and, as my and Senator Johnson's public document productions have shown, targeted hundreds of Republican individuals and organizations.

   What steps do you plan to take to conduct a comprehensive and aggressive investigation into those and related units to determine the full scope of their abuses against Congress and the American people?

   RESPONSE: The Department will continue to work with you and your Committee to shed light on the abuses of the prior Administration and continue taking the necessary steps based on what is revealed to ensure accountability.

9. For decades, my oversight work has exposed a bloated government that's broken faith with the American taxpayer. Trillions of dollars of taxpayer money have been lost to waste, fraud, and abuse while some within the federal workforce ride the gravy train without actually doing the job for which they're on payroll. As this administration works to eliminate government waste and fraud and hold employees accountable for failing to uphold their duty to taxpayers, it's important that these efforts aren't used as an excuse to retaliate against federal workers who've made legally protected whistleblower disclosures. If that has happened, this would not only be unlawful, but it would also have a severe chilling effect on federal employees who would otherwise blow the whistle.

   Whistleblowers are the government's most powerful tool to root out waste, fraud, and abuse. Congress has recognized this and passed several pieces of legislation that were enacted into law to ensure that federal agencies treat whistleblowers fairly and are held accountable for

whistleblower retaliation. Indeed, our Founding Fathers recognized the significant importance of whistleblowers by enacting the first whistleblower protection legislation in our nation's history in 1778 during the Second Continental Congress.

If confirmed, do you commit that DOJ will uphold and enforce whistleblower protection laws pursuant to the plain text and original intent of Congress?

RESPONSE: Yes, under my leadership, the Department will faithfully carry out its legal obligations to protect whistleblowers and enforce all legal safeguards.

10. The High-Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTA) program is a uniquely nimble and effective law enforcement collaboration program that has delivered an average return on investment of over 80% since 2016. Congress has historically mandated that at least 51% of HIDTA funds shall be transferred to state and local law enforcement agencies. This program is highly popular and a critical source of resources for state and local law enforcement agencies.

    The HIDTA program has remained within the Office of National Drug Control Policy since 1988 when Congress established the program. Can you pledge that your agencies will continue to support HIDTAs and their Boards of Directors?

    RESPONSE: Yes. The Department remains committed to supporting the HIDTA programs through DEA and FBI Task Force integration, which collaborate directly with state and local police; intelligence sharing; and prosecutions intended to disrupt and dismantle drug trafficking organizations. Regardless of where the grant program is housed, the Department will continue to support these successful programs that make our communities safer and limit the harm caused by illegal drugs.

11. I am increasingly concerned about the effective administration of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). This Act is supposed to create a transparency tool to empower citizens, the media, and others to hold our government accountable for its actions. However, the backlog of FOIA requests, over-redaction of documents, and, in some cases, lack of agency compliance shows this Act is not working as promised.

    If you are confirmed, will you commit to working to ensure that FOIA requests are responded to within the statutory deadline?

    RESPONSE: If confirmed, I will consult with personnel from the Department's Office of Information Policy to address the Department's efforts concerning its statutory obligations in responding to FOIA requests.

    Last September, Senator Durbin and I asked GAO to evaluate the technologies used to fulfill FOIA requests and assess new technology that could be used to speed up FOIA responses and save government money. Will you prioritize improving FOIA efficiency and setting the system up for success in the decades to come?

RESPONSE: Yes.

12. I am concerned that it has been impossible to search the Foreign Agents Registration Act database website for at least several weeks. See: Foreign Agents Registration Act | Browse/Search Filings.

    Will you commit to fixing this website malfunction as soon as possible?

    RESPONSE: The website is not malfunctioning. In 2021, the Department migrated the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA) websites to the below current locations.

    Browse Filings: https://efile.fara.gov/ords/fara/f?p=1381:1

    Search Filings: https://efile.fara.gov/ords/fara/f?p=1235:10

    Efforts are underway to automatically redirect users accessing the legacy websites to the new locations.

13. **If confirmed, will you make health care and prescription drug competition a priority and ensure that the Justice Department works closely with the Federal Trade Commission to address anticompetitive conduct by vertically integrated pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs) that may steer patients, favor affiliated businesses, obscure payments, or disadvantage independent pharmacies?**

    RESPONSE: Yes. This Department has demonstrated its commitment to affordability especially in the healthcare space.

Senator Dick Durbin
Ranking Member, Senate Judiciary Committee
Written Questions for Todd Blanche
Nominee to be Attorney General of the United States
July 17, 2026

1. Former Attorney General Bondi told the House Oversight Committee in May that you were "in charge of the process and the entire release of the Epstein files." Last year, FBI personnel reviewing the Epstein files were ordered to flag records that mentioned Donald Trump. I asked Attorney General Bondi who gave this order, and she stonewalled, saying, "I'm not going to discuss anything about that with you."

a. Who gave the order to flag records that mentioned Donald Trump?

RESPONSE: Consistent with EFTA, reviewers were instructed to not redact the names of politically exposed persons "on the basis of embarrassment, reputational harm, or political sensitivity."

The Epstein Files Transparency Act (EFTA) set a December 19, 2025, deadline for DOJ to provide a full, public production of the Epstein files. DOJ did not comply with this deadline. On December 31, DOJ sent an email seeking Assistant U.S. Attorney volunteers to review these records, and the review of the overwhelming majority of these files did not even begin until January 5, 2026, weeks after the statutory deadline.

b. Why did DOJ wait to start reviewing most of the Epstein files until after you had already violated the law?

RESPONSE: The Department's work on collecting, reviewing, redacting, and released records responsive under EFTA began immediately after the Act became law on November 19, 2025.

2. In May, you attempted to create a slush fund for January 6 rioters and other allies of the President by ordering that the Treasury Department direct payments—nearly $2 billion—to the slush fund account. As a federal court ruled just a few days ago: "This was an attempt to use the Court to provide some legitimacy to an agreement to confer immunity to people and entities affiliated with the President and to earmark billions of dollars from American taxpayers to redress grievances not defined in the law."

That court found that the case was brought for an improper purpose and imposed sanctions, which included the referral of one of the President's lawyers to the Florida Bar for potential disciplinary action. The court also mailed a copy of its order to the State Bar of New York, of which you are a member.

a. Will you officially rescind your May 18 memorandum instructing the Treasury Department to direct a payment of $1.776 billion into an account for the Anti-Weaponization fund?

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, the Fund is dead.

b. Has the Treasury Department directed any payments to an account for use by the so-called "Anti-Weaponization Fund"?

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed, no funds have been transferred, no claims have been received, and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

In our meeting this week, you said, "I made a mistake" by creating this slush fund.

c. Do you stand by this characterization of this slush fund?

RESPONSE: I contest the accuracy of this statement.

d. Whose idea was it to create the slush fund?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

3. Hundreds of January 6 rioters have reportedly filed complaints under the Federal Tort Claims Act and hope to receive settlements out of the Judgment Fund.

I sent you a letter on this subject on June 30, alongside several of my colleagues. In it, I urged you to defend American taxpayers and not make payments to individuals who assaulted law enforcement officers on January 6. We have not yet received a response.

e. Will you issue a memorandum directing DOJ not to enter into any settlement that would result in paying money or issuing an apology to any person convicted of assaulting law-enforcement officers during the January 6 attack on the Capitol?

RESPONSE: Every claim submitted pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act is reviewed on the merits and addressed by the Torts Branch of the Civil Division. The compromise and/or settlement of any claim is made only in the best interest of the United States.

f. Has the Justice Department already approved any claims related to the attack on the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021?

RESPONSE: To my knowledge, no FTCA claim arising from the events of January 6 has been compromised and/or settled by the Department of Justice.

g. Have any DOJ officials participated in discussions with individuals prosecuted for their involvement on January 6, or with their representatives, about settling any claims or other ongoing litigation?

RESPONSE: This question pertains to ongoing litigation and as such, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on the same.

h. Please produce a list of all FTCA settlements which DOJ has entered into since January 20, 2025, including identifying the claimant, settlement amount and/or any other relief provided, and a description of the claimant's allegations.

RESPONSE: Under the FTCA, an administrative claim is presented in the first instance to the federal agency alleged to be responsible for the harm, 28 U.S. Code § 2675. Such claims are not public filings; and the Department does not publish an aggregate count of claims presented to it. FTCA complaints filed in district court are matters of public record.

4. As part of the settlement agreement in President Trump's lawsuit against the IRS, you signed a document in which you attempted to provide President Trump, his family, and his businesses with immunity for any federal tax law violations prior to May 19, 2026. On Monday, a federal court found that the lawsuit was brought for an improper purpose and imposed sanctions. In her order, the judge wrote: "While the Court appreciates that attorneys successfully transition between private practice and government service, such transitions do not absolve counsel of their ethical obligations."

According to public reporting, shortly after you assumed your role in the Justice Department last year, you were informed by a career ethics official, who you later fired, that you would be required to recuse from cases that involved President Donald Trump in his personal capacity. You also signed an ethics pledge, and DOJ regulations prohibit your participation in certain cases involving past clients and individuals with whom you have a personal relationship—including President Trump.

You told me during our courtesy meeting that you could not recuse because of the rule of necessity, but that only applies when there is no other competent decisionmaker, which is not the case at the Justice Department where there is a line of succession. In light of your past work as the President's personal attorney, it is obvious that you should have recused yourself in his lawsuit against the IRS.

a. Why did you not recuse in this case?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

b. Do you believe it was appropriate for you to sign a document that attempted

to grant criminal immunity to your former client and his family?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice. The document speaks for itself and does not extend to potential criminal charges.

c. How can you claim that the rule of necessity permitted you not to recuse when there are other Department officials who could have handled this issue if you had recused?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

5. Many of the January 6 rioters pardoned by the President violently assaulted law enforcement officers, have shown no remorse for their actions, and have continued to commit crimes and endanger public safety. You said during our courtesy meeting and at your hearing that you have not defended these pardons. But in a speech at CPAC, you touted this blanket pardon as an example of the Administration "bringing justice." You continued: "If you look at what happened to the men and women convicted because of January 6th, by 5PM on January 20th, every one of them was either pardoned or had their sentence commuted. When folks say we've done nothing, I say you have a very short memory."

According to a review by *Lawfare*, as of June 2026, at least 97 of the nearly 1,600 pardoned insurrectionists have committed subsequent crimes. Some of these crimes were enabled by the Administration's clemency and promises of future restitution. Consider Andrew Paul Johnson, who was sentenced to life in prison after being found guilty of five charges of sexual abuse against children as young as 11 years old. Johnson attempted to bribe one of his child-victims into silence with the promise of sharing the restitution he expected to receive from the Trump Administration as a January 6 offender.

a. These pardons were indefensible from day one. But knowing now how these offenders have gone on to victimize children, using the expectation of restitution from this Administration to facilitate their abuse, how can you continue to defend these pardons?

RESPONSE: The Constitution gives the President the power to pardon or commute the sentence of anyone convicted of a Federal crime. *See Trump v. United States*, 603 U.S. 593, 608 (2024).

b. Will the Department of Justice apologize to Mr. Johnson's victims?

RESPONSE: My heart breaks for any victim of sexual abuse. The Department of Justice is committed to prosecuting sexual predators.

6. Once reserved largely for Nazis, communists, and national security threats, the Trump Justice Department has made denaturalization an enforcement priority. There are three ways a person can be denaturalized. The first is a naturalized citizen obtained citizenship without meeting the physical presence and "good moral character" requirements during the naturalization period. The second is if someone gained citizenship through service in the U.S. armed forces but was discharged in "other than honorable conditions." The third is if they made a willful misrepresentation in their immigration application that would have affected their approval.

a. As I mentioned to you during our courtesy meeting, convicted sex-trafficker Ghislaine Maxwell is a naturalized citizen. Given the criteria for denaturalization and the Trump Administration's focus on this issue, will DOJ begin denaturalization proceedings against her?

RESPONSE: Consistent with longstanding policy, the Department does not comment on potential denaturalization efforts involving specific individuals.

Maxwell gained U.S. citizenship on November 27, 2002, and documents released by your office earlier this year indicate that she made willful misrepresentations on her application when she checked "No" to two critical questions on her N-400 Application for Naturalization: "Have you EVER committed a crime or offense for which you were NOT arrested?" and "Have you EVER been a prostitute, or procured anyone for prostitution?"

b. Given the egregious abuses she carried out with Jeffrey Epstein, who was her initial visa sponsor, can you assure this Committee that you will pursue her denaturalization?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 6(a).

7. You have gutted DOJ's cryptocurrency enforcement, including disbanding the National Cryptocurrency Enforcement Team. I have serious concerns that President Trump's cryptocurrency interests contributed to this reduced scrutiny. But I am also disturbed by your own financial interests. At the time of your nomination to serve as Deputy Attorney General, in early 2025, you held more than $150,000 in cryptocurrency. You agreed, in a signed statement, to divest those assets as soon as practicable upon your confirmation.

You were confirmed as Deputy Attorney General in March 2025. In April 2025, you issued a memo scaling back DOJ's cryptocurrency enforcement. But it was not until late May and early June 2025 that you finally sold or transferred your crypto holdings, and you only did so by transferring them to your children and grandchildren. Under federal law, it is illegal for employees of the executive branch to participate in matters that affect their own financial interests. Yet that is exactly what you did. It is also clear that you should have recused yourself from cryptocurrency enforcement decisions while holding substantial crypto assets.

a. Why did you fail to recuse yourself from the decision to issue the April 2025 memo regarding cryptocurrency enforcement?

RESPONSE: I entirely reject the premise of your statement. The April 2025 memorandum set general enforcement priorities and did not constitute a particular matter having a direct and predictable effect on my personal financial interests within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 208. The matter was reviewed with, and cleared by, the Department's ethics officials in advance.

b. Have you failed to recuse yourself in any other matters at DOJ in which you or your former client, President Trump, have a financial interest?

RESPONSE: I have addressed potential conflicts of interest consistent with 18 U.S.C. § 208, 5 C.F.R. § 2635.502, and the guidance of the Department's ethics officials.

8. This past February, you signed a letter asking a New Jersey federal district court to schedule a jury trial for Matthew Goettsche, who was accused of spearheading a $722 million cryptocurrency fraud scheme and faced up to 25 years in prison. Now just five months later, the Department of Justice has agreed to drop all charges.
According to press reports, Mr. Goettsche retained two new attorneys: Bradford Cohen, a Florida lawyer who has previously appeared on President Trump's reality show, "The Apprentice," and Brett Tolman, a former prosecutor who now has a substantial practice lobbying the Trump Administration for pardons. These new attorneys convinced the Department not to move forward with the case against Mr. Goettsche.

What message does it send to crime victims when criminals have a literal "get out of jail free" card if they know the right people?

RESPONSE: I respectfully reject the premise of this question, which is based on faulty and biased news reporting. As the Department has stated publicly, the resolution of this matter was not the result of any alleged pressure by the defendant's attorneys; it reflected the Department's routine evaluation of pending cases, and the government is in the process of recovering a substantial amount owed to investors. Charging and declination decisions at the Department are made based on the facts and the law and are consistent with the Principles of Federal Prosecution.

9. Under your leadership, the Department of Justice is trying to relitigate the 2020 election and suppress the vote ahead of the 2026 midterm election. The Department has tried to extort sensitive voter roll data from states and unlawfully purge legitimate, eligible voters from the rolls, filed lawsuits against states that refuse to comply with these absurd demands, and launched bogus investigations into debunked allegations of election fraud.

As a former personal attorney to President Trump, you are well aware that he and his

allies lost more than 60 lawsuits involving challenges to the 2020 elections, in federal and state courts across the country. Yet you claim that "[t]here is a ton of evidence that the election was rigged."

a. **Where is the evidence that those seven million votes were somehow fraudulent and that these unprecedented steps by the federal government to disenfranchise eligible American citizen voters are an acceptable response?**

   RESPONSE: In addition to the May 17, 2026, statement quoted above, I also stated that there are several outstanding investigations. Consistent with longstanding rules and guidelines of the Department, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on outstanding investigations.

Federal courts have dismissed multiple DOJ lawsuits in cases in which the Department sought access to state voter rolls. Last month, the Trump Administration lost a lawsuit challenging the Administration's attempt to create a centralized federal database of U.S. citizens and their sensitive private information. As the court noted, the Administration "haphazardly combined and repurposed the private information of millions of Americans, including citizenship data that they knew to be unreliable."

The opinion explained that due to this effort, "the undisputed record shows that [American citizens] have been injured by 'dissemination of . . . inaccurate information' falsely indicating that they are non-citizens…. Such publication is defamatory not only because it resulted in the revocation or threatened revocation of their voter registrations but because it carries an implication that those [individuals] are 'serious criminals.'" The opinion also noted that the government couldn't even dispute or challenge evidence that eligible American voters had their registration wrongfully revoked.

b. **What is your response to the eligible American voters who would like to understand why their ability to exercise their right to vote, their most fundamental right, has been—and, depending on the future of this litigation, could further be—impacted by the Trump Administration's clumsy, erroneous efforts to purge voter rolls?**

   RESPONSE: This question pertains to ongoing litigation and as such, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on the same.

Since May 2025, DOJ has demanded unredacted voter rolls from 48 states and the District of Columbia. In response to a bipartisan slate of states that refused to accede to the demand, DOJ has filed 31 lawsuits attempting to compel handover of full voter rolls containing sensitive voter data. The cases against 15 of these states have been dismissed so far—six of which were decided by judges appointed by President Trump. The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals has also upheld the district court's decision dismissing the case in Michigan.

In the order dismissing DOJ's lawsuit demanding Maryland's voting records, Judge

Stephanie Gallagher—who was appointed by President Trump—noted that she "joins every court to have addressed this issue" in holding that the unredacted voter registration file "is not a record or paper that a state must produce to the United States."

a. Why does the Department continue to devote significant staff resources and taxpayer money to attempting to compel states to hand over voter information that every court it has appeared before has held it has no constitutional or statutory right to obtain?

RESPONSE: This question pertains to ongoing litigation and as such, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on the same.

b. Does the Department intend to use (or work with other federal agencies to use) state voter rolls to amass a national voter database?

RESPONSE: See my response to the preceding Question.

DOJ sent a "Confidential Memorandum of Understanding" (MOU) to the states that did agree to voluntarily supply their voter rolls. Under the MOU, after a state provides its voter roll, DOJ would test, analyze and assess the information and then notify states of "any voter list maintenance issues, insufficiencies, inadequacies, deficiencies, anomalies, or concerns" found. The MOU stipulates that, after reviewing the rolls, DOJ will provide each state a list of voters who must be removed within 45 days. It does not provide the criteria the Department will use to eliminate voters.

c. How does this arrangement not effectively transfer control of state voter roll maintenance—a power the Constitution reserves to the states through the Elections Clause—to the Justice Department?

RESPONSE: See my response to the preceding Question.

d. What criteria would the Department use to screen voter rolls?

RESPONSE: See my response to the preceding Question.

e. Will the Department rely on the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) system to screen voter rolls, despite its demonstrated record of unreliability and errors, including misidentifying American citizens as noncitizens?

RESPONSE: See my response to the preceding Question.

f. Please explain the data security protocols DOJ has implemented to protect sensitive voter data already collected.

RESPONSE: See my response to the preceding Question.

10. The *Wall Street Journal* has revealed that politically-connected lobbyists, in particular far-right activist Mike Davis, have used their connections to former Attorney General Bondi, yourself, and other Trump appointees to steamroll Antitrust Division attorneys to benefit wealthy corporate interests. Former Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General Roger Alford, a conservative Trump appointee, was fired for refusing to go along with this politicization of antitrust enforcement. He explained that Davis and others made a "Faustian bargain of trading on relationships with powerful people to reportedly earn million-dollar success fees by helping corporations undermine Trump's antitrust agenda, hurt working class Americans, break the rules, and then try to cover it up."

We have seen a number of controversial antitrust settlements and merger approvals under the current Administration, from HPE-Juniper and Compass-Anywhere to the recent Live Nation settlement and approval of the Paramount-Warner Bros. Discovery merger.

a. What are the costs to the public when lobbyists with close ties to the President, rather than career antitrust attorneys, are the ones making antitrust enforcement decisison?

RESPONSE: Lobbyists do not make the Department's enforcement decisions. The Department resolves each matter based on the facts and the law.

b. How many times in the current Administration has DOJ political leadership overridden the recommendations of career Antitrust Division attorneys?

RESPONSE: Internal recommendations are deliberative, and I will not catalog them. Final decisions rest with Division and Department leadership, which is accountable for them.

The Associate Attorney General, the number three official in the Department, has reportedly told subordinates that the Antitrust Division should not sue any corporations over their proposed mergers and should settle all active cases to let the deals proceed. Reporting also indicates that DOJ political appointees have prohibited the Antitrust Division from issuing "second requests" which require merging corporations to turn over in-depth internal records. It is clear to me that approving mergers without fully analyzing the impact of those mergers will result in everyday Americans paying more and getting less as a result of decreased competition.

c. Has the Antitrust Division been prohibited from issuing second requests to merging companies?

RESPONSE: No.

d. Is it good policy to signal to corporations that their mergers and acquisitions will not be scrutinized as long as they know the right people?

RESPONSE: No, and that is not the Department's practice.

e. **What do you say to Americans concerned that they will be forced to pay more for gas and airline travel because the Justice Department is turning a blind eye to the harms of proposed mergers?**

RESPONSE: The antitrust laws will be enforced on the facts and the law. The mission of the Antitrust Division is to promote competition by enforcing the antitrust laws to protect economic freedom and opportunity on behalf of the American people. Competition in a free-market benefits American consumers, workers, and taxpayers. It provides consumers with lower prices, better quality, greater choice, and innovation. It provides workers with job opportunities, higher wages, better benefits, and other terms of employment. And it ensures that taxpayer dollars are well spent on goods and services for the public's benefit rather than lost to collusion. This Department of Justice is firmly committed to enforcing the law.

11. Numerous media reports and whistleblowers have documented FBI Director Patel's misuse of Department resources and its material impact on the FBI's time-sensitive operations and investigations. As Deputy Attorney General and Acting Attorney General, you are responsible for overseeing the FBI.

Unfortunately, under your supervision, the Bureau is being led by a Director whose personal leisure activities and travel bucket list dictate his official duties. A Director who told FBI personnel: "If you have golf, hockey, fishing, or hunting and beautiful sights, you're going to see a lot of me," and whose excessive drinking has reportedly alarmed senior Administration officials. A Director who wastes time promoting his personal branded merchandise and whiskey, while prematurely releasing details about ongoing criminal investigations that are under seal by court order. A Director who has refused to account for the impact of his luxury travel on high-profile criminal investigations or explain who is paying for his VIP treatment and perks.

The Director's frequent and unapologetic misuse of DOJ and FBI resources raises concerns not only about his behavior, but whether the Department has the will and sufficient internal controls in place to keep such behavior in check.

a. **As DAG, have you taken any steps to rein in the wasteful spending and questionable behavior of the FBI Director?**

RESPONSE: I do not accept the characterization contained in the question. Oversight of the FBI includes ensuring compliance with the rules governing travel and the use of Department resources, and I address such matters through appropriate channels.

b. **What changes would you make as Attorney General to ensure DOJ's investigations and time-sensitive operations are not further compromised by the Director's irresponsible misuse of resources?**

RESPONSE: The Department expects all officials, including the Director, to comply with the rules governing the use of Department resources. I will continue to ensure appropriate oversight and internal controls so that the Department's investigations and time-sensitive operations are carried out effectively.

12. In May 2026, BOP quietly issued a new policy giving the Attorney General new personal authority to transfer any federal prisoner to any facility in the country regardless of the security level required by the seriousness of their conviction.

a. What is the justification for this new grant of authority to you?

RESPONSE: The designation of the place of a prisoner's confinement is committed by statute to the Bureau of Prisons, subject to the direction of the Attorney General. Decisions of this kind are made based on legitimate considerations, including safety and security.

b. Will you commit to not using this authority to favor allies of President Trump, or to retaliate against any opponents of President Trump?

RESPONSE: Yes. Inmate designation and transfer decisions should be made on legitimate grounds, and not to favor or to retaliate against any person based on political considerations.

13. As Deputy Attorney General, you are responsible for overseeing the Office of the Pardon Attorney, which traditionally plays a critical role in assisting the President with reviewing petitions for clemency. The Justice Manual provides standards for considering clemency petitions, which include review of post-conviction conduct, the seriousness of the offense, and acceptance of responsibility, among other factors. However, according to a *Reuters* investigation, 96 percent of the clemency grants President Trump has issued in his second term have not complied with these Justice Manual standards.

a. Is the Office of the Pardon Attorney following the Justice Manual standards for clemency when making recommendations to the President?

RESPONSE: Yes.

b. If not, why not?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to subsection (b) above.

Instead of pardon applicants who have rehabilitated themselves and demonstrated remorse for their offenses, this Administration seems more focused on ensuring that the President's political allies receive clemency, particularly if they make financial contributions to the President or engage expensive lobbying firms with direct connections to the White House and the Justice Department to plead their case. This failure to

maintain the integrity and fairness of the justice system is not surprising given that Ed Martin, an unqualified partisan operative who has weaponized every role he has been given in the Trump Administration, remains the Pardon Attorney.

c. Will you commit to removing Ed Martin as Pardon Attorney and ensuring the role goes to a qualified career civil servant?

RESPONSE: It is not appropriate for me to comment on personnel matters.

14. Since the beginning of the second Trump Administration, DOJ attorneys have been misleading federal courts and allowing other government departments and agencies not to comply with federal court orders. According to a review of a sample of court opinions from January 20, 2025, to March 16, 2026, in non-habeas cases, federal courts expressed concern with non-compliance with their orders in 34 cases, and expressed distrust in information and representations from the government in 90 cases. This shocking trend is even worse in habeas immigration cases, where federal courts found noncompliance with their orders in 740 cases from January 20, 2025, to June 22, 2026. The federal courts expressed distrust in information and representations from the government in 150 cases in that same time period.

As Chief Judge Patrick Schlitz in the District of Minnesota found, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) failed to follow at least 96 court orders in less than a month in that district alone, and that this count was "almost certainly substantially understated." DOJ represented ICE in all these cases. This level of disrespect and lawlessness is not surprising given the credible whistleblower disclosure this Committee received last year that then-Acting Deputy Attorney General Emil Bove told DOJ colleagues that the Department should tell the courts, "f--- you," if they enjoined unlawful attempts to deport individuals.

How can you justify the Department misleading courts and violating court orders so frequently under your leadership?

RESPONSE: This is a gross mischaracterization and does not reflect my experience or observation of the diligent public servants and dedicated litigators who serve the American public at the Justice Department.

15. Federal courts have found at least five acting U.S. Attorneys appointed during this Trump Administration to be serving unlawfully after their temporary term expired. In several cases, the district courts used their authority to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys, and you fired those appointments via posts on X. In fact, you did so just hours after your nomination hearing.

Do you deny that district courts have the authority under 28 U.S.C. § 546(d) to appoint interim U.S. Attorneys?

RESPONSE: This pertains to ongoing Department litigation in various district courts and circuit courts of appeal. Therefore, I cannot comment beyond what is available in public DOJ filings, and I hereby incorporate the positions of the United States as stated in those public DOJ filings.

16. Since January 2025, the Trump Administration has fired more than 100 immigration judges without due process. It has also explicitly threatened disciplinary action in internal DOJ guidance against judges purportedly perceived as biased "in favor of an alien". To replace the fired judges, the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) has rushed to hire 153 new permanent judges, with job advertisements for the role of "deportation judge" rather than neutral arbiters and has eliminated the requirement that temporary immigration judges have at least 10 years of immigration law experience.

Instead of treating each case individually, EOIR also has instituted hearings for 100 or more people at once, largely targeting those without lawyers. EOIR has gone further to restrict due process by issuing a regulation requiring the Board of Immigration Appeals to automatically dismiss appeals without a majority vote within 10 days.

a. What is the justification for firing over 100 judges with immigration expertise only to hire over 150 replacements who lack that same experience and familiarity with notoriously complex immigration law?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice continually evaluates all immigration judges on factors such as conduct, impartiality/bias, adherence to the law, productivity/performance, and professionalism. The failure to meet such standards necessarily undermines the fair and orderly processing of immigration matters, and judges who fail to meet those standards, especially those who demonstrate partiality or bias, may face disciplinary action, including removal. A background in immigration law has never been a requirement to serve as an immigration judge, and EOIR has hired successful immigration judges with a wide variety of legal experiences.

b. You have described the hiring process for immigration judges as "very rigorous." How can you justify this claim when this Administration no longer requires temporary judges to have at least 10 years of immigration law experience and EOIR has cut weeks of training for new judges?

RESPONSE: EOIR has never required any years of immigration experience to be hired as a permanent immigration judge. All current temporary immigration judges are federal employees serving on detail, so their selection process is necessarily distinct from that of the hiring process for permanent immigration judges. All immigration judges, regardless of whether they are permanent or temporary, are chosen based on merit. All immigration judges, regardless of whether they are permanent or temporary, receive the same rigorous training. Finally, EOIR has not cut any training for new immigration judges, and media reports to the contrary are simply false.

c. How does a rigorous hiring process result in the hiring of attorney, Melissa Isaak, who defended three January 6 defendants, but has no apparent immigration-related experience?

RESPONSE: It is not appropriate to comment on any specific personnel actions. All immigration judges hired meet the statutory requirements for the position. Further, EOIR does not discriminate against applicants based on political affiliation or prior work experience.

17. Under this Administration, instead of focusing on violent criminals, ICE officers have arrested individuals who were simply attending their scheduled hearings at immigration courts. These arrests impede justice by deterring immigrants from appearing for their hearings. As a result, federal courts have responded by barring those types of arrests, including in an order from a court preventing arrests at Manhattan immigration courts. Yet, in early July, DHS agents violated this order by arresting and detaining three individuals at immigration courts in Manhattan.

a. How did these arrests not violate the court order in *African Communities Together v. Lyons*?

RESPONSE: These incidents are the subject of ongoing litigation. Therefore, I cannot comment.

b. What possible justification is there deterring immigrants from attending scheduled immigration hearings beyond manufacturing a basis for deportation when individuals do not appear?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 17(a).

18. During a hearing before a Senate Appropriations subcommittee in May 2026, you confirmed that DOJ plans to consolidate the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, the Office of Justice Programs, and the Office on Violence Against Women into a new Bureau of Justice Grants, supposedly to streamline administrative operations. In 2022, Congress expressly prohibited consolidation of the Office on Violence Against Women when it reauthorized VAWA.

a. How can you justify this blatant violation of the law?

RESPONSE: The Office of Legal Counsel evaluated the relevant statutes and authorities and determined that this important government efficiency initiative complies with existing law. Nevertheless, OVW will remain a distinct office within the new grants component.

You have claimed that this reorganization will better serve these components' constituencies, but I am concerned that this one-stop-shop approach to grantmaking will

hinder implementation of their critical and distinct missions to protect public safety and support victims of crime.

b. Aside from the Office on Violence Against Women, can you explain how this consolidation is justified by actual evidence of administrative burdens to be in the best interests of the vulnerable populations served by these vital offices?

RESPONSE: Stakeholders have expressed frustration at having to work through multiple offices to determine which grants they can apply for, as well as needing to work through multiple different applications and reporting frameworks depending on which DOJ component provides their grant. As part of the consolidation effort, COPS, OJP, and OVW are streamlining their grant management processes so that all three organizations use a uniform, efficient grant review and administration framework.

19. In April 2026, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF) published 34 proposed and final rules either deregulating firearm requirements or streamlining processes for federally licensed firearms dealers. In announcing these rules, you were surrounded by representatives of firearms industry groups.

a. Did you consult with industry-affiliated groups—such as the National Shooting Sports Foundation, National Rifle Association, and Gun Owners of America— in formulating and drafting the recently published rulemakings? If so, which ones?

RESPONSE: I did not formulate or draft these rulemakings, as they were undertaken by ATF. Accordingly, I would refer you to the ATF, who is better positioned to respond to this question.

b. Did you consult with any victims or survivors of gun violence when crafting these rules? If so, which ones?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 19(a).

c. Did you consult with any gun violence prevention organizations when crafting these rules? If so, which ones?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 19(a).

d. How do the purported justifications for these proposals maintain ATF's commitment to protecting the public from violent crime?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 19(a).

20. Community violence intervention (CVI) programs fill gaps in the traditional law

enforcement response to violence and are viewed by law enforcement as valuable partners, spurring active collaboration. In recent years, Congress and DOJ have allocated and distributed resources for states to implement CVI programs because of their effectiveness in reducing violent crime.

What role do you see for community violence intervention programs in the Department's overall public safety strategy?

RESPONSE: The Department remains committed to supporting effective community violence intervention programs that complement traditional law enforcement efforts, foster collaboration with state and local partners, and help reduce violent crime in communities.

21. The Office for Victims of Crime administers Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) grants to support services for crime survivors. These grants help cover medical costs and mental health counseling, and victim assistance grants are distributed to organizations in each state to provide a range of services, including crisis intervention. VOCA grants are funded through the Crime Victims Fund, which is supported by payments of criminal fines, penalties, forfeitures, and special assessments from individuals and organizations convicted of violating federal law. However, revenues for the Fund have declined, due in part to a steady decline in prosecutions against major corporations, leading to corresponding cuts in grants for victims and victim service providers.

What are you doing to ensure victims of crime have access to the resources and services they need?

RESPONSE: This Administration stands behind and supports victims of crime. We will continue to ensure victim interests are a top consideration and maintain the health of the Crime Victims Fund.

The Department's collection of criminal fines has increased significantly over the last three years. Total collections rose from just over $1 billion in 2023 to approximately $2.1 billion in both 2024 and 2025. The percentage of outstanding collectible fines recovered also increased from 40 percent in 2023 to 67 percent in 2024 and 80 percent in 2025. Since 2010, federal courts have imposed approximately $42 billion in criminal fines, of which the Department has collected roughly $33 billion, or approximately 77 percent.

A substantial portion of these collections arises from corporate prosecutions in white-collar crime cases. Over the last three years, collections from corporate defendants have totaled approximately $4 billion. These cases often involve significant penalties designed to promote deterrence, strengthen corporate accountability, and protect the public from fraud and misconduct. Corporate defendants also generally have a greater financial capacity to satisfy substantial monetary penalties.

The Department will continue prioritizing the collection of criminal fines, including amounts deposited into the Crime Victims Fund to support services and resources for victims of crime.

22. While testifying before the House Appropriations Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight of the Department of Justice on June 2, 2026, you called the Comstock Act an "important law" and said that there is "a lot of effort" within DOJ and "other agencies" to look into this law.

To your knowledge, what components within the Department of Justice and any other federal agencies are currently engaging on the Comstock Act and in what manner?

RESPONSE: Consistent with principles of executive privilege and the confidential nature of the attorney-client relationship, it would be inappropriate to disclose the specific nature of, including participants in, the Department's non-public, internal deliberations as to interpretations of federal law.

23. In 2022, DOJ secured the landmark conviction of French cement company, Lafarge, for engaging in a criminal conspiracy with ISIS resulting in the injury and deaths of U.S. servicemembers. Lafarge paid over $775 million in fines and forfeiture into DOJ's Asset Forfeiture Fund. The victims and their families submitted "Petitions for Remission" to DOJ seeking a portion of the funds. One of these victims, retired Senior Chief Petty Officer Kenton Stacy, was severely injured and left quadriplegic by a 2017 ISIS attack in Syria. As victims of the crime that gave rise to the forfeiture, these families are entitled under statute to a portion of those funds. However, there has been no public movement on their petitions to-date. Earlier this year, then-Attorney General Bondi committed to resolving this matter when questioned by the House Oversight Committee, but the families have heard nothing.

a. Why has there been no action on these petitions and why has compensation not been paid to these Gold Star families?

RESPONSE: I am deeply committed to protecting service members, law enforcement, and their families. I support efforts to investigate terrorism and to hold any and all perpetrators accountable. However, I am not familiar with the specific situation raised in this question. If confirmed, I will review this matter, consult with Department personnel, and ensure the Department takes appropriate action to comply with applicable law in order to support servicemembers and their families.

b. Will you commit to meeting with the Gold Star families and taking swift action to see to it that their petitions for remission are granted without further delay?

RESPONSE: I am committed to protecting our service members, law enforcement, and their families, and I would welcome the opportunity to meet with these families (and/or, as appropriate, their lawyers). As I am not familiar with the situation raised in this question, I will review the matter and consult with appropriate officials at the Department.

24. Since September 2025, President Trump has ordered 66 separate military strikes on vessels in and around the Caribbean Sea that have reportedly killed at least 221 people. The premeditated use of lethal force by government officials against civilians, whether alleged criminal suspects or alleged members of criminal organizations, is illegal under both domestic and international law in both peacetime and wartime. To justify these killings, before the fourth strike, President Trump told Congress that the U.S. was purportedly in an "armed conflict" with the Latin American cartels that he has designated as terrorist organizations, and claimed that the individuals killed were "unlawful combatants."

In October 2025, it was reported that DOJ's Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) produced a formal opinion providing legal justification for these strikes. And yet, nearly a year after the first strike, this opinion remains classified and hidden from the American people. I have grave concerns about the Department's role in providing legal guidance to the President and any officials that led to these killings, and I worry that the OLC opinion remains secret because its implausible conclusions would deeply trouble Congress and the American people.

a. You told Senator Coons that "there's a lot of process" that goes into publicly releasing an OLC opinion. Please explain what "process" is involved.

RESPONSE: Pursuant to Executive Order 12146 and directives from the Attorney General, OLC's practice is to publish selected opinions that explain legal principles important to the Executive Branch. Publication of OLC opinions ensures that agencies throughout the Executive Branch have access to OLC's work, and OLC opinions often assist the courts, the bar, and the public in understanding legal issues. Publication also advances the Administration's goal of promoting openness and responsiveness in government. For these reasons, consistent with OLC's best practices memo (www.justice.gov/media/1226496/dl?inline), we apply a presumption that significant OLC opinions will be made available to the public. OLC opinions from 1977 through 2019 have been published in bound volumes, and we are currently preparing the volumes for subsequent years. Opinions that have been approved for publication are posted on the Department of Justice's website (www.usdoj.gov/olc/opinions.htm) and appear in Lexis and Westlaw databases.

b. Was this legal opinion produced before or after the first strike?

RESPONSE: We have already made the memorandum available for Members of Congress to review in an appropriately classified setting. The document speaks

for itself both on when the advice it reflects was rendered and the scope of that advice.

c. Does the legal opinion assess whether these killing may violate U.S. law, including criminal statutes prohibiting murder and war crimes?

RESPONSE: See the above answer to Question 24(b).

d. Under the legal guidance provided, would the U.S. military or law enforcement agents be able to conduct such killings on American soil?

RESPONSE: See the above answer to Question 24(b).

25. It has been nearly 18 months since the deadly collision between a U.S. Army Black Hawk helicopter and American Airlines flight 5342—operated by PSA Airlines—over Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport (DCA). Since then, we have seen the families of the victims initiate litigation against the U.S. government, American Airlines, and PSA Airlines, seeking compensation for their losses. In February 2026, following an extensive investigation into the crash, the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) issued its final report. The NTSB determined that the probable cause of the accident was "the FAA's placement of a helicopter route in close proximity to a runway approach path…failure to regularly review and evaluated helicopter routes…and failure to act on recommendations to mitigate the risk of a midair collision near DCA," amid other factors attributed to the U.S. Army. Based on these findings, the NTSB issued recommendations to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the Army, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Transportation—but did not appear to find any fault with the pilot or airlines' handling of the situation.

With the government admitting its culpability, and NTSB's findings confirming this, it is only fair to assume that the U.S. government would cover the vast majority of any compensation to the families.

Does DOJ plan to heed the NTSB's findings that the U.S. government was at fault for this collision and ensure it provides the greatest portion of compensation owed to the families?

Response: The Department is limited in its ability to comment on the ongoing litigation regarding the mid-air collision between American Eagle Flight 5342 and a United States Army Black Hawk Helicopter over the Potomac River near Washington Reagan National Airport on January 29, 2025. In the litigation, the United States has admitted that the pilots of the Army helicopter were negligent and that their acts and omissions were a proximate cause of the crash.

26. In both the *Rehabilitation Act* and the *Americans with Disabilities Act* (ADA), Congress codified protections to (1) prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability in federally-assisted programs or activities, and (2) ensure that recipients of such federal funds

provide services to individuals with disabilities in the most integrated settings appropriate to their needs. These protections, known as the integration mandate, were upheld in the Supreme Court's landmark 1999 *Olmstead v. L.C.* opinion. As a result, for decades, the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, in both Republican and Democratic administrations, spearheaded litigation to protect the rights of Americans with disabilities and ensure that states transfer individuals with mental illness from institutionalized settings to community-based services. However, in June 2026, OLC issued an opinion undermining the integration mandate, arguing that *Olmstead* did not conclusively decide that the *Rehabilitation Act* and the ADA impose the integration mandate and that Congress did not impose such a mandate in those laws.

a. Why did OLC issue this opinion, which it acknowledged was "out of step" with established law?

RESPONSE: By delegation, OLC exercises the Attorney General's authority under the Judiciary Act of 1789 to provide the President and executive agencies with advice on questions of law. The OLC opinion, which is available on the Department's website and which speaks for itself, reflects that it was issued in response to a request from the White House Counsel's Office. It did not, however, assert that its view was "'out of step' with established law."

b. Will you commit to rescinding this opinion?

RESPONSE: No.

27. The Article III Project is an organization which claims that "The left is weaponizing the power of the judiciary against ordinary citizens." Mike Davis is the founder and president of the Article III Project. According to reporting that has been reposted by Davis, he helped you prepare for your confirmation hearing.

e. Please provide details of your preparations with Davis for your nomination.

RESPONSE: I prepared for my hearing with the assistance of a number of people. Consistent with the confidential nature of hearing preparation, I do not think it appropriate to detail those sessions.

The responses to subparts (f) through (k) are subject to the following overarching statement: I can only speak for myself. What another person says is theirs to explain; my positions are a matter of public record.

Mr. Davis has a history of making offensive statements about women. For example, in January 2024, he referred to Anita Hill, Christine Blasey Ford, and Jean Carroll as "three Democrat women who let Democrat operatives use them like cheap whores. (And liked it.)".[1]

[1] Mike Davis (@mrddmia), X (Jan. 17, 2024, 8:22 PM), https://x.com/mrddmia/status/1747791643057565944.

f. Do you condemn this statement?

RESPONSE: Those are not my words, and they do not reflect my views.

Mr. Davis has also made offensive statements about immigrants. For example, in September 2023, he said: "We're gonna put kids in cages. It's gonna be glorious."[2]

g. Do you condemn this statement?

RESPONSE: I do not endorse that statement; it does not reflect my views.

Mr. Davis has made overtly racist remarks on numerous occasions. For example, in an October 2023 social media post, he wrote, "[t]he violent Black underclass is a danger to America" and said "[t]hese monsters will kill."

h. Do you condemn these statements?

RESPONSE: I do not share or endorse those views, and that language is not something I would use.

Commenting on a campaign ad from Senator Cornyn supporting legalization for Dreamers, Mr. Davis asked "How can any politician become this out-of-touch?"[3]

i. Do you agree with this conclusion?

RESPONSE: No.

Mr. Davis has claimed that Senator Tim Scott "is too dumb to be President or VP."[4]

j. Do you condemn this statement?

RESPONSE: Those are not my words, and they do not reflect my views.

Mr. Davis has reposted on social media the offensive claim that "we should be very hesitant about nominating any woman" to a vacancy on the Supreme Court.

k. Do you condemn this statement?

RESPONSE: Those are not my words, and they do not reflect my views.

28. The Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances (FACE) Act of 1994 was enacted to protect providers and patients at reproductive health care clinics. Anti-abortion extremists have

[2] *Dems RAGE As Republicans EXPOSE Biden Crimes, DNC in PANIC to REPLACE Joe | Sen. Feinstein DEAD*, THE BENNY SHOW (Sept. 29, 2023), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-s9-SotiUkI.
[3] Mike Davis (@mrddmia), X (May 26, 2025, 11:48 PM), https://x.com/mrddmia/status/2059481758421434850.
[4] Mike Davis (@mrddmia), X (Feb. 6, 2026, 12:47 PM), https://x.com/mrddmia/status/2019830409509630316.

long pushed politicians—including via Project 2025—to roll back these critical protections for reproductive health care. The Trump Administration has largely catered to their demands: President Trump pardoned dozens of people convicted under the FACE Act during the first week of his second term, DOJ dropped active FACE Act cases against anti-abortion extremists, and the DOJ fired several lawyers who successfully prosecuted people who violated the FACE Act.

These actions come at a time when the FACE Act is more important than ever, as anti-abortion extremists have only been further emboldened in the post-*Dobbs* setting. According to the National Abortion Federation's 2025 Violence & Disruption Report, abortion providers across the country have been targeted by anti-abortion extremists and faced consistent threats, harassment, and acts of violence.

Examples of this include increases from 2024 to 2025 in a variety of acts targeting providers: An increase from 38 to 81 death threats or threats of harms; an increase from 19 to 23 instances of assault and battery; an increase from 19 to 40 instances of stalking; and a sixfold increase in clinic blockades.

a. Does the FACE Act prohibit violent extremists from harassing, stalking, threatening, or committing acts of violence against reproductive health providers and patients seeking reproductive health care?

RESPONSE: If confirmed, I will enforce the civil rights laws in accordance with the relevant facts and law to protect the civil rights of all Americans. As with all matters, any decisions regarding whether to charge cases under any applicable laws will be based on a thorough analysis of the facts and the governing law.

b. Were you involved in terminating career federal prosecutors in the Eastern District of Michigan for prosecuting people who committed violence against reproductive health care clinics?

RESPONSE: Under longstanding Department policy, we do not address personnel decisions in public forums.

c. Have you met with or spoken to any anti-abortion activists or organizations about how DOJ under Trump will or should enforce the FACE Act?

RESPONSE: If confirmed, I will continue to enforce the civil rights laws in accordance with the relevant facts and law to protect the civil rights of all Americans.

d. You once described the conduct of people who illegally blocked patients from getting care at reproductive health clinics as "peaceful protesters." How does threatening reproductive health care providers and patients constitute "peaceful" behavior?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 28(a).

29. The Civil Rights Division (CRT), often called the "crown jewel" of the Justice Department, enforces landmark laws that prohibit discrimination and protect the right to vote. Under your leadership, the Division's mission has been effectively abandoned. DOJ has dismissed or closed an alarming number of cases on key civil rights concerns such as voting rights and police misconduct.

a. How do you account for the inconsistency between CRT's mission of protecting the civil rights of all people—including women, the LGBTQ+ community, people with disabilities, communities of color, and all minority communities—and CRT's current work?

RESPONSE: The mandate of the Civil Rights Division is to protect the civil and constitutional rights of all Americans. To accomplish this mandate, the talented attorneys in the Civil Rights Division vigorously enforce federal anti-discrimination laws and civil rights laws. If confirmed, I will enforce the civil rights laws in accordance with the relevant facts and law to protect the civil rights of all Americans. As with all matters, any decisions regarding whether to pursue a case under any applicable laws will be based on a thorough analysis of the facts and the governing law.

b. With these alarming changes to the Department and CRT, why should Americans believe that you are committed to and capable of ensuring that the Civil Rights Division enforces federal civil rights laws consistently for all communities, operating independently from the President's command and control?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 29(a).

30. Under your leadership, the Department of Justice has taken actions that have made the Jewish community and other targeted communities less safe, at a time when antisemitic and other forms of hate crimes have reached record high levels as reported by the FBI. DOJ summarily terminated hundreds of federal grants dedicated to preventing violence, addressing hate crimes, and keeping communities safe. The President's FY27 budget request for the Department completely eliminated funding for crucial programs that protect communities from hate-driven violence, support victims and survivors of hate crimes, and advance hate crime reporting and prosecution efforts. Specifically, the budget request eliminates funding from the Khalid Jabara and Heather Heyer NO HATE Act Program, grants for Community-Based Approaches to Prevent and Address Hate Crime, and the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Grants Program — funds that mostly go directly to law enforcement agencies across the country.

a. Why is the Administration proposing the elimination of funding for these crucial programs, at a time when hate crimes have reached such alarming levels?

RESPONSE: Prosecuting hate crimes, including antisemitic violence that has targeted Jewish communities, is a priority of the Trump Administration and this Department. Nothing in the President's budget retreats from that commitment. As I testified before the Senate and House Appropriations Committees earlier this year, every budget request makes choices, and this request makes them in favor of the Department's core law-enforcement mission. It sought billions in grant funds to combat violent crime and to support state and local efforts that include hate-crime response and prevention. Further it consolidates the grantmaking component into a Unified Bureau of Justice Grants so that the application process is simpler for grantees while preserving the mission of each office. If confirmed, I will make sure the Department works with you and your colleagues so that grant funding reaches the law enforcement agencies and communities doing this work.

b. Given the continuing rise of threats to Jewish communities, what tangible steps is the Department taking to help rebuild the sense of safety within the Jewish community?

RESPONSE: No one in this country should be afraid to worship, send their children to school, or live openly as a person of faith. This Department is enforcing federal statutes that protect Jewish communities, including 18 U.S.C. § 248, 17 U.S.C. § 247, and the FACE Act's protections for houses of worship. The FBI also coordinates with Jewish organizations about potential threats through its Joint Terrorism Task Forces and field-office civil rights programs. Finally, among other efforts, the Department leads a multi-agency Task Force to Combat Anti-Semitism, and we recently announced continued efforts to combat antisemitism nationwide through the forthcoming launch of the Anti-Semitism Advisory Committee (ASAC), a new advisory body that will provide recommendations to the Attorney General and the Department of Justice on strategies to address the rising tide of antisemitism across the United States.

c. What steps is the FBI taking to ensure that hate crimes, including those against the Jewish community, are thoroughly reported and prosecuted?

RESPONSE: The FBI is the lead investigative agency for criminal violations of federal civil rights statutes. These crimes are investigated through the civil-rights program in each of the FBI's 56 field offices, in coordination with the Joint Terrorism Task Forces where the facts warrant, and are prosecuted by the United States Attorneys' Offices and the Civil Rights Division where the facts and the law support federal charges. The Bureau works closely with its local, state, tribal, and federal law enforcement partners around the country in many of these cases. FBI resources, forensic expertise, and experience in identification and proof of hate-based motivations often provide an invaluable complement to local law enforcement. If confirmed, I will ensure that the reporting, investigation, and prosecution of hate crimes, including crimes targeting the Jewish community, remain a priority for the FBI and the Department.

31. The Community Relations Service (CRS) was established by Congress in the *Civil Rights Act of 1964*, and since then, has played an essential role in reducing violence and helping communities respond to conflict. CRS works across the country with local law enforcement, other public safety officials, local and national civil rights organizations, and religious leaders to mediate conflict and maintain peace. The Trump Administration has carried out an ongoing attack on this vital arm of the Department of Justice, attempting to dismantle CRS altogether. The President's FY27 budget request, which you have defended, refers to CRS as a "woke enterprise" and accuses CRS of "legitimizing riotous behavior that puts America's police in the crosshairs." This is the furthest thing from the truth, as CRS has, for decades, been a key support for law enforcement agencies resolving racial tensions around the country.

In a moment of rising hate and growing tensions and distrust, and with the elimination of the other community building and hate crime prevention and training programs, what is the Department's alternative to support state and local governments and communities suffering in the wake of hate-driven violence?

RESPONSE: The Department will continue to fulfill its main mission of public safety, while at the same time satisfying all statutorily created requirements. There is no need to create an alternative to CRS, because CRS continues to fulfill its statutory obligations under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Executive Office for United States Attorneys, under which CRS now resides, is compiling the required information for the annual reports, as well as responding to requests for assistance from various communities and organizations. Training materials on deescalating tensions, in particular, are still being provided as requested.

32. During your nomination hearing, you stated that you were not responsible for the hiring of Jared Wise, who called for police to be killed during the January 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol. Wise was later pardoned by President Trump. One of President Trump's own appointees, U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Alabama Phil Williams, stated that DOJ "needs to reexamine their hiring policies" in light of Wise's hiring by failed U.S. Attorney nominee Ed Martin.

a. Do you believe that Wise should have been hired by the Justice Department, given his history of encouraging violence against law enforcement?

RESPONSE: I did not hire Mr. Wise and he is no longer employed at the Department of Justice. Under my leadership, the Department of Justice will prosecute those who commit violence against federal law enforcement officers.

b. Did you object to Wise's hiring or employment by Mr. Martin?

RESPONSE: I was not involved in the hiring of Mr. Wise. It would otherwise be inappropriate for me to comment on personnel matters within the Department of Justice.

c. Is it ever be appropriate for an individual who encouraged others to kill federal law enforcement officers to serve in a federal law enforcement agency?

RESPONSE: Please see my answer to Question 32(a).

33. Have you ever reprimanded Ed Martin for disobeying DOJ's media contacts policy?

RESPONSE: Supervisory and personnel matters concerning individual employees are not appropriate for public discussion.

34. On July 7, ICE agents shot and killed Lorenzo Salgado Araujo—a father of three and business owner who had lived in the United States for 35 years. DHS has stated that the FBI is investigating the incident as a "potential assault on a federal law enforcement officer." There has been no independent determination as to whether the officers acted in self-defense or used excessive force. This raises concerns regarding whether the FBI has predetermined the outcome of its investigation, rather than conducting a full, fair, and independent investigation.

a. How will you ensure that the FBI conducts a full, fair, and independent investigation, free from any improper influence by political officials?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate to discuss the details of any ongoing investigation, but all investigations conducted by the Department of Justice are conducted in a full and fair manner consistent with ethical and professional responsibility obligations.

b. Will the Civil Rights Division investigate whether Mr. Salgado Araujo's rights were violated by federal agents during the incident? Will any other DOJ entity investigate the officer's conduct?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 34(a).

c. Will you commit to cooperating with local law enforcement on their investigation into the killing of Mr. Salgado Araujo, including preserving and sharing evidence with local officials?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 34(a).

On July 13, ICE agents shot and killed Johan Sebastián Durán Guerrero. The FBI is reportedly investigating this incident in consultation with the DHS Office of Inspector General.

d. What is the scope of the FBI investigation?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 34(a).

e. Will you commit to coordinating with state/local law enforcement on any state/local investigation into the killing in Maine, including preserving and sharing evidence with state/local officials?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 34(a).

35. Questions remain related to whether there have been full, fair, and independent investigations into federal agents actions with respect to uses of force by the Department of Homeland Security.

a. What steps has the Department of Justice taken under your leadership to investigate the killings of U.S. citizens Renee Good and Alex Pretti in Minneapolis, as well as other reported incidents of excessive force by federal agents during the unprecedented deployment of federal agents to Minnesota earlier this year?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice takes any incident in which lives are lost seriously. While it would be inappropriate to discuss the details of any ongoing investigation, all investigations conducted by the Department of Justice are conducted in a full and fair manner consistent with ethical and professional responsibility obligations.

b. What is the status of Department of Justice investigations into federal agents' killings of Alex Pretti and Renee Good?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 35(a).

c. If confirmed as Attorney General, do you commit to conduct full, fair, and independent investigations into past and future incidents of excessive force by DHS personnel? And to work with state and local police as they work to conduct such investigations?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 35(a).

During your time in the leadership of the Department of Justice, there have been well-documented reports of wrongful arrests of U.S. citizens who were arrested without warrants and under the mistaken belief that they violated immigration laws. In the first nine months of President Trump's immigration crackdown, at least 170 citizens were wrongfully detained. My staff documented the reported detention of at least 40 U.S. citizens in Illinois alone between late August and early November 2025, during the so-called, "Operation Midway Blitz".

d. What steps has the Department of Justice taken under your leadership as Acting Attorney General to investigate the wrongful arrests of U.S. citizens without warrants and under the mistaken belief that they violated immigration laws?

RESPONSE: The Civil Rights Division takes seriously any alleged violation of civil rights and reviews any allegations of such violations professionally and in accordance with the applicable law. The Department has recruited and hired civil rights attorneys and investigators to ensure that federal prosecutors and agents have the resources needed to ensure that rights are protected across the country.

e. As Attorney General, what steps do you commit to take to prevent the racial profiling that has resulted in these wrongful detentions by the Trump Administration?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 35(d).

36. During the first Trump administration, the Department of Justice played a central role in implementing the "zero tolerance" policy that resulted in thousands of children being separated from their parents.

If confirmed, will you commit that the Department will not support, implement, or defend any policy that intentionally separates children from their parents for the sole purpose of deterring migration?

RESPONSE: The processing of illegal alien families is under the authority of the Department of Homeland Security, not the Department of Justice. To the extent processing decisions become the subject of litigation, the Department of Justice's litigating positions will continue to reflect applicable law.

37. Earlier this year, the Board of Immigration Appeals, housed within the Executive Office of Immigration Review at the Department of Justice, issued a precedential decision in *Matter of Santiago-Santiago*, in which the Board undermined protections provided Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA).

a. What role did you play in the issuance of *Matter of Santiago-Santiago*? Did you personally review the decision prior to its issuance?

RESPONSE: DACA is a program administered by the Department of Homeland Security, not the Department of Justice. Accordingly, nothing in *Matter of Santiago-Santiago* altered, or could have altered, the requirements for that program. I played no role in the issuance of *Matter of Santiago-Santiago*, nor did I review the decision prior to its issuance.

b. What role did the White House play in issuing that decision? Did anyone at

the White House personally review the decision prior to its issuance? If so, who?

RESPONSE: The White House played no role in the issuance of *Matter of Santiago-Santiago*, nor did anyone at the White House review the decision prior to its issuance.

Please provide the following information regarding DACA recipients in immigration court, from January 2025 to date, disaggregated by month:

c. The number of DACA recipients issued removal orders;

RESPONSE: The Department of Homeland Security administers DACA, not the Department of Justice. As such, the Department of Justice does not track DACA cases.

d. The number of DACA recipients with pending removal cases;

RESPONSE: Please see the response to subsection (c) above.

e. The number of DACA recipients on the detained docket; and

RESPONSE: Please see the response to subsection (c) above.

f. The number individuals on the detained docket who have indicated to an immigration judge or the Board of Immigration Appeals that they have pending renewal applications.

RESPONSE: Please see the response to subsection (c) above.

g. What guidance have immigration courts been given with respect to cases for detained individuals upon notification that their DACA has been renewed?

RESPONSE: The Department of Homeland Security administers DACA, not the Department of Justice. As such, the Executive Office for Immigration Review, which operates the immigration courts within the Department of Justice, does not issue guidance about DACA.

h. What guidance have immigration courts received to address cases of DACA recipients who were erroneously detained and placed in removal proceedings? What actions are the courts taking to work with the Department of Homeland Security to remedy the situation in these cases?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to subsection (g) above. Further, it would be inappropriate and a violation of applicable professional responsibility

obligations for the Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security to collude on outcomes in particular immigration court cases.

38. What steps will the Department of Justice take to protect and preserve access to immigration protection, especially Continued Presence, T Visas, and Adjustment of Status, for all eligible trafficking survivors and ensure that survivors can safely report their exploitation without fear of immigration consequences?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice will continue to support victims of trafficking and criminal exploitation to the fullest extent of the law. Department resources are available at https://www.justice.gov/humantrafficking/resources.

39. Given your efforts on unaccompanied children and indicting "super sponsors" and human smuggling rings, please describe what steps the Department of Justice will take to protect and preserve access to immigration protections, such as U- and T-visas, for eligible trafficking and criminal exploitation survivors.

RESPONSE: Immigration-related benefits such as U- and T- visas are provided by the Department of Homeland Security, not the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice law enforcement will continue to provide support such as certifications for all eligible victims of trafficking or other crimes as appropriate.

40. Since becoming Acting Attorney General, how many U- and T-visa certifications has your office completed based on applicants' compliance in prosecuting these "super sponsor" cases?

RESPONSE: The Office of the Attorney General does not typically complete certifications for U and T visas. Such certifications are completed by the relevant law enforcement component involved in the case. Please also note that a law enforcement certification is not a mandatory requirement for a T visa.

41. Has the Executive Office of Immigration Review issued any guidance regarding individuals with immigration protection, such as Continued Presence, T Visas, and Adjustment of Status, for all eligible trafficking survivors?

RESPONSE: The Executive Office of Immigration Review adjudicates all cases in accordance with the law, including applicable law on trafficking victims. It has also issued internal protocols for employees for identifying and reporting suspected child abuse or human trafficking.

42. Since January 2025, disaggregated by month, please provide the number of individuals who have been issued a removal order despite having a—

a. An approval or determination that they are prima facie eligible for a T visa for survivors of trafficking;

RESPONSE: Prima facie eligibility for a T visa is determined by the Department of Homeland Security. Accordingly, the Department of Justice does not track these cases.

b. An approval or determination that they are prima facie eligible for a U visa for survivors of crimes; or

RESPONSE: Prima facie eligibility for a U visa is determined by the Department of Homeland Security. Accordingly, the Department of Justice does not track these cases.

c. An approval or determination that they are prima facie eligible for VAWA protections for survivors of domestic violence.

RESPONSE: Prima facie eligibility for a VAWA self-petition is determined by the Department of Homeland Security. Accordingly, the Department of Justice does not track these cases.

43. Labor trafficking and forced labor remain significantly under-investigated and under-prosecuted, despite their prevalence across the United States. Data on federal criminal human trafficking prosecutions from the U.S. Department of State shows that in 2024, there were only 10 labor trafficking prosecutions compared to 136 sex trafficking prosecutions. Those low numbers of labor trafficking prosecutions have persisted year after year for over a decade.

a. What action will the Department of Justice under your leadership take to increase federal investigations and prosecutions of labor trafficking and forced labor cases? How will it ensure these crimes receive the attention and resources necessary to hold traffickers accountable?

RESPONSE: Human trafficking, including both labor and sex trafficking, remains a Department priority given the gravity of the harm it causes to victims. On June 17, 2026, I announced the creation of a National Coordinator for Child Exploitation and Human Trafficking to sit in the Office of the Deputy Attorney General. The new Coordinator will submit a report to the Deputy Attorney General within 120 days updating the Department's strategy to combat human trafficking and child exploitation. I anticipate that the updated strategy will include recommendations for increased training opportunities for prosecutors and investigators, the promotion of cross-agency task forces within each District to identify, disrupt, investigate and prosecute trafficking crimes, and the expansion of victim-based resources.

Trafficking survivor service providers are facing significant funding reductions that threaten access to housing, legal representation, trauma-informed mental health care, and other critical services.

b. How will the Department of Justice work with Congress to protect and strengthen funding for survivor services so that survivors have access to the resources they need to heal, rebuild their lives, and participate in the pursuit of justice?

RESPONSE: Human trafficking is a horrific crime that often leaves many victims and survivors in its wake and requires resources to assist these individuals to reintegrate back into society. The Department of Justice supports a broad range of victim assistance resources, technical assistance and training, and funding to support anti-trafficking stakeholders across the United States. Fuller descriptions of those resources are available at https://www.justice.gov/humantrafficking/resources. The Department will work with Congress to make recommendations for funding to support victims and survivors during the criminal justice process and after the case is concluded.

44. Reports indicate that immigration judges are increasingly excluding court observers from immigration proceedings, limiting public access to courts that have historically been open to observation.

a. How does restricting court observers promote public confidence in the fairness and integrity of immigration courts?

RESPONSE: Subject to certain regulatory exceptions, EOIR proceedings are open to the public. Information regarding access to EOIR proceedings is available at https://www.justice.gov/eoir/media/1449716/dl?inline. As this issue is also the subject of ongoing litigation, it would not be appropriate for me to comment further.

b. Will you commit to return to the longstanding practice of allowing court observation?

RESPONSE: Please see the answer to Question 44(a).

45. Congress has long funded the Legal Orientation Program (LOP), including the Immigration Court Helpdesk (ICH), because access to legal orientation promotes due process, improves the efficient administration of immigration courts, and helps respondents understand their rights and obligations. The Trump Administration has sought to discontinue funding for these programs, and legal service providers report they are increasingly being denied access to immigration court spaces to provide these services on a pro bono basis.

Will you commit to preserving the Legal Orientation Program, including the Immigration Court Helpdesk, by using appropriated funds in the manner intended by Congress and ensuring those funds are made available to qualified and experienced legal service providers?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice, through EOIR, has determined through multiple rigorous analyses that the Legal Orientation Program (LOP) as previously constituted was a wasteful program that actually increased both an alien's time in detention and the overall length of immigration proceedings. Although EOIR uses the funds currently appropriated for the LOP for FY 2026, the Department and the President's budget request do not seek any funding for it in FY 2027.

46. Many children appearing in immigration court lack the understanding required to meaningfully participate in their proceedings without the assistance of counsel.

a. As Attorney General, what specific steps would you take to ensure that immigration court procedures involving children are safe, individualized, and consistent with due process protections, rather than prioritizing speed or case completion?

RESPONSE: All immigration proceedings, regardless of the identity of any particular alien, are conducted in accordance with applicable law and policy. If confirmed, I would ensure that proceedings continue to be conducted in that manner.

b. Please identify the number and percentage of unaccompanied children with cases currently pending before EOIR who lack legal representation.

RESPONSE: EOIR does not track representation rates for pending cases because such a rate would be misleading for multiple reasons—e.g. representation status can change multiple times over the course of a single case and many aliens have representation that is not reflected in EOIR's case management system because the attorney has not yet filed an entry of appearance. The representation rate for completed cases of unaccompanied alien children in FY 2025 was 89%.

c. For the most recently completed quarter, please identify completed EOIR case outcomes, including *in absentia* decisions, for unaccompanied children, disaggregated by whether: (1) the children had legal representation; and (2) the children had pending and/or approved USCIS applications/petitions.

RESPONSE: EOIR does not track data disaggregated in this manner and does not directly track at all whether unaccompanied alien children (UAC) have pending applications at other agencies. EOIR's statistics for UAC outcomes as of the second quarter of FY 2026 are available at https://www.justice.gov/eoir/media/1344956/dl?inline.

d. Please identify, for the period from January 21, 2025 to the present, the number of individuals with Special Immigrant Juvenile Status who have received orders of removal in immigration court at the time they held such status.

RESPONSE: EOIR does not track this data.

Historically, immigration judges routinely granted continuances to permit unaccompanied children to obtain counsel, reunify with sponsors, and pursue relief before USCIS. Reports now indicate that judges are being encouraged or expected to grant fewer continuances and limit the length of continuances to two or three weeks, even when children are awaiting developments necessary to pursue relief.

e. Has EOIR adopted any policy or guidance regarding continuances in unaccompanied children's cases?

RESPONSE: All continuance requests are adjudicated in accordance with applicable law. By statute, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is required to initially adjudicate all asylum applications filed by unaccompanied alien children (UAC), including those in immigration court proceedings. Thus, UAC who have a pending asylum application with DHS generally receive a continuance until DHS adjudicates that application. Otherwise, EOIR has no UAC-specific guidance on continuances.

f. Please provide copies of such policy guidance or memoranda and any other relevant documentation involving guidance for continuing unaccompanied children's cases.

RESPONSE: Please see the response to the previous question.

Under the "Family Assistance Reintegration Program," certain unaccompanied children who agree to waive key rights and accept "voluntary departure" to their countries of origin during an immigration court hearing may receive $2,500 as paid out to a relative in the country of origin.

g. Please identify all terms and obligations of this program, provide a copy of the associated declaration that children must sign, and provide copies of all relevant EOIR guidance and other documentation.

RESPONSE: This program is not administered by the Department of Justice, and I am unfamiliar with its implementation by other agencies.

Reports indicate that immigration judges are increasingly taking pleadings from unrepresented unaccompanied children and asking them to admit allegations or concede removability despite the complexity of immigration law and children's limited ability to understand the proceedings.

h. Please provide any EOIR policy guidance, memoranda, or other relevant documentation regarding taking pleadings from unrepresented unaccompanied children in immigration court.

RESPONSE: By regulation, 8 C.F.R. 1240.10(c), immigration judges are prohibited from accepting an admission of removability by an unrepresented individual under the age of 18, and EOIR adheres to that regulation. Otherwise, there are no unaccompanied alien child-specific policies regarding pleadings.

i. For unaccompanied children that DOJ has characterized as "missing" and/or "located" who have since been "found," what support or services, if any, including legal and social services, is DOJ helping facilitate? Please identify the number of such children for whom DOJ has facilitated legal and/or social services.

RESPONSE: Except in particular circumstances (e.g. victim services for a witness in a human trafficking investigation), the Department of Justice does not generally provide legal or social services to unaccompanied alien children. Such services are generally within the purview of the Department of Health and Human Services.

j. Please identify: (1) the scope of Joint Force Task Alpha (JFTA)'s work as it relates to unaccompanied children; (2) the interagency partners participating in that work; and (3) JFTA's prosecutorial priorities as regards that work.

RESPONSE: Joint Task Force Alpha primarily focuses on dismantling large scale smuggling organizations and trafficking groups and operations. In September 2025, the former Attorney General announced that JTFA would include prosecutors with expertise in handling child exploitation as many of the smuggled persons involved with these perpetrators are unaccompanied alien children. JTFA includes partners from DOJ components including the Federal Bureau of investigation, Drug Enforcement Administration, Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, and United States Marshals Service. They partner with DHS's Homeland Security Investigations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and Customs and Border Patrol as well as state and local law enforcement in many jurisdictions.

k. Please provide the following data for the period from January 21, 2025 to the present, disaggregated by law enforcement agency and offense: (1) the number of unaccompanied child-related cases referred to U.S. Attorneys' Offices; (2) the number of pending unaccompanied child-related investigations and prosecutions; and (3) the number of unaccompanied child-related convictions and resulting sentences.

RESPONSES: On September 24, 2025, I issued a memo titled "Expansion of Joint Task Force Alpha and Prioritizing the Prosecution of UAC Offenses" which prioritized smuggling, trafficking, and other criminal cases involving unaccompanied alien children (UAC). This memo followed former Attorney General Bondi's memo which expanded the scope of Joint Task Force Alpha and

the priority of protecting UAC. My memo directed all United States Attorney's Offices to begin tracking cases involving UAC. Since that time, and through June 30, there have been 19 total referrals: CBP – 3; DHS/HSI-6; HHS/ICE -1; ICE – 4; HHS-5. There are 17 pending cases: CBP – 3; DHS/HSI-6; HHS/ICE -1; ICE – 3; HHS-4. Two cases have progressed to sentencing: ICE – 1. Defendant was convicted of 18 U.S.C., 1001 and received a time served sentence; HHS – 1. Defendant was convicted of 18 U.S.C., 2244(a)(4 and received a time served sentence.

47.

a. On April 7, 2026, you issued a memo announcing the creation of the National Fraud Enforcement Division (NFED). Is it accurate that the NFED was officially established on April 7, 2026?

RESPONSE: On January 8, 2026, the Trump Administration announced that the Department of Justice would create a new division for national fraud enforcement to "enforce the Federal criminal and civil laws against fraud targeting Federal government programs, Federally funded benefits, businesses, nonprofits, and private citizens nationwide."[1] President Donald J. Trump soon thereafter nominated Colin M. McDonald to serve as the new Division's first Assistant Attorney General. One week before my memorandum announcing the creation of the National Fraud Enforcement Division, Mr. McDonald was sworn in as the Assistant Attorney General for the Division on April 1, 2026.

b. How many of the investigations resulting in charges announced as part of the 2026 National Health Care Fraud Takedown were first opened prior to April 7, 2026? Please provide the date that each such investigation was opened, and indicate the DOJ section responsible for opening it.

RESPONSE: Consistent with longstanding rules and guidelines of the Department, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on outstanding investigations. Within those guidelines, I can say that on June 23, 2026, the Justice Department, along with numerous partners, announced the 2026 National Health Care Fraud Takedown. The Takedown resulted in charges against 455 defendants by federal and state law enforcement involving over $6.5 billion in false claims, representing a new era in federal, state, and international cooperation to combat health care fraud. As in years past, the dedication and hard work of Department prosecutors and their partners from various agencies across the globe over the course of many months made this record-setting initiative possible.

c. On June 30, 2025, DOJ issued a press release announcing that the 2025 National Health Care Fraud Takedown resulted in 324 defendants charged in connection with $14.6 billion in fraud. How many of the investigations referenced in this press release were first opened prior to January 20, 2025? Please provide the date that each such investigation was opened, and indicate the DOJ section responsible for opening it.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 47(b).

48. Basic questions about the National Fraud Enforcement Division (NFED) have not been answered. At a January 8, 2026, news conference, Vice President Vance claimed that the NFED would be "run out of the White House" rather than the Justice Department. In contrast, an organizational chart provided to the House Appropriations Committee stated that the Assistant Attorney General for the NFED will report directly to the Deputy Attorney General. A DOJ webpage about the NFED currently states: "The Fraud Division is central to the Department of Justice's support of President Trump's Task Force to Eliminate Fraud, a whole-of-government effort chaired by Vice President J.D. Vance to eliminate fraud, waste, and abuse within Federal benefit programs."

a. Do Vice President Vance, FTC Chair Ferguson, or any individual outside of the Justice Department have any oversight or jurisdiction over NFED?

RESPONSE: As described in the Department of Justice's Organization Chart, the Assistant Attorney General for the National Fraud Enforcement Division reports to the Deputy Attorney General. The National Fraud Enforcement Division works with the White House Task Force to Eliminate Fraud and many other federal and state partners as part of the Administration's whole-of-government approach to fighting the rampant fraud on American taxpayers and their tax dollars.

As you are undoubtedly aware, there are already existing Fraud Sections within the Justice Department's Criminal Division and Civil Division. Earlier this year, Criminal Division Assistant Attorney General Tysen Duva stated that the NFED would be established in addition to both of these existing Fraud Sections. However, days later, in a letter to the House Appropriations Committee, the Justice Department claimed that the NFED would be provided with "personnel and funding from within the Department's existing resources."

b. How many attorneys have been assigned to the NFED?

RESPONSE: As set forth in my April 7, 2026, memorandum announcing the creation of the National Fraud Enforcement Division, the Department of Justice is consolidating and realigning relevant resources from other Department components into the National Fraud Enforcement Division to make a significant and immediate impact in the fight against fraud. On May 27, 2026, I ordered the permanent transfer of various resources from the Criminal Division—including its Government Fraud portfolio, Health Care Fraud Unit, and Tax Section—to the National Fraud Enforcement Division. The National Fraud Enforcement Division will work closely with other Department components and partners to ensure resources are fully committed to efficiently combatting fraud. The Department's work to identify and realign resources from other components within the agency is ongoing.

c. From which DOJ offices or sections have these attorneys been reassigned?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 48(b).

d. Given that funding was reduced in fiscal year 2026 for DOJ's General Legal Activities salaries and expenses account, what existing resources is the Department using to fund the NFED?

RESPONSE: The Department is using existing resources to fund the National Fraud Enforcement Division's operations in fiscal year 2026. In March 2026, the Department notified the appropriations committees of a transfer of $5 million from grants to support the National Fraud Enforcement Division's initial operations. The President's Budget for FY 2027 requests additional resources for the National Fraud Enforcement Division.

e. Have the existing Fraud Sections been disbanded or merged into NFED? If not, what is the relationship and division of enforcement responsibilities among these entities?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 48(b).

49. Competition among farm input manufacturers is historically low. Notably, fertilizer production is dominated by just three companies, and very little transparency into the industry exists. Similar conditions exist in the seed industry. In March 2026, reporting indicated that DOJ has opened an investigation examining whether these companies have colluded to raise prices.

Will you commit to vigorously pursuing antitrust investigations into farm inputs, including the fertilizer and seed markets, and to keeping Congress apprised of DOJ's work in this area?

RESPONSE: The Department does not confirm or deny the existence of particular investigations. If confirmed, I will support the Antitrust Division's continued efforts to vigorously enforce the antitrust laws in agricultural markets, including farm inputs, and the Department will keep Congress appropriately informed consistent with Department practice and the confidentiality of law enforcement matters. As I testified, I have already worked closely with Secretary Rollins on agricultural issues, and the Department has recently publicized some of the work we're doing to combat anticompetitive behavior and ease prices in this space.

50. In March 2025, DOJ proposed eliminating its Chicago antitrust field office. This came less than a year after DOJ said it would create an enforcement team in Chicago focused on the agriculture industry. The Chicago office plays a key role in enforcing antitrust laws in the agricultural sector and is the main antitrust enforcement team in the Midwest.

Will you commit to retaining agricultural antitrust operations in the Chicago office?

RESPONSE: If confirmed, I will ensure the Division maintains the capacity to enforce the antitrust laws in the agricultural sector, including in the Midwest. Decisions about field-office structure will be made through the Department's ordinary budget and management processes, in consultation with Congress.

51. Every attorney in this country has independent professional and ethical requirements that must be met to remain barred in each state. In 28 U.S.C. § 530(b), Congress has expressly required that any attorney for the Government "shall be subject to State laws and rules, and local Federal court rules . . . to the same extent and in the same manner as other attorneys in that State." Yet, despite this clear legal requirement, DOJ has proposed a new rule that clearly violates this statutory requirement to shield its attorneys from the same state investigative and disciplinary rules to which all other attorneys in this country must adhere.

On what basis can DOJ propose a rule to shield its attorneys from state investigative and disciplinary rules when that rule clearly violates federal law?

RESPONSE: The Proposed Rule is entirely consistent with federal law. Under 28 U.S.C. § 530B, Department attorneys are required to conform to the same substantive standards of conduct as non-federal attorneys in the States in which they are practicing, where compliance with the State rules does not interfere or conflict with federal law. The Proposed Rule proposes an amendment to 28 CFR Part 77, which implements 28 U.S.C. § 530B. The amendment would establish a process for the Department to review allegations against Department attorneys before the bar disciplinary authorities may undertake any investigative steps or otherwise seek information from a Department attorney.

52. According to a letter submitted to the Committee from former Pardon Attorney Liz Oyer, you initiated a misconduct complaint against her with the Office of Disciplinary Counsel for the D.C. bar shortly after she testified at a March 2025 spotlight hearing.[5] Your complaint was found to be without merit and dismissed in February 2026.

a. Why did you pursue a misconduct complaint against Ms. Oyer, given the Department's newly found distrust of state investigative and disciplinary bodies?

RESPONSE: I did not initiate a complaint against Ms. Oyer with the D.C. Bar.

In her letter, Ms. Oyer discussed her efforts to obtain documents related to her firing by

[5] Elizabeth G. Oyer, *Letter of Opposition to the Nomination of Todd Blanche for Attorney General of the United States*, (July 1, 2026).

means of a FOIA request.[6] The Department of Justice has claimed that your office has no documents related to her firing despite the fact that you dismissed her from her post. This raises significant questions about what communication channels you are using to conduct official DOJ business and comply with federal law regarding the preservation of records.

b. Have you complied with all of the requirements of the Federal Records Act?

RESPONSE: Yes, to the best of my knowledge.

c. Please provide a list of all the platforms you are using to communicate about official DOJ business.

RESPONSE: To the best of my knowledge, I am in compliance with all applicable rules and regulations regarding records and communications about official DOJ business. I use Microsoft Outlook and standard telephone communications on my DOJ issued devices.

During your hearing, you claimed that Ms. Oyer was not fired for the firearms issued related to actor Mel Gibson, instead saying, "The decisions that she made as a pardon attorney in the weeks and months leading up to the end of President Biden's term were completely inconsistent with President Trump's authority."

During her testimony before this Committee, Ms. Oyer said that the Department of Justice submitted a pleading to the Merit Systems Protection Boarding (MSPB) stating that the facts of her firing were not in dispute, i.e., she was fired for declining to make a recommendation regarding the restoration of Mel Gibson's federal firearm rights.

d. Did you mischaracterize the reasons underlying Ms. Oyer's dismissal from the Justice Department during your hearing?

RESPONSE: No. The Gibson matter played no role in my decision to terminate Ms. Oyer, and I did not learn of it until days after her termination. Ms. Oyer mischaracterizes the Department's filing. The filing states only that the undisputed fact is that she was removed under Article II and that the remaining issues are legal, making discovery unnecessary. It does not concede her account of why she was terminated. The Department has consistently rejected her claim that the Gibson matter played any role in that decision, including publicly as early as March 10, 2025. *See Justice Dept. Official Says She Was Fired After Opposing Restoring Mel Gibson's Gun Rights*, Devlin Barrett, New York Times, March 10, 2025 ("A Justice Department official, speaking on the condition of anonymity to describe internal deliberations, said the disagreement over Mr. Gibson played no role in the decision to dismiss the pardon attorney.").

53. On July 6, 2026, you posted on X about participating in a flyover over the National Mall

[6] *Id.*

with NASA Administrator Jared Isaacman as part of America's 250th celebration.[7] The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) had denied Isaacman's request for this flyover on June 30, finding the 1970s-era F-5 fighter jet as "very high-risk" to operate over densely populated area with a lack of emergency landing zones, in part because it is "an aircraft for which a single system failure will render the aircraft uncontrollable."[8] The 24-year FAA veteran who authored the denial found that the proposed flight would adversely affect safety and would not be in the public interest.[9]

Despite the FAA's ruling, Isaacman found a way to circumvent the agency all together by transferring the privately-owned aircraft to NASA, leading it to become a "public use" aircraft falling outside of the FAA's domain.[10] According to public reporting, you were disappointed at the prospect of missing out on the flight opportunity, so much so that you spoke to President Trump, who encouraged you to go.[11]

a. Were you aware of the FAA's ruling prior to participating in the flyover?

RESPONSE: I understood the flight to be conducted lawfully as a public-use aircraft operation outside the FAA's certification jurisdiction.

b. Please explain what role, if any, you played in Isaacman's decision to bypass the FAA and have the aircraft transferred to NASA?

RESPONSE: I had no role in the ownership of the aircraft or in any decision regarding its regulatory classification.

c. Did you consider the safety risks to the public involved with participating in a flyover involving an aircraft deemed "very high-risk" and not in the public interest by the FAA?

RESPONSE: I understood the flight to be lawful and appropriately authorized, and I would not have participated otherwise.

d. Do you regret putting D.C. residents and visitors at risk?

RESPONSE: I participated in a lawful flyover conducted as part of the Nation's 250th-anniversary commemoration, and I do not accept the premise of the question.

---

[7] Todd Blanche (@DAGToddBlanche), X (July 6, 2026, 9:09 PM), https://x.com/DAGToddBlanche/status/2074239311571005479.
[8] Federal Aviation Administration, *Denial of Exemption in the matter of the petition of JDI Holdings LLC*, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (June 30, 2026), https://www.regulations.gov/document/FAA-2026-7261-0002.
[9] *Id.*
[10] Isaac Arnsdorf, *Trump weighed in on Cabinet squabble over ride for July Fourth flyover*, THE NEW YORK TIMES (July 7, 2026), https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2026/07/07/trump-encouraged-todd-blanche-fly-nasa-administrators-jet/.
[11] *Id.*

54. At his nomination hearing, ATF Director Robert Cekada said, "ATF's core mission is public safety," and then stated that ATF "disrupt[s] firearms trafficking networks that arm gangs and cartels." ATF data indicates that the third most common trafficking channel involves theft from Federal Firearms Licensees (FFLs). FFLs reported a total of 10,383 firearms to have been stolen, through larcenies, burglaries, and robberies, or lost in 2025 alone.

While federal law, under 18 U.S.C. § 923(g)(6), requires FFLs to "report the theft or loss of a firearm from the licensee's inventory or collection, within 48 hours after the theft or loss is discovered, to the Attorney General and to the appropriate local authorities," it does not require FFLs to conduct inventory checks, securely store their inventories, or implement anti-theft and other physical security measures to protect their inventories against theft and loss.

a. Yes or no: Should FFLs check their inventories at regular intervals for stolen or lost firearms? If not, why not?

RESPONSE: FFLs should comply with federal law.

b. Yes or no: Should FFLs securely store their inventories after business hours? If not, why not?

RESPONSE: FFLs should comply with federal law.

c. Yes or no: Should FFLs implement anti-theft and other physical security measures to protect their inventories against theft and loss? If not, why not?

RESPONSE: FFLs should comply with federal law.

55. Last year, you advised DHS to continue flights to Centro de Confinamiento del Terrorismo (CECOT), despite an oral order from a judge stopping those flights.[12] The Department of State provided $4.76 million dollars to cover the costs "associated with" their detention.[13] Although the Salvadorian government's made vague assurances that detainees would not be tortured, CECOT has long been notorious for torturing prisoners.[14] Deputy Chief of Staff Stephen Miller even stated with respect to the men sent to CECOT, "They know that these are monsters, who got exactly what they deserved."[15] Since then, the Venezuelans and others detained there have confirmed that they were

[12] Declaration of Todd Blanche, *J.G.G. v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00766-JEB (D.D.C. Dec. 5, 2025), ECF No. 198-3.
[13] Dan Gooding, *Trump Admin's $4.7 Million Deal With El Salvador Revealed in Court Filing*, Newsweek, September 9, 2025, https://www.newsweek.com/trump-administration-el-salvador-deal-cecot-alien-enemies-actlawsuit-2127087.
[14] *See, e.g.,* Bryan Avelar, *Inmates in El Salvador tortured and strangled: A report denounces hellish conditions in Bukele's prisons,* El Pais*,* May 29, 2023, https://english.elpais.com/international/2023-05-29/inmates-in-el-salvadortortured-and-strangled-a-report-denounces-hellish-conditions-in-bukeles-prisons.html.
[15] https://thehill.com/homenews/administration/5662062-stephen-miller-cbs-news-60-minutes-producers/

indeed tortured.[16]

d. Do you regret your decision to advise the Department of Homeland Security to send people to a prison subsidized by taxpayer dollars, where they were tortured in violation of the law, over the objection of a judicial order stopping that flight?

RESPONSE: Matters concerning removals to third countries have been the subject of active litigation, and legal advice provided within the Executive Branch is protected by applicable privileges. I do not accept the premises embedded in the question, and it would not be appropriate for me to discuss privileged deliberations or matters in litigation.

e. Moving forward, will you commit to advise the Department of Homeland Security that sending individuals back to a third country, without an individualized determination as to whether they may face serious human rights violations in that country, is a violation of international and domestic laws?

RESPONSE: The Department follows applicable law governing removals, including the United States' obligations under the Convention Against Torture and its implementing statute and regulations. I commit that the Department will continue to follow that law.

56. The Department of Justice has repeatedly violated the *Epstein Files Transparency Act* (EFTA) protections for victims by publishing records without redacting personally identifiable information of both publicly identified and non-public victims, including nude photos where their names and faces could be identified. In sharp contrast, other produced records heavily redacted information identifying powerful business and political figures who are alleged co-conspirators or material witnesses to Epstein's crimes. Violations of the EFTA continue as DOJ has yet to produce all Epstein-related records required under the EFTA and has removed thousands or records from its website beyond those that inappropriately identify victims.

a. Why did the Department fail to cross-check the names of identified survivors before allowing the site to be released to the public?

RESPONSE: After its release of responsive materials, the Department immediately initiated a comprehensive review to identify and correct instances where victim names or other PII were inadvertently disclosed. This included pulling affected documents, establishing a dedicated victim tip line for reporting issues, coordinating with victims' counsel, and implementing enhanced redaction protocols for subsequent or re-released materials. We take victim privacy extremely seriously and continue to rectify any errors promptly.

[16] Cristosal and Human Rights Watch, "*You Have Arrived in Hell": Torture and Other Abuses Against Venezuelans in El Salvador's Mega Prison*, Nov. 12, 2025.

b. Some of the redaction issues appear to be mistakes that would have been caught with minimal supervision. What quality control or review procedures were put in place to reduce human error?

RESPONSE: The quality control and review procedures are outlined in my January 30, 2026 letter to Congress.

c. Were any corrective actions taken to hold accountable those responsible for these errors?

RESPONSE: After its release of responsive materials, the Department immediately initiated a comprehensive review to identify and correct instances where victim names or PII were inadvertently disclosed. This included pulling affected documents, making additional redactions, establishing a dedicated victim tip line for reporting issues, coordinating with victims' counsel, and implementing enhanced redaction protocols for subsequent or re-released materials. We take victim privacy extremely seriously and continue to rectify any errors promptly.

d. What safeguards were in place to protect survivors' privacy, and why did those safeguards fail?

RESPONSE: The safeguards are outlined in my December 19, 2025 and January 30, 2026 letters to Congress as well as in the Attorney Review Protocol for the Epstein Files. After its release of responsive materials, the Department immediately initiated a comprehensive review to identify and correct instances where victim names or other PII were inadvertently disclosed. This included pulling affected documents, making additional redactions, establishing a dedicated victim tip line for reporting issues, coordinating with victims' counsel, and implementing enhanced redaction protocols for subsequent or re-released materials. We take victim privacy extremely seriously and continue to rectify any errors promptly.

e. What responsibility does the DOJ take for the harm caused to survivors whose identities were disclosed, and what is being done to ensure this never happens again?

RESPONSE: After its release of responsive materials, the Department immediately initiated a comprehensive review to identify and correct instances where victim names or other PII were inadvertently disclosed. This included pulling affected documents, making additional redactions, establishing a dedicated victim tip line for reporting issues, coordinating with victims' counsel, and implementing enhanced redaction protocols for subsequent or re-released materials. We take victim privacy extremely seriously and continue to rectify any errors promptly.

f. Do you believe the Epstein files contain no meaningful evidence of additional wrongdoing by others?

RESPONSE: If additional evidence of any federal crime is identified in the future, the DOJ will evaluate that evidence in accordance with long-standing policy. This Department remains steadfast in its commitment to pursue any and all investigative leads in the Epstein matter and all matters involving sex trafficking when there is evidence to suggest a federal crime occurred.

g. How many individuals identified by victims in the Epstein files were ever interviewed by the FBI or DOJ?

RESPONSE: As stated in my December 19, 2025 letter to Congress: "As part of the review and production, the Department solicited counsel for any victims of Jeffrey Epstein and invited counsel to provide us with the names of victims, whether previously identified or not. This process resulted in over 1,200 names being identified as victims or their relatives."

h. Deutsche Bank records reportedly document approximately $755 million across 186 Epstein-related transactions involving more than 95 shell entities. Did the DOJ conduct a comprehensive financial crimes or money laundering analysis based on those transaction chains?

RESPONSE: The FBI pursued all investigative leads in its investigations into Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell including potential financial crimes. If any evidence is provided to the Department suggesting a federal crime occurred, the Department will investigate and prosecute that matter in accordance with the long-standing principles of federal prosecution.

i. Were suspicious activity reports (SARs), wire transfers, shell companies, or offshore entities connected to Epstein and his associates fully analyzed to identify additional perpetrators, facilitators, recruiters, or financial beneficiaries?

RESPONSE: The FBI pursued all investigative leads in its investigations into Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell, including potential financial crimes. If any evidence is provided to the Department suggesting a federal crime occurred, the Department will investigate and prosecute that matter in accordance with the long-standing principles of federal prosecution.

57. A handwritten victim journal uncovered in the Epstein Files[17] identifies more than 20 individuals, including allegations against powerful businessmen, senators, and sports owners. Manhattan District Attorney investigators reportedly stated they did "not doubt her allegations," and forensic review reportedly found "no evidence of recent

[17] https://epstein-data.com/EFTA02731420.

fabrication."

Did DOJ independently assess this journal as a potential investigative roadmap?

RESPONSE: The FBI pursued all investigative leads in its investigations into Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell. If any evidence is provided to the Department suggesting a federal crime occurred, the Department will investigate and prosecute that matter in accordance with the long-standing principles of federal prosecution.

58. In January 2026, the FBI seized more than 600 boxes of election materials in Fulton County, Georgia. A recent FBI memo assigns 260 investigative analysts to a priority investigation related to the 2020 election in Fulton County. President Trump's own Department of Homeland Security, Attorney General, and FBI Director during his first Administration all publicly rejected the idea that there was fraud impacting the results of the 2020 election. President Trump and his allies brought over 60 lawsuits contesting the results of the 2020 election, but lost nearly every suit. In Georgia specifically, election officials and state investigators conducted multiple investigations and a full hand recount, followed by a machine recount, both of which upheld the original result.

DOJ attempted to subpoena the names, addresses, and phone numbers of the individuals involved in the vote count in Fulton County Georgia. On July 7, 2026, Judge William Ray II, appointed by President Trump, called the request "unreasonable" in his order quashing the subpoena. He also found that "the statute of limitations for any possible crime arising from the 2020 Election has long expired."

a. Do you believe that allocating hundreds of employees, overtime hours, and taxpayer dollars to investigating claims that have been thoroughly litigated and debunked by judges, state election officials, and President Trump's own former agency officials is a responsible use of the Department's resources?

RESPONSE: The trustworthiness and accuracy of election results is a paramount concern for all Americans and the use of Department resources to address that concern is appropriate.

b. Please detail the total cost of this "surge"—including overtime, personnel hours, training, and reallocated resources—and identify which other FBI investigative priorities have been deprioritized to accommodate it.

RESPONSE: As evidenced by this Department's success in fighting gang violence, combatting illegal and dangerous drugs including fentanyl, helping secure our borders, and making Americans safer, the Department's investigations into the integrity of elections has not been to the detriment of its other priorities.

c. Given Judge Ray's assertion that the statute of limitations for any possible

crime arising from the 2020 election has expired, what is the purpose of the Department's renewed investigation?

RESPONSE: Consistent with longstanding rules and guidelines of the Department, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on outstanding investigations.

d. What was the purpose of the grand jury subpoena seeking the names and contact information of Fulton County election workers? What steps has the Department taken to ensure this subpoena does not expose those individuals to harassment or intimidation?

RESPONSE: This Department takes seriously its obligations to safeguard the secrecy of grand jury proceedings. The referenced subpoena speaks for itself. If any person subject to subpoenas issued by, or in connection with, Department investigations or proceedings supervised by the Department, believes that grand jury secrecy has been compromised, that person should immediately contact the FBI or other appropriate law enforcement agencies within the Department.

59. In April 2025, then-Attorney General Pam Bondi rescinded a Justice Department policy that had barred prosecutors from seizing journalists' phone and email records during leak investigations. Recently, DOJ used that authority to issue grand jury subpoenas compelling *Washington Post* national security reporter Ellen Nakashima and three *Wall Street Journal* journalists to testify about their sources—an extraordinary step that, according to CNN, followed President Trump personally handing you, then-Acting Attorney General, a stack of the reporters' articles with the word "Treason" written across them in Sharpie. Both news organizations fought the subpoenas in sealed federal court proceedings, and DOJ ultimately withdrew them.

Just last week, DOJ escalated further: federal prosecutors in Manhattan subpoenaed four *New York Times* journalists, some of them served at their homes by federal agents, ordering them to appear before a grand jury today to testify about their reporting on security concerns involving the President's new, Qatari-gifted Air Force One. The *Times*'s lawyer called it "an attempt to prevent the public from knowing what is happening in their country by intimidating journalists from doing their jobs." The National Press Club called it "an extraordinary assault on the freedom of the press that strikes at the heart of the First Amendment."

a. You took an oath to defend the Constitution. How are these subpoenas consistent with upholding the First Amendment?

RESPONSE: Pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e)(2)(B), I am prohibited from discussing any matters occurring before a federal grand jury.

Courts have long recognized that the First Amendment does not just protect what a reporter publishes—it also protects newsgathering, including the ability to interview

confidential sources without the fear of government reprisal.

b. What First Amendment analysis did DOJ conduct before issuing these subpoenas? How are these subpoenas consistent with the First Amendment?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 59(a) above.

You withdrew your subpoenas of the *Washington Post* and *Wall Street Journal* journalists, then subpoenaed *New York Times* journalists less than a month later.

c. What factors led you to withdraw the first batch of subpoenas? What led you to believe that those same factors are not at play in the more recent batch of subpoenas?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 59(a) above.

In her April 2025 memo rescinding the policy barring prosecutors from seizing journalists' phone and email records, then-Attorney General Bondi stated that "investigative techniques relating to newsgathering are an extraordinary measure to be deployed as a last resort when essential to a successful investigation or prosecution… subpoenas are to be narrowly drawn, and warrants must include protocols designed to limit the scope of intrusion into potentially protected materials or newsgathering activities."

d. Was sending federal agents to journalists' homes on a Friday night consistent with your own Department's policy of narrowly drawn subpoenas with protocols designed to limit the scope of intrusion into newsgathering activities?

RESPONSE: Pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e)(2)(B), I am prohibited from discussing any matters occurring before a federal grand jury.

You recently affirmed that "reporters are not our targets." Issuing subpoenas to journalists breaks from longstanding DOJ practice requiring prosecutors to seek information from reporters only when all other avenues have been exhausted. This includes Bondi's April 2025 memo stipulating that prior to issuing a subpoena, the Attorney General must consider several factors, including "whether prosecutors have made all reasonable attempts to obtain the information from alternative sources."

e. What alternative avenues did you pursue before subpoenaing these journalists 48 hours after they published their story?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 59(a) above.

60. On July 14, 2026, a Senator posted on social media, "December 2025: Jack Smith swore under oath that he didn't spy on text messages belonging to members of Congress.

Today: New evidence confirms he spied on dozens of members of Congress, myself included." As part of this post, Senator Paul included a clip from Jack Smith's December 2025 testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, in which Smith was asked, "did the toll records that you requested from the Senators, did they include the content of the phone calls?" and "did the records that you requested, the toll records from the members of Congress, include the content of text messages?" Smith answered "no" to both questions.

In your nomination hearing on July 15, 2026, another Senator referenced this same accusation, stating: "We lived through Jack Smith, and the Chairman has just revealed new revelations, of course, that he was reading text messages. By the way, Jack Smith testified under oath he didn't do that. He testified that they just had the phone logs. We know that's not true now. Jack Smith should be subject to prosecution for lying to Congress."

a. By definition, do toll records include the contents of communications or just the metadata associated with communications such as time, date, and duration?

RESPONSE: Members of Congress have asked the Department of Justice to review the situation referenced above for potential investigation and, if appropriate, prosecution. It would therefore be inappropriate for me to provide public analysis of the underlying facts at this point.

b. Is a toll record the same thing as a wiretap?

RESPONSE: They are both tools utilized in criminal investigations.

61. Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e) mandates government officials and attorneys, "must not disclose a matter occurring before the grand jury." Fed. R. Crim. P. 6(e)(2)(B)(vi).

a. Do you agree that as an attorney, you and the rest of the Department and its components are bound by FRCP Rule 6(e)?

RESPONSE: Yes.

b. Under what circumstances may an attorney for the government reveal information protected by Rule 6(e)?

RESPONSE: Rule 6(e)(3)(A) sets out the circumstances under which a grand-jury matter may be disclosed.

On June 2, 2026, you appeared on the podcast *Hang Out with Sean Hannity*. During that podcast, you were twice asked about the existence of an "ongoing grand conspiracy investigation," which you confirmed, including confirming the existence of "a grand jury

in Florida" and "in one other state," and describing testimony provided by witnesses who "maybe they only know a little part of it, but it … does help the proof that you develop about the, you know, about the guys that you're actually going after."

c. Do any of the exceptions enumerated in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(e)(3) apply to your disclosure of the existence of a grand jury during this interview?

RESPONSE: The statements I made on *Hang Out with Sean Hannity* did not trigger Rule 6(e)'s prohibition. Therefore, there was no need to rely on any of the exceptions enumerated in Rule 6(e)(3).

On December 6, 2025, FBI Director Kash Patel appeared on *My View with Lara Trump*, where he said described an ongoing grand jury investigation, stating: "So we have multiple teams, we've built squads for both Russiagate and Arctic Frost and we're using the grand jury process and we're issuing, I think we're up to 75 or 100 subpoenas already. For witnesses, that's what you target first." On May 5, 2026, Director Patel claimed on *Hang Out with Sean Hannity* that you had given him permission to discuss the investigation: "We're triaging computer hard drives from previous directors and deputies. Um we're looking at the totality of information. We're finding jurisdiction. And by the way, I'm not looking at it in one jurisdiction. I've launched this investigation in multiple jurisdictions. And I can tell you that cause I got the permission of the attorney general to tell you that."

d. Did you authorize FBI Director Patel to make disclosures about ongoing grand jury investigations?

RESPONSE: My discussions with FBI Director Patel regarding ongoing investigations are protected by applicable privileges.

e. Do any of the exceptions enumerated in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(e)(3) apply to Director Patel's disclosures?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 61(d).

62. Earlier this year, the Department of Justice successfully prosecuted former Syrian prison official Samir Ousman Alsheikh for his involvement in the torture of prisoners at Adra Prison in Damascus, Syria. Mr. Alsheikh was also convicted of immigration fraud for lying to U.S. immigration authorities about these crimes. I applaud the Department's efforts to bring human rights violators and war criminals to justice and ensure that the United States is not a safe haven for the perpetrators of atrocities.

Chairman Grassley and I previously worked together to pass the bipartisan Justice for Victims of War Crimes Act, which enables the Department of Justice to prosecute foreign national war criminals found in the United States regardless of the nationality of their victims or location of their crimes.

Nevertheless, prosecutions of war crimes and human rights violations have been rare.

Do you commit to evaluating ways to strengthen and expand the Department's efforts to investigate and prosecute serious human rights crimes, including genocide, torture, use or recruitment of child soldiers, war crimes, and other crimes committed by serious human rights violators?

RESPONSE: Yes, I commit to evaluating ways to strengthen and expand the Department's efforts to investigate and prosecute serious human rights crimes, including genocide, torture, use or recruitment of child soldiers, war crimes, and other crimes committed by serious human rights violators. The Criminal Division charges and tries these cases in the Human Rights and Special Prosecutions Section. Just this year, Criminal Division Trial Attorneys tried the case of United States v. Samir Ousman Alsheikh in the Central District of California, which involved the use of a wooden torture device used to fold victims in half during the regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria. In addition, in July 2026, the Criminal Division also charged the case of the United States v. Moran Kostic in the District of Idaho. The charges in that case are based upon immigration fraud, the premise of which was the defendant's alleged physical beating of prisoners during the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Department is always seeking to protect the people of the United States and deliver justice for innocent victims, and welcomes working with Congress on legislation that would strengthen or add new authorities to our toolbox. In addition to pursuing criminal charges, the Department is leveraging other available tools including the denaturalization of war criminals and human rights violators who have illegally procured U.S. citizenship. For example, on November 11, 1994, Baboucarr Mboob, a native of The Gambia, while serving as a military police officer in the Gambian army, participated, along with fifteen other soldiers, in the execution of six officers following the orders from his commanding officer who believed the victims were plotting a counter-coup against then President Yahya Jammeh – without the benefit of a trial. Mboob concealed his involvement in war crimes and acts of persecution throughout his immigration and naturalization proceedings after entering the United States 2002, naturalizing as a U.S. citizen in 2011. But, in testimony before a hearing of The Gambian Truth, Reconciliation, and Reparations Commission (TRRC) held on April 9, 2019, Mr. Mboob admitted to executing six officers. The Unites States is seeking to revoke his certificate of naturalization because he obtained his U.S. citizenship illegally by concealing material fact and willfully misrepresented his military background.

63. This September will mark the 25th anniversary of the horrific terrorist attacks on this country on September 11, 2001. In the two and half decades since the attacks, the American people and the family members of the more than 3,000 people killed that day have been waiting for answers and for justice to be served. Too many 9/11 family members have passed away while still waiting for transparency and accountability.

a. Will you commit to meeting in person with 9/11 family members and their representatives regarding remaining avenues for securing justice, transparency, and accountability?

RESPONSE: I am committed to supporting the families of the victims of 9/11 consistent with applicable law, and I would welcome the opportunity to meet with them (and/or, as appropriate, their lawyers).

b. Will you also commit to prioritizing the declassification review of documents related to the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, that have yet to be publicly released?

RESPONSE: Subject to applicable legal and constitutional factors, I support transparency for the Department. However, I am not familiar with the specific documents raised in this question, and it would be inappropriate for me to make commitments regarding the release of these documents, which may implicate matters pertaining to national security. If confirmed, I will review the situation and consult with appropriate Department and interagency personnel.

64. National Security Presidential Memorandum 7 (NSPM-7) directs the Department of Justice to investigate individuals and domestic organizations that exhibit disfavored viewpoints, including 'anti-capitalism,' 'anti-Christianity,' and "hostility towards those who hold traditional American views on family, religion, and morality."

a. Can you explain how the DOJ can investigate a domestic group based on its advocacy or views without infringing on that group's First Amendment rights to free speech and freedom of association?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice is a key defender of the rights enshrined in the First Amendment, and this Department does not investigate individuals for exercising their constitutional rights. Rather, the Department investigates and prosecutes potential violations of federal criminal law, based on the facts, all applicable law, the Justice Manual, and the Principles of Federal Prosecution.

b. If the President identifies a progressive advocacy group or a political donor on social media and suggests they be investigated, do you believe it is your "right and duty" to carry out that investigation, even if career prosecutors conclude there is no evidence of a federal crime?

RESPONSE: All Department investigations must be sufficiently predicated with specific and articulable facts tending to show that a possible crime has been or will be committed. If confirmed, I will continue to uphold the laws of the United States.

Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act authorizes warrantless

surveillance targeted at non-U.S. persons located outside the United States. But the surveillance nonetheless sweeps in large volumes of Americans' communications. I have long raised concerns about the government's practice of searching through Section 702 databases without a warrant to find and review Americans' private communications.

c. Given that NSPM-7 asserts that there is a sophisticated and organized campaign of left-wing political violence, and that non-governmental organizations and foundations allegedly participating in this supposed campaign may have ties to foreign governments, agents, citizens, foundations, or influence networks, would the FBI be able to run warrantless searches of Section 702 data to try to access the private communications of Americans associated with those nonprofits or foundations?

RESPONSE: I understand Section 702 to be an important national security tool. I have not had occasion to explore every fact pattern for which Section 702 may or may not authorize the FBI to use additional authorities. If confirmed, I will review each case that comes before me and consult the relevant subject matter experts.

d. Similarly, given that the Administration has portrayed Antifa as an international network, and the State Department has designated a number of overseas groups as foreign terrorist organizations because of alleged ties to Antifa, if people attended a protest here in the United States that the administration claimed was organized by Antifa, would the FBI be able to run warrantless searches for the communications of these protesters?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 64(c).

e. The Administration has also claimed that there was foreign interference in the 2020 election and seems to be positioning itself to make a similar claim about the 2026 mid-term elections. In your view, could the FBI run warrantless searches for Americans' communications collected under Section 702 as part of a purported effort to protect the elections against foreign interference?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 64(c).

Senator Josh Hawley
Questions for the Record

Hon. Todd Blanche
Nominee, Attorney General of the United States

1. **By its own terms, the Office of Legal Counsel's December 23, 2022 opinion on the Comstock Act concludes only that the Comstock Act does not reach the mailing of abortifacients where the sender lacks the *intent* that they be used unlawfully. It does not purport to immunize senders who act with that intent. Manufacturers, distributors, and telehealth networks today mass-mail mifepristone into states where its use is unlawful, advertise nationwide without regard to state law, and structure their operations around so-called shield laws whose sole purpose is to defeat state enforcement.**

    a. **Will the Department evaluate whether manufacturers and third parties that promote and mail mifepristone into states where its use is unlawful exhibit the intent that the drug be used unlawfully such that their conduct violates the Comstock Act, even under the Department's current policy and 2022 opinion?**

    RESPONSE: The Department will address questions implicating the Comstock Act consistent with the facts and governing law. In doing so, the Office of Legal Counsel and other components will be consulted as appropriate regarding any interpretive questions.

    b. **In conducting that evaluation, will the Department consider all relevant facts probative of such intent, such as marketing directed into states where the drug's use is unlawful, reliance on shield laws, shipment volumes into those states, and the absence of any bona fide physician-patient relationship or effort to verify the recipient's location?**

    RESPONSE: Yes. As in all cases, any assessment of criminal intent must consider the totality of relevant, admissible evidence, consistent with federal law and evidentiary standards.

2. **You testified that interference with state laws is at the core of the dispute concerning President Biden's mail-order abortion policy. Out-of-state prescribers and distribution networks are using the United States mail and the channels of interstate commerce at industrial scale to defeat the duly enacted state laws.**

    a. **Does the Department agree, as a general matter, that federal instrumentalities—the mails and the channels of interstate commerce—should not be used as vehicles to circumvent validly enacted state laws?**

RESPONSE: The Department agrees that federal law and regulations governing the use of federal instrumentalities should be enforced—including the mails and channels of interstate commerce.

b. **Beyond the Comstock Act, will the Department evaluate whether the use of the mails or interstate facilities to violate, or to facilitate the violation of, state abortion laws may itself violate federal law, including the Travel Act and federal conspiracy statutes?**

RESPONSE: The Department will examine the lawful application of federal law, including the Travel Act and federal conspiracy statutes, to conduct for which we have reason to suspect a violation. As always, any enforcement or litigation position will be based on the facts and governing law.

c. **Will the Department commit to supporting the states in enforcing their own laws, including through statements of interest, information sharing, and consultation with state attorneys general?**

RESPONSE: I will ensure that the Department continues to engage with our state partners to advance the rule of law. The Department may consider submitting statements of interest in litigation where appropriate. The Department will also continue to work with state attorneys general and law-enforcement partners to share information, as appropriate, and to advance the Administration's enforcement priorities.

3. **You testified that the Department is "not defending what Biden did, and will not," and that you want "a good result consistent with President Trump's administrative directive and priorities." As you know, the Department is now a party to multiple cases concerning the FDA's 2016, 2021, and 2023 changes to the mifepristone safeguards.**

a. **The FDA owes the district court in Louisiana a status report by October 7, 2026, demonstrating substantial progress on its safety review. Will you commit to briefing the Committee promptly after that report on how the Department's litigation posture in each pending case will conform to the Administration's stated goals?**

RESPONSE: Yes.

Senator Thom Tillis
Questions for the Record
Senate Judiciary Committee Hearing
for the Nomination of the Honorable
Todd Blanche to be Attorney General of the United States

At CPAC in March 2026, you cheered on the President regarding the pardons granted to January 6 defendants, some of whom were convicted of assaulting federal officers.

1. Do you believe individuals who assaulted law enforcement officers on January 6 committed serious crimes?

   RESPONSE: An assault on a federal law enforcement officer is a serious crime and a violation of federal law. Under my leadership, the Department of Justice will prosecute those who assault federal law enforcement officers.

2. Do you believe that these individuals who were convicted of assaulting law enforcement are victims of government weaponization?

   RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, any person who assaults law enforcement should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

3. If confirmed, how would you ensure that future political violence is investigated and prosecuted without regard to political ideology?

   RESPONSE: There is no acceptable level of political violence that can be tolerated. For this reason, we have created Operation Vanguard which targets and prosecutes any criminal conduct that seeks to intimidate or suppress political speech or activity regardless of its affiliation.

4. In establishing the so-called "Anti-Weaponization Fund," you sought approval from the Treasury Department's Judgment Fund to transfer $1.776 Billion to that fund, correct?

RESPONSE: The document speaks for itself. It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

5. In making the request of the Treasury from the Judgment Fund in connection with President Trump's Privacy Act lawsuit in order to fund the "*Anti-Weaponization Fund* (AWF or Fund)" did DOJ have to justify the amount it requested?

   RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice. As I testified at my confirmation hearing, and as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed; no funds have been transferred; no claims have been received; and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

   a. What justification did DOJ provide?

      RESPONSE: The amount was a term of the negotiated settlement, and the settlement's terms are set out in the agreement, which is public. As I testified at my confirmation hearing, and as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed; no funds have been transferred; no claims have been received; and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

   b. Was the justification provided in writing? Please provide us with copies.

      RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

   c. Who at DOJ was involved in preparing the justification?

      RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

d. Did anyone at DOJ meet with anyone at the Treasury regarding the request for $1.776 Billion from the Judgment Fund? Who was involved in those discussions?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

6. How did DOJ derive the $1.776 Billion amount it requested from the Judgment Fund?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

a. Aren't requests for funds from the Judgment Fund to settle lawsuits supposed to be supported by an assessment of litigation risk from the underlying lawsuit?

RESPONSE: It has long been the opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel that the Attorney General has broad authority to compromise and/or settle claims on behalf of the United States. Accordingly, all such claims are settled in the best interest of the United States.

b. Was the request and determination from the Treasury's Judgment Fund for $1.776 Billion based on an assessment of litigation risk? Is it documented? If so, please provide copies.

RESPONSE: It has long been the opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel that the Attorney General has broad authority to compromise and/or settle claims on behalf of the United States. Accordingly, all such claims are settled in the best interest of the United States.

c. What was the litigation risk if President Trump's lawsuit had proceeded?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice. In any

case there is litigation risk and it has long been the opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel that the Attorney General has broad authority to compromise and/or settle claims on behalf of the United States. Accordingly, all such claims are settled in the best interest of the United States.

d. What assumptions went into making such a litigation risk assessment?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

e. If President Trump, his family, and the Trump Organization had gone forward with their Privacy Act case and you had not settled the lawsuit, what was the risk that individuals other than the President, his family, and the Trump Organization would have been able to recover damages?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice. In any case there was litigation risk, and it has long been the opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel that the Attorney General has broad authority to compromise and/or settle claims on behalf of the United States. Accordingly, all such claims would have been settled in the best interest of the United States. As I testified at my confirmation hearing, and as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed; no funds have been transferred; no claims have been received; and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

f. Do you agree that only plaintiffs to that lawsuit would have been eligible to recover damages?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice. In any case there was litigation risk, and it has long been the opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel that the Attorney General has broad authority to compromise and/or settle claims on behalf of the United States.

Accordingly, all such claims would have been settled in the best interest of the United States. As I testified at my confirmation hearing, and as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed; no funds have been transferred; no claims have been received; and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

7. Did DOJ ever assess the risk that a class action could successfully have been maintained as part of President Trump's lawsuit?

   RESPONSE: The document speaks for itself. It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

   a. How did DOJ assess that risk? Is that documented? If so, please provide copies.

      RESPONSE: The document speaks for itself. It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

   b. How many class members did DOJ estimate would be part of a successful class action?

      RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

   c. How did DOJ define the class for purposes of thinking about the $1.776 Billion amount it requested of Treasury from the Judgment Fund?

      RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

8. Did DOJ make any assumptions about who would make claims for money from the Anti Weaponization Fund when it asked Treasury for the $1.776 Billion?

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, anyone with a claim against the United States for weaponization – except the President or his family – could have pursued relief from the Anti-Weaponization Fund.

a. Did those assumptions include making payments to people who harmed police officers?

   RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice. That said, as I testified at my confirmation hearing, anyone who assaults law enforcement should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

b. Did those assumptions include making payments to people who destroyed property on Capitol Hill?

   RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice. That said, anyone who destroys property on Capitol Hill should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

c. If DOJ did not make assumptions about who would make successful claims for payment from the Anti-Weaponization Fund, how was DOJ able to derive the $1.776 Billion it requested for the Fund?

   RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not, have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice. Both the May 18, 2026 Settlement Agreement and May 18, 2026 Memorandum specify that: "The corpus of the Anti-Weaponization Fund's funding does not represent the value of any claim by Plaintiffs, but rather is based on the projected valuation of future claimants' claims."

d. Is any of this documented? Please provide copies.

   RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in

conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice. Both the May 18, 2026 Settlement Agreement and May 18, 2026 Memorandum specify that: "The corpus of the Anti-Weaponization Fund's funding does not represent the value of any claim by Plaintiffs, but rather is based on the projected valuation of future claimants' claims."

9. Your Principal Associate Deputy, Trent McCotter, created the Anti-Weaponization Fund, correct?

   RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

   a. What attorneys at DOJ were involved in creation of the Anti-Weaponization

      RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

10. DOJ sought to dismiss the case challenging the Anti-Weaponization Fund arguing it was moot, and a federal judge ordered you to attest in writing that the Fund was no longer going to be used, correct?

    Response: That is incorrect. As I testified at my confirmation hearing, and as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed; no funds have been transferred; no claims have been received; and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

    a. Did you have a role in drafting or approving of the filing DOJ made to the court in that case? Who did?

       RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

11. You have testified before Congress that you will NOT move forward with the Anti-Weaponization Fund, and at the same time the President has

consistently supported the Fund. If the President directs you to reverse your decision and move forward with the Fund, will you move forward?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on hypothetical communications I may or may not have with the President. That said, as I testified at my confirmation hearing, and as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed; no funds have been transferred; no claims have been received; and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

a. And if you do move forward with the Fund after having testified to Congress that the Fund will "not go forward, period," will you be subject to a charge of perjury for your testimony to Congress?

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, and as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed; no funds have been transferred; no claims have been received; and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

12. Has any January 6th defendant, or their counsel, applied for or inquired about payment from the Anti-Weaponization Fund? Please provide copies of those records.

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, and as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed; no funds have been transferred, no claims have been received; and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

13. Will you commit that under your leadership, DOJ will not give any payouts from taxpayer money in the Judgment Fund or from the Anti-Weaponization Fund to any rioters who assaulted law enforcement officers or damaged property on Capitol Hill on January 6th?

RESPONSE: An assault on a federal law enforcement officer is a serious crime and a violation of federal law. Every claim submitted pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act is reviewed on the merits and addressed by the Torts Branch of the Civil Division. Any decision by the Department to resolve or settle any claim is made only in the best interest of the United States.

14. You've publicly stated that the Anti-Weaponization Fund has been abandoned by the administration. What assurances do you offer both the American people and us that it won't return later?

    RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, and as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed; no funds have been transferred; no claims have been received; and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

    a. Can you reaffirm your statement, in writing, that the Anti-Weaponization Fund is "moot"?

       RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, and as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed; no funds have been transferred; no claims have been received; and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

15. Will you commit to working with my office and other Senate offices in good faith to develop legislative language that would eliminate the Anti-Weaponization Fund?

    RESPONSE: Yes.

Louisiana v. FDA

The State of Louisiana and individual plaintiff Rosalie Markezich are suing the FDA to challenge the 2023 regulatory "REMS" change that allowed for mail order prescriptions of the chemical abortion drug, mifepristone. On January 27, 2026, the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) filed to stay the case.

1. Why is the DOJ defending the Biden-era policy yet has overturned countless other policies, memos, regulations, and executive orders from Biden. Why has that not happened here?

   RESPONSE: As I stated at my confirmation hearing, it would be inappropriate for me to discuss specific litigation strategy or to comment on pending matters beyond what is set forth in the Department's public filings. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is currently reviewing the safety

of mifepristone and Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategy (REMS) regulations set forth by the Biden Administration. The Department will not defend the Biden Administration FDA's policy on the merits. I anticipate that the Department will forcefully defend any revised policy produced as a result of the FDA's currently ongoing review.

2. Will you commit to a thoughtful and timely response to the July 14, 2026, letter regarding *Louisiana v. FDA* on behalf of Senator Cornyn and myself?

   RESPONSE: Yes.

DOJ Grants

DOJ's FY 2027 budget proposed a consolidation of the Office of Justice Program (OJP) with the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) and the Office of Community Oriented Policing Service (COPS) into a new "Bureau of Justice Grants."

1. Given the DOJ's policy to reorganize the grant structure, many people are concerned that certain grants may not be delivered. Given this fact, what policies has the DOJ adopted to ensure all grants are handled in a timely and efficient manner?

   RESPONSE: As part of the consolidation effort, COPS, OJP, and OVW are streamlining their grant management processes so that all three organizations use a uniform, efficient grant review and administration framework. OVW, COPS, and OJP will remain separate and distinct entities working within one new grantmaking entity: the Bureau of Justice Grants. The underlying grant programs would continue to serve their distinct statutory purposes, while the consolidated structure would allow applications and payments to be processed more efficiently and consistently.

2. Following that, what risks currently exist to VAWA fund recipients, VOCA funding, COPS funding, and the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act grants?

   RESPONSE: Under the legacy grantmaking framework, stakeholders expressed frustration about having to work through separate grantmaking offices to determine which grants best suit the needs of their organization, resulting in needing to work through multiple different applications and reporting frameworks. As part of the consolidation effort, COPS, OJP, and OVW are streamlining their grant management processes so that all three

organizations use a uniform, efficient grant application, review, and administration framework from one grantmaking entity: the Bureau of Justice Grants.

Epstein Survivors- Meeting

1. Will you commit to meeting with the victims of Jeffrey Epstein, through proper legal channels and with counsel present as appropriate, within two weeks of the July 16th, 2026, hearing?

   RESPONSE: In addition to previous meetings DOJ leadership and officials have had with victims and their counsel over the last 15 months, I met with several victims of Jeffrey Epstein and their counsel on July 16, 2026, including Dani Bensky who testified at my confirmation hearing. I remain committed to engaging with the victims of Jeffrey Epstein through appropriate legal channels.

Senate Judiciary Committee Hearing
"The Nomination of the Honorable Todd Blanche to be Attorney General of the United States"
Wednesday, July 15, 2026
Questions for the Record for General Blanche

QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR BLACKBURN

1. **This week, the Department of Justice announced one of its largest trade fraud prosecutions ever as part of DOJ's broader fraud enforcement efforts. I am working to support the administration's anti-fraud efforts with my legislation, the Fraud Accountability Act. This bill would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to explicitly make any crime of fraud—of any amount—committed against private individuals, funds, corporations, or government entities a deportable offense. On top of that, my bill also allows for the denaturalization of individuals who commit these fraud crimes or any other deportable offense.**

   a. **Please explain the need to ensure that *every* crime of fraud committed by a naturalized citizen should result in deportation and denaturalization.**

      RESPONSE: Fraud against the United States prevents critical benefits from reaching those in need and sows distrust in government institutions and civil society. Whether I am serving as the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General, the Department of Justice will continue to zealously prosecute fraud and immigration offenses, and seek denaturalization as permitted by law.

2. **As we discussed in my office, I am very concerned about the proliferation of mail-order mifepristone pills. Last month, the Fifth Circuit granted Louisiana's request to halt the Biden-era policy of allowing mail-order abortion drugs, but the Supreme Court subsequently allowed the policy to continue while the litigation is pending. As the state of Louisiana has argued, the Biden FDA policy of allowing mail-order mifepristone has effectively allowed pro-abortion states to circumvent the *Dobbs* decision.**

   a. **At your confirmation hearing, you noted that you are not able to discuss the Department's specific litigation strategy in this matter. But, generally speaking, can you comment on the Department's approach to this issue more broadly?**

      RESPONSE: As I stated at my confirmation hearing, it would be inappropriate for me to discuss specific litigation strategy or to comment on pending matters beyond what is set forth in the Department's public filings. However, the FDA is currently reviewing the safety of mifepristone and the Biden Administration's REMS. The Department is not defending the Biden Administration FDA's policy on the merits. I anticipate that the Department will forcefully defend any revised policy produced as a result of the FDA's ongoing review.

3. **Earlier this summer, we learned that a United States District Judge in Georgia—Judge Eleanor Ross—engaged in egregious conduct that falls beneath the dignity of the federal judiciary. Specifically, an Eleventh Circuit Special Committee found that Judge Ross engaged in a deeply inappropriate sexual relationship with a high-ranking official of the Atlanta Police Department. This conduct occurred in her judicial chambers with her law clerks nearby. Just as troubling, the Committee also found that Judge Ross made materially false statements about her conduct. She deliberately lied during the course of this investigation.**

   a. **In your view, is this the type of conduct that we should expect from federal judges?**

      RESPONSE: No. The American people expect federal judges to act according to the highest ethical standards, to be honest, and to show respect for parties, attorneys, and court staff. As detailed by the Eleventh Circuit Special Committee, the conduct at issue is disappointing and deeply troubling, and it falls far short of the American people's expectations for federal judges.

4. **Under your leadership as Acting Attorney General, the Department of Justice has continued to support the President's goal of deporting criminal illegal aliens and restoring law and order to our communities. The Tennessee General Assembly has banned sanctuary cities altogether, ensuring my state will never be a sanctuary state. However, blue states, counties, and cities continue to enact sanctuary policies that obstruct cooperation with federal immigration authorities and undermine public safety. That is exactly why I introduced the 287(g) Enhancement Act with my former Senate colleague and friend, the late Senator Lindsey Graham. This bill would incentivize states and localities to enter into 287(g) agreements by increasing Byrne JAG grants by up to 10 percent of the average total funding provided to that state or locality under its three most recent awards.**

   a. **Why is legislation like the 287(g) Enhancement Act is vital to enforcing federal immigration laws, strengthening cooperation among federal, state, and local law enforcement, and enhancing public safety?**

      RESPONSE: Grant funding to support cooperation between federal, state, and local law enforcement is an important tool to address our vital national interests. Immigration enforcement is a vital issue, and the 287(g) program provides a key framework for that cooperation. The Department's Office of Legislative Affairs would be happy to work with you on this legislation.

5. **Despite the tremendous progress that has been made with the Memphis Safe Task Force, the one weak link in Shelby County is the far-left, Soros-backed District Attorney, Steve Mulroy. D.A. Mulroy penned an op-ed last week maligning the brave men and women of law enforcement by saying that police officers are "trained to kill," implying that law enforcement use deadly force regularly. DA Mulroy has also refused to hold violent criminals accountable in Memphis. In the month of December 2025**

alone, 430 of the 514 felony cases in Shelby County Criminal Court resulted in *no prison time*.

a. What are some steps that your Department can take to hold these Soros-backed District Attorneys accountable for their failures to keep our communities safe?

RESPONSE: I share the concern that every community deserves to have its laws enforced and its residents protected. Categorically declining to prosecute cases, dropping charges, and undercharging violent crime erodes public trust and safety.

As far as the Department's role is concerned, I believe there are meaningful actions that have been fruitful in Memphis and can be adopted elsewhere. *First*, the Department can vigorously prosecute federal firearms and drug trafficking crimes against individuals who might otherwise escape accountability. *Second*, the Department can direct resources, task forces, and grant support to communities facing increased violent crime, while attaching appropriate conditions on grant funding. *Third*, the Department can attempt to sift through a district attorney's declinations to see if any individuals can be prosecuted under federal law. If confirmed, I will continue to leverage the Department's muscle to keep local communities safe.

6. In 2022, the Justice Department secured the landmark conviction of French cement company, Lafarge, for engaging in a criminal conspiracy with ISIS resulting in the injury and deaths of U.S. servicemembers. Lafarge paid over $775 million in fines and forfeiture into DOJ's Asset Forfeiture Fund. The victims' families submitted "Petitions for Remission" to DOJ seeking a portion of the funds. As victims of the crime that gave rise to the forfeiture, these families are entitled under statute to a portion of those funds.

a. Will you commit to taking swift action to ensure that these families' petitions for remission are granted?

RESPONSE: I am deeply committed to protecting servicemembers, law enforcement, and their families. I support efforts to investigate terrorism and to hold any and all perpetrators accountable. However, I am not familiar with the specific situation raised in this question. If confirmed, I will review this matter, consult with Department personnel, and ensure the Department takes appropriate action to comply with applicable law in order to support servicemembers and their families.

7. The use of irreversible gender transition procedures on minors has become an increasingly serious concern as more children are being exposed to medical interventions with lifelong consequences. Organizations and medical providers across the country, including major abortion providers like Planned Parenthood, have expanded into offering gender transition services for minors. As you know, the Trump Department of Justice endorsed for my Chloe Cole Act, which would prohibit these procedures for children and provide a federal cause of action for children and their parents who are harmed.

a. Why is it so critical for Congress to act to create such a cause of action for this heinous conduct?

RESPONSE: This issue is a priority for the Administration. In Executive Order 14187, titled *Protecting Children from Chemical and Surgical Mutilation*, President Trump directed the Department to, "in consultation with the Congress, work to draft, propose, and promote legislation to enact a private right of action for children and the parents of children whose healthy body parts have been damaged by medical professionals practicing chemical and surgical mutilation, which should include a lengthy statute of limitations." The Department has been proud to work with you and others in Congress to support the Chloe Cole Act, which would accomplish this goal, protecting children from harm and holding those who harm them accountable for their actions.

8. Kratom and concentrated kratom-derived products like 7-OH have become a growing public safety concern, with these opioid-like substances increasingly available in convenience stores and marketed to young people. In one tragic case, 19-year-old Sam Nelson died after receiving dangerous advice from ChatGPT that it was safe to combine kratom with Xanax.

a. As the DEA considers taking action against dangerous kratom-derived substances, will you commit to ensuring the Department uses its authorities—including under the Controlled Substances Act—to combat emerging drug threats like kratom and protect Americans from dangerous and addictive substances?

RESPONSE: The Department is committed to combatting emerging drug threats and protecting our communities by leveraging all resources at our disposal. The Department is actively engaged on this issue. If confirmed, I will give the matter careful consideration after conferring with all relevant stakeholders, including DEA personnel.

Nomination of Todd Blanche
To be Attorney General of the United States
Questions for the Record
Submitted July 17, 2026

QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR WHITEHOUSE

Please answer each question and sub-question individually and as specifically as possible. Where indicated, please provide only yes or no answers.

1. Specify which if any privilege you assert in responding to any of the questions below and produce a privilege log for any requested document that is withheld. Please note that, as Chairman Grassley stated at the Senate Judiciary Committee's October 9, 2025, executive business meeting, the use of attorney-client privilege to withhold material "does not apply to Congress."

   RESPONSE: This statement does not require a response.

2. If you decline to respond to any question below on the basis that DOJ policy prevents you from commenting on or confirming or denying the existence of a DOJ investigation, please explain why you declined to respond to that specific question but did comment on and confirm the existence of an ongoing investigation to Sean Hannity on June 2, 2026.[1]

   RESPONSE: Yes, subject to any applicable laws, privileges, and Departmental policies that may limit the disclosure of information.

3. If you decline to respond to any question below on the basis that DOJ policy prevents you from commenting on or confirming or denying the existence of a DOJ investigation, please explain why you declined to respond to that specific question but did comment on, confirm the existence of, and suggest you would discuss further an ongoing investigation to Chairman Grassley during your nomination hearing.[2]

   RESPONSE: Yes.

4. At your nomination hearing, I pointed out that you refused to exclude January 6 rioters from your "Anti-Weaponization Fund."

   a. Yes or no: When you testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 19, 2026, in response to the question whether "individuals who assaulted Capitol Hill police officers" are eligible to apply for payments from the "Anti-

[1] https://pod.wave.co/podcast/hang-out-with-sean-hannity/todd-blanche-the-doj-room-full-of-evidence-nobody-knew-existed-hang-out-with-sean-hannity (at 00:12:48, 00:38:30-00:39:15, 00:56:40-00:58:00).
[2] https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/committee-activity/hearings/the-nomination-of-the-honorable-todd-blanche-to-be-attorney-general-of-the-united-states (at 01:13:00-01:14:00) ("We are investigating that, Chairman, and it would be inappropriate in this setting to get into the details of that investigation, but the sworn affidavit that we reviewed that you provided does raise serious allegations.") (emphasis added).

Weaponization Fund," did you say, "anybody in this country is eligible to apply if they believe they were a victim of weaponization"?

RESPONSE: Yes.

5. At your nomination hearing, I pointed out that you refused to put in writing that the "Anti-Weaponization Fund" is "dead."

   a. Yes or no: When you testified before the House Appropriations Committee on June 2, 2026, in response to the question whether you were "going to issue a new memo in writing rescinding that May 18 memo" establishing the "Anti-Weaponization Fund," did you say, "I'm not committing to putting anything in writing" and "OK, I'm not committing to doing anything in writing. No"?

   RESPONSE: Yes.

   b. Can a verbal statement from the Acting Attorney General legally modify a contractual or settlement agreement between the U.S. government and private individuals?

   RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed, no funds have been transferred, no claims have been received, and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

   c. If the U.S. government does not fulfill its obligations under the agreement between the parties in *Trump v. IRS*, can President Trump sue the IRS and Treasury for failure to fulfill the terms of the agreement?

   RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, the Fund can only operate through action by the Department, namely, the appointment of commissioners, the creation of a claims process, the transfer of funds, and payments. At my direction, the Department will not take these steps.

6. At your nomination hearing, I pointed out that DOJ has signaled that payouts related to "lawfare" or "weaponization" are still forthcoming.

   a. Yes or no: On June 2, 2026, after you said the "Anti-Weaponization Fund" would not move forward, did Stanley Woodward—your subordinate and the DOJ representative who signed the purported settlement agreement establishing the "Anti-Weaponization Fund"—tweet, "We're on it" in response to a tweet suggesting that there should be a "weaponization fund that will be available" to "victims of the weaponized Biden Justice Department . . . who can prove their claim against the federal government through the Federal Torts Claims Act"?

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, the Fund can only operate through action by the Department, namely, the appointment of commissioners, the creation of a claims process, the transfer of funds, and payments. At my direction, the Department will not take these steps.

i. Did you or anyone from your office discuss this tweet with Mr. Woodward before he deleted it?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

ii. Did you or anyone from your office request that Mr. Woodward delete this tweet?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

b. Are individuals who assaulted law enforcement at the U.S. Capitol on January 6 eligible to seek compensation through the Federal Tort Claims Act?

RESPONSE: The FTCA permits any person to present a claim; it entitles no one to recover. Any claim is evaluated on the facts and the law, and the Department will defend the United States vigorously.

c. Since January 20, 2025, has DOJ reached any settlements with individuals convicted of assaulting or impeding law enforcement officers at the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021? If so, provide the number of settlements reached and list each one.

RESPONSE: No.

d. Since January 20, 2025, has DOJ reached any settlements with individuals convicted of offenses related to breaching the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021? If so, provide the number of settlements and list each one.

RESPONSE: No.

e. Since January 20, 2025, has DOJ paid any compensation, including the refund of any previously paid restitution payments, to anyone convicted of offenses related to breaching the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021? If so, list each one.

RESPONSE: To the best of my knowledge, the DOJ has not affirmatively paid any compensation, including the refund of any previously paid restitution payments, to anyone convicted of offenses related to breaching the U.S. Capitol

on January 6, 2021. Instances of refunding restitution have been the result of DOJ complying with court orders requiring the DOJ to do so.

f. Going forward, will DOJ notify the Committee or make public the existence and terms of any such settlement with or compensation paid to any such individuals?

RESPONSE: The Department will continue to comply with its obligations under applicable law to disclose the existence and terms of settlement agreements that it enters with third parties.

7. At your nomination hearing, I pointed out that you have vacated seditious conspiracy convictions against members of the Proud Boys and Oath Keepers.

a. On April 14, 2026, did DOJ move to vacate the seditious conspiracy convictions of members of the Proud Boys?

RESPONSE: On April 14, 2026, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia filed a motion to vacate the convictions of multiple individuals that I believe are the subject of this question.

b. On April 14, 2026, did DOJ move to vacate the seditious conspiracy convictions of members of the Oath Keepers?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 7(a).

8. At your nomination hearing, I pointed out that you hired January 6 rioter Jared Wise, who called police protecting the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021, "Nazi" and "Gestapo" and urged rioters attacking those officers to "[k]ill 'em!"

a. Did Mr. Wise work for DOJ during your tenure as Deputy Attorney General?

RESPONSE: Mr. Wise worked at DOJ during my tenure, although I did not hire him. It would otherwise be inappropriate for me to comment on personnel matters within the Department of Justice.

b. During that time, did Mr. Wise at any point have the title of Senior Advisor in the Office of the Deputy Attorney General?

RESPONSE: Yes.

c. During that time, did Mr. Wise at any point have an email address associated with the Office of the Deputy Attorney General?

RESPONSE: Yes.

d. During that time, did you have weekly meetings scheduled with members of the Weaponization Working Group, including Mr. Wise?

RESPONSE: As Deputy Attorney General, I commonly meet with all components to ensure fulfillment of administration priorities.

e. When did you first learn that Mr. Wise was under consideration to be hired in your office?

RESPONSE: I do not recall. Otherwise, please see my response to Question 8(a).

f. When did you first meet Mr. Wise?

RESPONSE: I do not recall.

g. On what date did DOJ hire Mr. Wise?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice has over 115,000 employees. I do not know the specific details of Mr. Wise's hiring.

h. Did you ever ask Mr. Wise whether he regretted his conduct on January 6, 2021?

RESPONSE: It would not be appropriate for me to discuss internal conversations, if any, with Department employees.

i. Before hiring him, did you ask Mr. Wise whether he apologized to law enforcement officers who defended the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 8(a).

j. Since your appointment to be Deputy Attorney General, has DOJ hired any other individual who was charged with criminal conduct in relation to the January 6, 2021, attack on the U.S. Capitol? If so, who, on what date were they hired, and what is their role?

RESPONSE: I am not aware of any such individuals. See also my response to Question 8(g).

9. At your nomination hearing, I pointed out that you scrubbed press releases about January 6 prosecutions from the DOJ website and referred to those releases as "partisan propaganda."

a. Did DOJ, during your tenure as Deputy Attorney General or Acting Attorney General, remove from its website press releases on prosecutions related to the January 6, 2021, attack on the U.S. Capitol?

RESPONSE: During my tenure, the Department of Justice has worked to reverse the Biden Administration's weaponization of the Department. This includes stripping the Department's website of partisan propaganda like the press releases mentioned.

b. On May 22, 2026, did DOJ's "Rapid Response" account on X tweet, in response to a tweet about the deletion of these press releases, "Nothing 'quiet' about it. We are proud to reverse the DOJ's weaponization under the Biden administration. We will do everything in our power to make whole those who were persecuted for political purposes. This includes stripping DOJ's website of partisan propaganda"?

RESPONSE: Yes, the "Rapid Response" account issued that post in May 2026.

10. At your nomination hearing, I pointed out that you denied that President Trump encouraged any violence on January 6.

a. On November 15, 2023, in the case *United States v. Trump*, did you and other attorneys representing President Trump submit a filing saying, "[n]ot a shred of evidence suggests President Trump called for any violence or asked anyone to enter the Capitol unlawfully" on January 6?

RESPONSE: Yes, that is one quote from a substantive court filing.

11. At your nomination hearing, I pointed out that you have "cleaned house" of every attorney who worked on the prosecutions against President Trump.

a. On March 26, 2026, at CPAC, with respect to the prosecutions against President Trump, did you say, "There is not a single man or woman at the Department of Justice who had anything to do with those prosecutions"?

RESPONSE: Yes, that is an excerpt of my remarks.

b. On the same day, in response to the question of how many of these investigators "have been canned," did you say, "Over 200. Over 200 either left before we came in because they knew it was coming or were fired or took early retirement. They are no longer employed by this Department"?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 11(a).

c. On the same day, did you say, "And when it comes to the FBI . . . Director Patel has cleaned house there too. There isn't a single man or woman with a gun, federal agent, still in that organization that had anything to do with the prosecution of President Trump."

RESPONSE: The correct quotation is "And when it comes to the FBI, which takes a lot of criticism, especially because of what happened over the past several years, Director Patel has cleaned house there, too. There isn't a single man or woman with a gun, federal agent, still in that organization that had anything to do with the prosecution of President Trump."

12. At your confirmation hearing, I pointed out that you bragged that "bringing justice" to violent rioters meant that "on January 20th, every one of them was either pardoned or had their sentence commuted"?

    a. On March 26, 2026, at CPAC, did you say, "When you talk about justice, we're working hard every day. And I don't just say working hard as a cliché. I mean the Attorney General and myself, every single day, 7 days a week, are focused on bringing justice, and it will come. And I know every single person in this room is saying to themselves, 'Why is it taking so long?' . . . Here's the answer. For one, it's not taking so long. For one, we have already done more in one year than any administration has ever done before. If you look at what happened to the men and women convicted because of January 6th, by 5PM on January 20th, every one of them was either pardoned or had their sentence commuted. So, when folks say you've done nothing, I say you have a very short memory"?

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 11(a). It is inaccurate to say I bragged, as I explained during my nomination hearing, "I was responding to inquiries around why more hadn't been done by the Department of Justice with respect to January 6 defendants. And so, my answer was that January 6 defendants and some of their lawyers had a short memory because a lot had already been done."

13. Yes or no: Do you approve of how Director Patel has used FBI aircraft?

    a. Yes or no: Are you confident none of the "official" business associated with Director Patel's travel via the FBI's aircraft has been a pretext for snorkeling?[3]

    b. Yes or no: Are you confident none of the "official" business associated with Director Patel's travel via the FBI's aircraft has been a pretext for attending the Olympics?[4]

    c. Yes or no: Are you confident none of the "official" business associated with Director Patel's travel via the FBI's aircraft has been a pretext for visiting his significant other?[5]

[3] https://www.nytimes.com/2026/05/15/us/politics/patel-fbi-travel-snorkeling-pearl-harbor.html.
[4] https://www.nytimes.com/2026/02/24/us/politics/kash-patel-fbi-olympics-milan.html.
[5] https://www.nytimes.com/2025/04/20/us/politics/kash-patel-spotlight-fbi-director.html; https://www.nytimes.com/2026/05/15/us/politics/patel-fbi-travel-snorkeling-pearl-harbor.html.

d. Yes or no: Are you confident none of the "official" business associated with Director Patel's travel via the FBI's aircraft has been a pretext for attending professional sporting events?[6]

e. Yes or no: Are you confident none of the "official" business associated with Director Patel's travel via the FBI's aircraft has been a pretext for visiting hunting lodges?[7]

RESPONSE: Official use of FBI aircraft is governed by applicable rules and is subject to appropriate review. I am not going to answer these questions on a yes-or-no basis based on media characterizations. To the extent there are questions about specific travel, they are properly addressed through the Department's and the Bureau's review processes. This response applies to subparts (a) through (e).

14. Yes or no: Are you confident Director Patel has not had any "episodes of excessive drinking and unexplained absences" during his tenure as FBI Director?

RESPONSE: I am not going to certify, on a yes-or-no basis, matters that are the subject of liberal media reporting and that would be appropriately addressed through the Department's review processes.

15. Yes or no: Are you sure Director Patel knows what he's doing as FBI Director?

RESPONSE: I have confidence in Director Patel's leadership of the FBI.

16. Yes or no: Do you vouch for Director Patel as FBI Director?

RESPONSE: I have expressed my confidence in Director Patel, and I continue to have full faith in his leadership of the Bureau.

17. Did President Trump ask for the tax amnesty and legal immunity provisions in the May 19, 2026, addendum to the purported settlement agreement in *Trump v. IRS*?

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, I did not discuss this matter with President Trump or his personal counsel prior to the execution of the settlement agreement or the May 19, 2026, release.

a. Did you otherwise discuss these provisions with President Trump? If so, describe that discussion in detail.

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 17.

b. Did you discuss any of the tax amnesty and legal immunity provisions with President Trump's lawyers? If so, with whom?

[6] https://www.cbsnews.com/news/patel-fbi-director-government-jet/.
[7] https://www.wsj.com/politics/policy/kash-patel-private-jet-flights-fbi-197da8fd.

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 17.

c. Did you discuss any of the tax amnesty and legal immunity provisions with anyone at the White House? If so, with whom?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may to have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

d. Did you discuss the tax amnesty and legal immunity provisions with Secretary Bessent?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

e. Did you discuss the tax amnesty and legal immunity provisions with anyone else at the Treasury Department? If so, with whom?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

f. Did you discuss the tax amnesty and legal immunity provisions with IRS CEO Frank Bisignano?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

g. Did you discuss the tax amnesty and legal immunity provisions with anyone else at the IRS? If so, with whom?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

h. Which DOJ personnel negotiated the tax amnesty and legal immunity provisions in the May 19, 2026, addendum?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

i. Who drafted the tax amnesty and legal immunity provisions?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

j. What is the status of DOJ's and the IRS's implementation of the May 19, 2026, addendum?

RESPONSE: I can speak only on behalf of the Department of Justice. As I testified at my confirmation hearing, as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed, no funds have been transferred, no claims have been received, and no claims have been paid. No further action has been taken and the Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

18. Did the IRS transmit to DOJ the 25-page memo outlining defenses to President Trump's claims in *Trump v. IRS* (hereinafter "the IRS defense memo")?

RESPONSE: I do not have personal knowledge sufficient to respond to this question.

a. Did you read the IRS defense memo? Who at DOJ read the IRS defense memo?

RESPONSE: I have not read the memo you reference, although as I testified at my confirmation hearing I am generally familiar with it.

19. On July 13, 2026, the court in *Trump v. IRS* noted that the IRS—represented by DOJ—"never appeared, never challenged Plaintiffs' claims, and never filed a single pleading," that DOJ "abdicat[ed] its responsibility to zealously defend the interests of the United States," and "has remained conspicuously absent and silent when serious questions about this matter have been raised."

a. Why has DOJ chosen not to file an appearance or submit anything in the case, despite the court's opening an inquiry as to whether the parties, including agencies represented by DOJ, committed a fraud on the court? Please provide any and all documents related to the decision to file no pleadings.

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

b. Did you know in advance of its filing that President Trump's lawyers would be filing a suit against the IRS?

RESPONSE: I did not.

c. Did you discuss DOJ's decision not to defend the IRS, nor challenge President Trump's claims, nor make any appearance or file any pleading in the case, with President Trump's lawyers?

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, I have not had any communications with President Trump's lawyers concerning this matter.

d. Did you discuss the plaintiffs' pleadings or posture in the case with President Trump's lawyers?

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, I have not had any communications with President Trump's lawyers concerning this matter.

e. Please provide all correspondence between DOJ and plaintiffs' counsel in *Trump v. IRS*.

RESPONSE: The matter you reference is currently the subject of ongoing litigation, as such it would be inappropriate for me to comment or otherwise commit to doing anything related to the same.

f. Please provide all documents related to the court's "fraud on the court" inquiry.

RESPONSE: The matter you reference is currently the subject of ongoing litigation, as such it would be inappropriate for me to comment or otherwise commit to doing anything related to the same.

g. Please specify exactly what information or evidence led you to believe, as you stated at your nomination hearing, that the *Trump v. IRS* case was in active litigation because of the parties' intended appeals?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

20. At your hearing, in response to questions regarding the bribery investigation into Tom Homan, you said you were "not aware of what" I was referring to and "know nothing about" public reporting that as part of, an investigation, the FBI provided $50,000 to Tom Homan in the form of a bribe. In September 2025, you and FBI Director Patel issued a joint statement to the media acknowledging the existence of a DOJ investigation into Tom Homan and that the investigation was closed under this administration.

a. Why did you say you were not aware of the investigation?

RESPONSE: My testimony at the hearing accurately reflected my familiarity with the specific reporting referenced at that time. As reflected in the September 2025 statement, the matter originated under the previous administration, was subjected to a full review by FBI agents and Department prosecutors, and was closed after that review found no credible evidence of any criminal wrongdoing.

b. Why did you say you were not aware of the public reporting around the investigation?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 20(a).

c. Have you or anyone in your office asked the FBI whether that $50,000 was returned to the FBI? If so, was the $50,000 returned to the FBI?

RESPONSE: Consistent with longstanding Department policy, it would be inappropriate for me to discuss non-public investigative information or any internal and confidential deliberations.

d. Please provide any records documenting the release and any return of the $50,000.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 20(c). The Department's Office of Legislative Affairs will work with the Committee through the established accommodation process regarding any records requests.

21. On February 7, 2026, the New York Times reported that senior officials at DOJ and the FBI told career prosecutors at the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Minnesota to stop pursuing a civil rights investigation into Agent Jonathan Ross's use of force in Renee Good's death. Instead, senior DOJ officials reportedly suggested that prosecutors open an alternative investigation into whether Ms. Good criminally assaulted Agent Ross, or whether Ms. Good's widow was connected to protest groups. DOJ and FBI also reportedly barred DOJ officials from assisting the Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension with its own investigation or proceeding with a joint investigation.

a. Who at DOJ and FBI ordered the stop of the use-of-force investigation?

RESPONSE: The Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General is investigating the death of Ms. Good, and the Department of Justice is providing support and legal process as necessary. It would be inappropriate for me to discuss any further details of an ongoing investigation.

b. Who at DOJ and FBI suggested that an investigation be opened into whether Ms. Good assaulted Agent Ross?

RESPONSE: Please see the answer to Question 21(a).

i. What is the status of this investigation?

RESPONSE: Please see the answer to Question 21(a).

c. Who at DOJ and FBI suggested that an investigation be opened into Ms. Good's widow?

RESPONSE: To my knowledge, there is not an active investigation into Ms. Good's widow, though if there were, it would be inappropriate to discuss any details of an investigation.

i. What is the status of this investigation?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 21(c).

d. Who at DOJ and FBI prohibited DOJ officials from assisting the Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension with its own investigation or proceeding with a joint investigation?

RESPONSE: As with any investigation, federal law enforcement will work with State and locals in the appropriate way. DHS OIG, FBI, and the U.S. Attorney's office have and will run these investigations professionally and in appropriate coordination with State and local partners

i. Are there, or have there ever been, standing orders prohibiting DOJ officials from permitting Minnesota state investigators to access evidence and conduct their own investigations? If so, please describe the orders and who gave them.

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 21(d).

e. Are there any ongoing civil rights investigations into Agent Ross's use of force?

RESPONSE: As Agent Ross is an employee of the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General is handling the investigation of this incident.

22. Why did Thomas Albus, a U.S. Attorney in Missouri, issue a search warrant for election records in Fulton County, Georgia?

RESPONSE: U.S. Attorneys may *apply* for search warrants, but it is a magistrate judge, a member of the Judicial Branch, that reviews the search warrant application for probable cause, and upon finding such probable cause that evidence of a crime exists in a specific location, *signs* and *issues* the search warrant. A U.S. Attorney's Office in another district may seek legal process in another district. Finally, 28 U.S.C. § 515 expressly authorizes a United States Attorney to conduct any kind of legal proceeding – criminal or civil – in a district where the U.S. Attorney lacks residence.

a. Why was the U.S. Attorney in the relevant jurisdiction for Fulton County not the originator of the search warrant?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 22(a).

23. Why was then-DNI Tulsi Gabbard present at the seizure of election records in Fulton County?

RESPONSE: I cannot comment on any ongoing investigation at the Department beyond what is available in public DOJ filings, and I hereby rest on the positions of the United States filed in any such public DOJ filings. This question would best be directed to the Office of the ODNI.

24. Why did the Special Agent in Charge of the Atlanta field office leave the office shortly before the seizure of election records in Fulton County? Please provide any documents related to his departure.

RESPONSE: I cannot comment on internal personnel decisions.

25. Why did the office of Dan Bishop, a U.S. Attorney in North Carolina, issue a subpoena for the names and personal contact information for every 2020 election worker in Fulton County, Georgia?

RESPONSE: It is not appropriate for me to comment on the details of any ongoing investigations, especially involving grand jury subpoenas, or pending litigation, both of which are implicated by this question. Finally, 28 U.S.C. § 515 expressly authorizes a United States Attorney to conduct any kind of legal proceeding – criminal or civil – in a district where the U.S. Attorney lacks residence.

26. Have you directed anyone at DOJ to coordinate your meetings with Epstein survivors? If yes, please provide the name of the individual. If not, why not?

RESPONSE: In addition to previous meetings DOJ leadership and officials have had with victims and their counsel, I met with several victims of Jeffrey Epstein and their counsel on July 16, 2026, including Dani Bensky who testified at my confirmation hearing. I remain committed to engaging with victims of Jeffrey Epstein through appropriate legal channels. Further, my National Coordinator for Child Exploitation and Human Trafficking is available to meet with any victim and their counsel. She provided her contact information to any victim or their counsel who requested it at the meeting.

a. What system exists at DOJ to connect with and conduct systematic intakes of Epstein survivors for investigative leads? Please describe in detail.

RESPONSE: The Department utilizes established victim-witness programs, including coordinators in U.S. Attorney's Offices and the FBI's Victim Services Division, to connect with Epstein survivors and systematically intake information for investigative leads. This includes dedicated tiplines, outreach following file releases, and coordination with victims' counsel to facilitate safe, confidential reporting.

b. DOJ maintains victim assistance personnel; who is assigned to Epstein survivors? From what office?

RESPONSE: My National Coordinator for Child Exploitation and Human Trafficking from the Office of the Deputy Attorney General is available to meet with any victim and their counsel. Additionally, each FBI and U.S. Attorney's Office has their own victim/witness personnel to assist with any issues.

27. Before her transfer to Federal Prison Camp (FPC) Bryan, did you or anyone else from your office discuss with Ghislaine Maxwell or her attorneys the possibility of her transfer to a minimum-security facility? If so, with whom?

RESPONSE: The Department learned about the threats against Ms. Maxwell from her and her counsel. I was not involved in any discussions with BOP about Ms. Maxwell's transfer.

a. Did you or anyone from your office approve Ghislaine Maxwell's transfer to FPC Bryan or otherwise approve her transfer to a facility other than FCI Tallahassee?

RESPONSE: The Office of Deputy Attorney General oversees the day-to-day operations of the Department, including all components and agencies. This includes oversight of the Bureau of Prisons. Ms. Maxwell was transferred after the DOJ and BOP learned about threats made against her at FCI Tallahassee.

b. Did you or anyone from your office direct or request that someone from BOP transfer Ghislaine Maxwell from FCI Tallahassee?

RESPONSE: The Department learned about the threats against Ms. Maxwell from her and her counsel. The DOJ, in consultation with BOP, ensured that the threats against Ms. Maxwell were handled appropriately consistent with BOP practice to ensure inmate safety and facility security.

c. Did you or anyone from your office direct or request that someone from BOP seek a waiver of Public Safety Factors associated with Ghislaine Maxwell to facilitate her transfer from FCI Tallahassee?

RESPONSE: I was not involved in any discussions with BOP about Ms. Maxwell's transfer.

d. When did you first learn of Ghislaine Maxwell's transfer to FPC Bryan?

RESPONSE: I learned about Maxwell's transfer to FPC Bryan through public reporting after it occurred.

e. On what date was Ghislaine Maxwell transferred to FPC Bryan?

RESPONSE: I do not have personal knowledge on which date Maxwell transferred to FPC Bryan. Based on public reporting, I understand that the transfer occurred in July 2025.

f. Since 2017, how many individuals who were convicted of conspiracy to entice minors to travel to engage in illegal sex acts has BOP transferred from a low-security facility to a minimum-security facility?

RESPONSE: The BOP makes individualized classification and transfer decisions based on security designation, Program Statement 5100.08, and inmate-specific factors rather than broad categories of offense. Specific statistics on transfer for individuals are not aggregated or publicly released to ensure privacy protection and operational security. That data can be requested through appropriate channels, subject to applicable exemptions.

g. Since 2017, how many individuals who were convicted of conspiracy to transport minors to participate in illegal sexual activity has BOP transferred from a low-security facility to a minimum-security facility?

RESPONSE: See response to Question 27(f).

h. Since 2017, how many individuals who were convicted of transporting a minor with intent to engage in illegal sexual activity has BOP transferred from a low-security facility to a minimum-security facility?

RESPONSE: See response to Question 27(f).

i. Since 2017, how many individuals who were convicted of sex trafficking conspiracy has BOP transferred from a low-security facility to a minimum-security facility?

RESPONSE: See response to Question 27(f).

j. Since 2017, how many individuals who were convicted of sex trafficking of a minor has BOP transferred from a low-security facility to a minimum-security facility?

RESPONSE: See response to Question 27(f).

k. Please provide all communications or correspondence between DOJ and Ms. Maxwell's lawyer related to your interview and her transfer.

RESPONSE: Every word of my interview was recorded and transcribed and is now available for the public to review.

28. On May 6, 2026, BOP Director Marshall approved a Change Notice related to Program Statement 5100.08, stating that the Attorney General, "in certain circumstances," "may exercise authority to designate or redesignate the place of a prisoner's imprisonment, consistent with the requirements of 18 U.S.C. § 3631(b)."

    a. Did you or anyone from your office request this Change Notice? If so, please note each individual involved, the date the discussion occurred, and why the request was made.

    RESPONSE: I did not personally request any change notice to BOP Program Statement 5100.08. Any police or classification updates are handled through standard BOP processes by career professionals based on operational needs.

    b. On what date did you first become aware that BOP was going to or had issued this Change Notice?

    RESPONSE: Early May 2026.

    c. Have you exercised your authority to designate or redesignate the place of a prisoner's imprisonment? If so, with respect to whom, on what date, and why? Did BOP provide any recommendation or other information with respect to that individual before you exercised your authority? If so, please provide that recommendation or information.

    RESPONSE: As Acting Attorney General, I have not personally exercised authority to designate or redesignate the place of imprisonment for any specific prisoner. I have informed certain inmates currently housed on death row at USP Terre Haute whose sentences were commuted by President Biden that I am considering transferring them, but I have not made any final decisions.

29. With respect to the Epstein Files Transparency Act, DOJ initially withheld, and then subsequently published, some but not all documents related to the FBI's 2019 interviews of a woman who alleged that President Trump assaulted her when she was around 13, after being introduced to her by Jeffrey Epstein.

    a. When did you first learn of these allegations against President Trump?

    RESPONSE: I became aware of various allegations involving high-profile individuals through public reporting and in the course of the Department's comprehensive efforts to release Epstein files. The files contained a wide range of historical information, much of it unverified or previously known, which the Department processed for release under EFTA.

    b. When did you first learn that DOJ intended to or had refused to publish documents related to these allegations?

RESPONSE: The Department has produced all known responsive records under the EFTA.

c. Did you ever direct someone to withhold files or notify you or your office regarding files that relate to Jeffrey Epstein and that mention or relate to President Trump? If so, when, and to whom did you give that direction?

RESPONSE: The Department has produced all known responsive records under the EFTA.

d. Did anyone from your office ever direct someone not to publish, or to notify you or your office regarding, files that relate to Jeffrey Epstein and that mention or relate to President Trump? If so when, who gave that direction, and to whom did they give that direction?

RESPONSE: The Department has produced all known responsive records under the EFTA.

e. Please provide the FBI interview notes related to these allegations.

RESPONSE: The Department has produced all known responsive records under the EFTA.

f. Did the FBI or DOJ ever obtain photographs described as in Jeffrey Epstein's safe of Donald Trump with females?

RESPONSE: The Department has produced all known responsive records under the EFTA.

g. Has President Trump asserted executive privilege with respect to any documents covered by the Epstein Files Transparency Act? If so, on what date and with respect to which documents?

RESPONSE: No.

30. DOJ attorneys have been referred for disciplinary proceedings in the Rhode Island District Court for misconduct in *In Re: Administrative Subpoena 25-1431-032 to Rhode Island Hospital*, C.A. No. 1:26-mc-00007-MSM-AEM (D. R.I. May 13, 2026). According to a statement by DOJ, DOJ's Civil Division, rather than the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR), conducted an internal review of the attorneys' actions, which is highly unusual.

    a. Please explain the basis for the Civil Division's determination that accusations regarding the DOJ's attorneys' conduct "are without merit."

RESPONSE: As a general matter, the Department cannot confirm or deny the existence of internal reviews or investigations.

b. Why did the Civil Division review the attorneys' conduct rather than OPR?

RESPONSE: The Department treats all allegations of misconduct seriously. As such, the Civil Division deemed it appropriate to review the allegations against its attorneys. The Department cannot comment on the existence or nonexistence of an OPR investigation.

c. Is OPR going to conduct a review of the attorneys' misconduct? If not, why not?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 30(b).

31. Since your confirmation to be Deputy Attorney General:

a. How many DOJ attorneys have been subject to contempt of court inquiries?

RESPONSE: I am aware of several such inquiries.

b. How many DOJ attorneys have been held in contempt?

RESPONSE: I am aware of two such instances.

c. How many DOJ attorneys have been investigated, or referred for investigation, by courts for misconduct?

RESPONSE: I am aware of several such instances.

d. How many DOJ attorneys have had bar complaints filed against them?

RESPONSE: I am aware of several such instances.

32. Please describe any internal review or investigation DOJ conducted in response to each of the following assertions by federal judges regarding DOJ attorneys' conduct:

a. "[I]n pursuing the Subpoena, the DOJ is engaged in an 'arbitrary fishing expedition,' such that the Subpoena is unreasonable and must be quashed." *Fulton Cnty. Bd. of Registration & Elections v. United States*, No. 1:26-cv-02777, slip op. at 16 (N.D. Ga. July 7, 2026).

b. "[T]he Government has produced essentially zero evidence to suspect Chair Powell of a crime; indeed, its justifications are so thin and unsubstantiated that the Court can only conclude that they are pretextual." *In re Grand Jury Subpoenas*, No. 1:26-mc-00012, slip op. at 26 (D.D.C. Mar. 11, 2026).

c. "[S]uch a characterization is at best disingenuous, and at worst flatly contradictory to the record." *Am. Fed'n of Gov't Emps. v. Trump*, 139 F.4th 1020, 1033 (9th Cir. 2025).

d. "Defendants' objection reflects a willful and bad faith refusal to comply with discovery obligations." *Abrego Garcia v. Noem*, No. 8:25-cv-00951, slip op. at 2 (D. Md. Apr. 22, 2025).

RESPONSE: The Department cannot confirm or deny the existence of internal reviews or investigations.

33. Who currently leads the Office of Professional Responsibility?

RESPONSE: The Office of Professional Responsibility is headed by a Counsel, appointed by and reporting to the Attorney General or, as appropriate, the Deputy Attorney General, under 28 C.F.R. § 0.39. The Counsel currently leading the Office is vacant and run by the deputy.

a. How many people are currently employed in the Office of Professional Responsibility?

RESPONSE: 16 employees are currently assigned to the Office of Professional Responsibility.

b. How many people were employed in the Office of Professional Responsibility on January 19, 2025?

RESPONSE: I was not employed at the Department in January 2025 and am not aware.

c. How many cases does OPR have open?

RESPONSE: OPR handles a significant caseload of attorney misconduct matters, but the precise number of currently open cases is not publicly disclosed to protect ongoing investigations and privacy.

d. How many cases has OPR opened since January 20, 2025?

RESPONSE: OPR has opened numerous cases since January 20, 2025. The exact figures are internal and not publicly released to avoid compromising active matters.

34. On February 5, 2025, former Attorney General Bondi disbanded Task Force KleptoCapture, the Kleptocracy Team, and the Kleptocracy Asset Recovery Initiative.

a. Did anyone direct former Attorney General Bondi to close these initiatives? If so, who?

RESPONSE: I do not know.

b. Did DOJ conduct any review of the task forces and initiatives before closing them?

RESPONSE: In accordance with applicable Department policies and regulations, the Department regularly reviews the work of its attorneys and personnel, and, as appropriate, takes steps to improve efficiencies to support Department attorneys and their investigations and prosecutions.

c. In 2022, Congress specifically appropriated $67 million to support the work of Task Force KleptoCapture. Please describe the current status of the funds, including any unspent amounts.

RESPONSE: Based on my understanding, as of June 30, 2026, the Department had obligated $47.9 million of the $67 million appropriated by Congress.

35. On March 20, 2025, I sent a letter urging DOJ to abandon—or, in the alternative, provide a briefing on—reported efforts to "slash" DOJ's Public Integrity Section and eliminate its ability to oversee investigations or prosecutions. On July 14, 2026, DOJ provided a response that neither addressed these reported changes nor offered a briefing.

a. Please describe the present status and staffing of, and provide a briefing on changes to, the Public Integrity Section implemented since January 20, 2025?

RESPONSE: The Department continues to vigorously investigate and prosecute the full spectrum of federal criminal law, including crimes affecting government integrity. This is accomplished primarily through U.S. Attorney's Offices nationwide, working in partnership as necessary with the Public Integrity Section, which remains a component within the Department's Criminal Division.

36. Please provide a list of all provisions of Justice Manual Section 9-85.000, Protection of Government Integrity, that DOJ has rescinded since January 20, 2025, are being reviewed for possible revision, or are currently being revised.

RESPONSE: There are no provisions under Section 9.85.000 that have been rescinded since January 20, 2025. The Department is reviewing the Justice Manual (JM) in its entirety to update and revise as necessary to be consistent with current law and Administration priorities. In addition, as noted below, the consultation requirement set forth in JM 9.85-210 is suspended pending review by DOJ leadership.

a. Does DOJ policy still require consultation with the Public Integrity Section in all investigations involving a member of Congress or congressional staff member? If not, please provide a copy of the relevant policy currently in effect.

RESPONSE: Yes, pursuant to JM 9-85.110.

b. DOJ's website says "Department leadership is currently revising" a section of the Justice Manual requiring consultation with the Public Integrity Section in federal criminal matters involving campaign finance violations and crimes or corruption of the election process. According to the website, "The Consultation Requirement is suspended while revisions are ongoing. [June 2025]."

i. What revisions are being made or have been made to this provision?

RESPONSE: To date, no revisions have been made to this section of the Justice Manual. As noted above, the entire Justice Manual is being reviewed in its entirety and will be revised to reflect current law and Administration policy.

ii. Why did DOJ suspend the consultation requirement before the revision has been completed?
RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to discuss internal DOJ deliberations. In general, however, the Department takes the view that prosecutors throughout the Department and in the United States Attorneys' Offices possess the ability to investigate and prosecute crimes in accordance with long standing principles of federal prosecution set forth in the JM 9-27.000. Several prior consultation and approval requirements such as approval to seek racketeering (RICO and VICAR) charges against cartels and transnational criminal organizations (TCO) were suspended to allow prosecutors the ability to charge their cases in accordance with the principles of federal prosecution. *See e.g.,* Total Elimination of Cartels and Transnational Criminal Organizations.

37. Who prepared the materials that former Attorney General Bondi used at her October 7, 2025, oversight hearing before the Committee and that contained background information on and insults of Committee members?

RESPONSE: Former Attorney General Bondi is no longer with the Department and would presumably have the best first-hand knowledge of this question. Furthermore, consistent with longstanding Department policy and practice, DOJ does not identify individual staff members involved in internal deliberative work or disclose internal deliberations, absent extraordinary circumstances not present here.

38. When will the Committee receive responses to Questions for the Record submitted to Director Patel following his September 2025 oversight hearing?

RESPONSE: The Department's Office of Legislative Affairs and the FBI's Office of Congressional Affairs have been working together to ensure these move through the applicable clearance processes and hope to submit them soon.

39. During your tenure as Deputy Attorney General or Acting Attorney General, have you ever discussed any matters currently before a grand jury with any person who is not authorized by law or DOJ policy to be aware of that information?

    RESPONSE: No.

40. On December 6, 2025, FBI Director Patel said on Fox News: "So, we have multiple teams, we've built squads for Russiagate and Arctic Frost and we're using the grand jury process and we're issuing, I think we're up to 75 or 110 subpoenas already. For witnesses, that's what you target first." He later said, "I've launched this investigation in multiple jurisdictions, and I can tell you that cause I got the permission of the Attorney General to tell you that."

    a. Did you authorize Director Patel to disclose the existence of ongoing grand jury investigations? If no, is Director Patel otherwise authorized by law or DOJ policy to disclose the existence of an ongoing grand jury investigation?

       RESPONSE: The Department is committed to protecting the secrecy of grand jury proceedings as required by Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e). It would not be appropriate for me to confirm, deny, or discuss the existence or conduct of any grand jury investigation, and I will not characterize Director Patel's public statements. Matters occurring before a grand jury are protected from disclosure under Rule 6(e).

    b. Did you authorize Director Patel to disclose the existence and number of subpoenas issued as part of ongoing grand jury investigations? If no, is Director Patel otherwise authorized by law or DOJ policy to disclose the existence and number of subpoenas issued as part of ongoing grand jury investigations?

       RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 40(a).

41. Will your U.S. Attorneys fulfill their duty to bring before a grand jury any referrals for criminal contempt of Congress pursuant to 2 U.S.C. § 194?

    RESPONSE: The Department of Justice will prosecute cases as the relevant facts, circumstances, and applicable law warrant.

42. Will DOJ comply with subpoenas issued by congressional committees to DOJ or DOJ officials?

RESPONSE: The Department will respond appropriately to duly issued congressional subpoenas, consistent with its legal, ethical, court-imposed, constitutional, and national security obligations.

a. Is the November 4, 1982, Presidential Memorandum on "Procedures Governing Responses to Congressional Requests for Information" still in effect?

RESPONSE: Yes, presidential memoranda typically remain in effect until rescinded, superseded, or modified.

43. At your nomination hearing to be Deputy Attorney General, you told Senator Tillis that "lawfare" by DOJ against political enemies would end with you.

a. Were you in any way involved in, or did you approve, DOJ's criminal investigation into the Federal Reserve and then-Federal Reserve Chair Jerome Powell?

RESPONSE: As U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia Jeanine Pirro stated publicly, the Department of Justice has closed this investigation as the Federal Reserve's Office of Inspector General has opened an internal investigation. As is normal practice, the Department will impartially review any criminal referral made by any OIG across the federal government.

b. Were you in any way involved in, or did you approve, DOJ's criminal investigation into Federal Reserve Governor Lisa Cook?

RESPONSE: I cannot confirm or deny the existence of ongoing investigations. I cannot comment on any ongoing criminal prosecutions beyond what is stated in public DOJ filings and hereby incorporate the positions of the United States stated in these public DOJ filings.

c. Were you in any way involved in, or did you approve, DOJ's criminal investigation into New York Attorney General Letitia James?

RESPONSE: *U.S. v. Letitia James*, a criminal case filed in the Eastern District of Virginia (EDVA), is pending litigation in the Fourth Circuit. I cannot comment on an ongoing litigation at the Department of Justice beyond what is available in public DOJ filings and hereby incorporate the positions of the United States from said filings in this response.

d. Were you in any way involved in, or did you approve, DOJ's criminal investigation into Senator Adam Schiff?

RESPONSE: I cannot confirm or deny the existence of ongoing investigations.

e. Were you in any way involved in, or did you approve, DOJ's criminal investigation into Senator Mark Kelly, Senator Elissa Slotkin, Congresswoman Maggie Goodlander, Congressman Jason Crow, Congresswoman Chrissy Houlahan, and Congressman Chris DeLuzio?

RESPONSE: I cannot confirm or deny the existence of ongoing investigations.

f. Were you in any way involved in, or did you approve, DOJ's criminal investigation into Georgia District Attorney Fani Willis?

RESPONSE: I cannot confirm or deny the existence of ongoing investigations.

g. Were you in any way involved in, or did you approve, DOJ's criminal investigation into California Governor Gavin Newsom?

RESPONSE: I cannot confirm or deny the existence of ongoing investigations.

h. Were you in any way involved in, or did you approve, DOJ's criminal investigation into former FBI Director James Comey?

RESPONSE: *United States v. James Comey*, 4:26-cr-00016, is an ongoing federal criminal prosecution in the Eastern District of North Carolina (EDNC). A federal grand jury in EDNC returned an indictment against Mr. Comey for knowingly and willfully making a threat to take the life of, and to inflict bodily harm upon the President of the United States, and for knowingly transmitting a communication in interstate commerce that contained a threat to injure the person of another. I cannot comment on an ongoing criminal prosecution at the Department of Justice beyond what is available in public DOJ filings and hereby incorporate the positions of the United States from said filings in this response.

i. Were you in any way involved in, or did you approve, DOJ's criminal investigation into former CIA Director John Brennan?

RESPONSE: I cannot confirm or deny the existence of ongoing investigations. I cannot comment on any ongoing criminal prosecutions beyond what is stated in public DOJ filings.

44. Has President Trump asked, signaled, or ordered you to open any investigation or take any investigative steps related to any specific individual or company?

RESPONSE: I will not comment on communications with President Trump, if any, as they are privileged. All investigative and prosecutorial decisions made by Department attorneys are in accordance with the facts and the law.

45. Have you or any members of your office ordered, or approved, the opening of any grand jury investigation after being asked to do so by the President or any member of his staff?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 44.

46. Were Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) officials involved in the termination of 373 Office of Justice Programs (OJP) grant awards last year? If so, who, and did they provide to DOJ the list of grant awards to terminate?

    RESPONSE: The Department made grant termination decisions consistent with applicable law, Department policy, and the Administration's priorities.

    a. Did any OJP official approve those terminations? If so, who?

       RESPONSE: The Department made grant termination decisions consistent with applicable law, Department policy, and the Administration's priorities.

47. In April 2026, DOJ fired at least four AUSAs who prosecuted abortion clinic obstruction cases under the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances (FACE) Act.

    a. How many new FACE Act prosecutions involving abortion clinic access has DOJ pursued since January 20, 2025?

       RESPONSE: The Civil Rights Division has one active criminal case under the FACE Act: *United States v. Armstrong*, Case No. 0:26-cr-00025-LMP-DLM (D. Minn.).

    b. How many FACE Act prosecutions that were ongoing as of January 20, 2025, has DOJ dropped as of July 17, 2026?

       RESPONSE: To my understanding, none. Before I started at the Department, a memorandum directed that three civil FACE Act cases be dismissed.

    c. How many new FACE Act prosecutions has DOJ pursued overall since January 20, 2025?

       RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 47(a).

48. Please provide copies of any memorandums of understanding, policy manuals, or any other guidance or documentation reflecting the requirements, policies, or procedures of any Homeland Security Task Forces in which DOJ has agreed to participate.

    RESPONSE: Information regarding Homeland Security Task Forces is available at https://hstf.gov/.

Please answer the following outstanding Questions for the Record from the October 7, 2026, DOJ oversight hearing.

1. On what date did DOJ close the investigation into Tom Homan for accepting $50,000 from undercover FBI agents?

   RESPONSE: Consistent with longstanding Department policy, it would be inappropriate for me to disclose non-public information regarding investigative matters, including internal close-out or declination memoranda, which reflect the Department's confidential deliberations.

   a. Please produce copies of any close-out memoranda, reports, declination memos, or other records related to closing this investigation.

      RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 1(a). The Department's Office of Legislative Affairs will work with the Committee through the established accommodation process regarding any records requests.

   b. Were you personally involved in the decision to close this investigation? Who was?

      RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 1.

      i. Did you speak with President Trump or anyone else at the White House about this investigation? If so, provide the names of the individuals to whom you spoke, detail what was discussed, and produce copies of any written communications.

         RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to disclose the occurrence or substance of any confidential deliberations, including any communications with the White House, regarding any matter.

2. What became of the $50,000 that Tom Homan accepted from undercover FBI agents in 2024? If he returned it, when did he?

   RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 1.

   a. Did Homan declare this money on his 2024 tax returns? Did anyone ask?

      RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 1.

   b. Federal law (26 U.S.C. § 6103(i)) and section 9-13.900 of the Justice Manual allow federal prosecutors access to tax-return information in a criminal investigation. Did DOJ seek access to Homan's 2024 tax returns? Please produce a copy of any applications for access to Homan's tax returns and any court order granting or denying access.

      RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 1. The Department's Office of Legislative Affairs will work with the Committee through the established accommodation process regarding any records requests.

c. Did FBI agents record their interaction with Homan when he accepted the $50,000? If so, please produce any recording.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 1. The Department's Office of Legislative Affairs will work with the Committee through the established accommodation process regarding any records requests.

3. On February 27, 2025, Senator Blumenthal and I submitted an ethics complaint to the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) concerning Emil Bove's conduct in dismissing pending federal charges against New York Mayor Eric Adams.

a. Did OPR conduct a review of this complaint?

RESPONSE: The Office of Professional Responsibility conducts its work independently and maintains the confidentiality of its processes. Consistent with longstanding Department practice, it would be inappropriate for me to confirm, deny, or characterize any OPR matter.

b. Did OPR initiate an inquiry based on this complaint?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 3(a).

c. Did OPR initiate an investigation based on this complaint?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 3(a).

d. Did OPR interview or request any information from Emil Bove related to this complaint?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to question 3(a).

e. Did OPR interview or request any information from any witnesses related to this complaint? If so, please identify each witness.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 3(a).

f. Did OPR undertake any investigative action related to this complaint, such as obtaining documents?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 3(a).

g. Did OPR reach any conclusions with respect to this complaint? If so, please produce any documentation memorializing or supporting those conclusions.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 3(a).

h. OPR's website says that "OPR publicly discloses . . . summaries of completed investigations." Did OPR prepare such a summary with respect to this complaint? If so, please produce a copy.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to question 3.a. The Department's Office of Legislative Affairs will continue to work with the Committee through the established accommodation process regarding any records requests.

4. FBI Director Kash Patel testified to the Committee that his 2022 grand jury testimony was "sealed by the Department of Justice" but that he has since "worked with the Department of Justice" to "publicly" release a transcript of his testimony.

   a. How and when was Director Patel's grand jury testimony sealed, and by whom? Please produce any court order or other directive "sealing" this testimony.

   RESPONSE: The Department's Office of Legislative Affairs can work with you to provide information responsive to this oversight letter.

   b. How and when was Director Patel's grand jury testimony "publicly" released, and by whom? Please produce any order or document reflecting public release of this testimony.

   RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 4(a).

5. Former Attorney General Bondi testified regarding Director Patel's grand jury testimony, "If it is released publicly, we will get you a copy." Please produce the transcript of Director Patel's grand jury testimony.

   RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 4(a).

6. Federal anti-money laundering suspicious activity reports (SARs) are filed with the Treasury Department and available to DOJ. Senate Finance Committee staff review of Treasury documents showed more than 4,725 wire transfers totaling $1.08 billion involving Jeffrey Epstein and his associates between 2003 and 2019.

   a. How many SARs related to those transactions involving Jeffrey Epstein did DOJ review or investigate during your tenure?

   RESPONSE: The FBI pursued all investigative leads in its investigations into Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell. If any evidence is provided to the Department suggesting a federal crime occurred, the Department will investigate and prosecute that matter.

7. Did DOJ or the FBI obtain photos (such as those described by author Michael Wolff) of Donald Trump with topless young women?

RESPONSE: The Department has produced all known responsive records under the EFTA.

8. Former Attorney General Bondi testified at her nomination hearing that "I will meet with White House Counsel, and I will meet with the appropriate officials and follow the contacts policy."

    a. Did former Attorney General Bondi have that meeting with the White House Counsel? If so, on what date and who attended?

    RESPONSE: I am not in a position to confirm the meetings of my predecessor.

    b. Have you had a meeting with the White House Counsel regarding the contacts policy? If so, on what date and who attended?

    RESPONSE: I am familiar with and adhere to the Department's policy governing communications with the White House.

    c. Is DOJ adhering to a White House contacts policy? If so, what is that policy?

    RESPONSE: The Department adheres to the Attorney General's policy currently in force governing contacts between the Department and the White House.

    d. Did former Attorney General Bondi issue, or have you issued, a new DOJ policy governing contacts between DOJ personnel and White House officials?

        i. If so, please produce any memorandum or other document memorializing the policy.

        ii. If not, please produce whatever previous Attorney General's policy governing contacts between DOJ personnel and White House officials remains in force.

        RESPONSE: The governing Attorney General memorandum on White House contacts remains in force, and the Department complies with it.

9. On August 7, 2025, I wrote to BOP Director William Marshall about the circumstances surrounding the transfer of Ghislaine Maxwell. I have not received a response.

    a. Did any Department of Justice officials, including at BOP, consult or notify former Attorney General Bondi before Ms. Maxwell's transfer?

    RESPONSE: I have no personal knowledge of anyone at the Department or BOP notifying former Attorney General Bondi before Maxwell's transfer.

i. If yes, who?

RESPONSE: See subpart (a) above.

ii. Please produce any documents reflecting such communications.

RESPONSE: The Department has produced all known responsive records under the EFTA.

b. Did any DOJ officials, including at BOP, consult or notify you before Ms. Maxwell's transfer?

RESPONSE: I was not involved in any discussions with BOP about Ms. Maxwell's transfer.

i. If yes, who? What did you discuss?

RESPONSE: See subpart (b) above.

ii. Please produce any documents reflecting such communications.

RESPONSE: Requests for documents should be directed to the Department's Office of Legislative Affairs.

10. DOJ has said it intends to consolidate the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) and COPS Office into the Office of Justice Programs (OJP).

a. Please provide any documentation of the legal rationale for consolidating OVW into OJP in conformance with 34 U.S.C. § 10442(b).

RESPONSE: The Office of Legal Counsel evaluated the relevant statutes and authorities and determined that this important government efficiency initiative complies with existing law. OVW will remain a distinct office within the new grants component. It will not merge with OJP.

b. Has DOJ conducted an analysis of the anticipated costs of consolidating OVW and COPS into OJP?

RESPONSE: OVW and COPS are not being merged into OJP. Rather all three will remain separate and distinct inside one new grants entity. The Department has conducted a budget analysis.

i. What costs does DOJ estimate it will incur to consolidate these offices?

RESPONSE: None. See subsection (b).

ii. From what budget account will DOJ pay for those costs?

RESPONSE: None. See subsection (b).

iii. Please produce any cost analyses that DOJ has conducted of its reorganization proposal.

RESPONSE: None. See subsection (b).

c. Does DOJ plan to consolidate grants as well as grantmaking functions?

RESPONSE: The Department will continue to comply with existing statutory mandates related to specific grant programs.

d. Which outside stakeholders, including those who work with or receive assistance from the COPS Office or OVW, did DOJ consult with before announcing this plan?

RESPONSE: The Associate Attorney General recently hosted two webinars with the grants community regarding the Departments consolidation efforts. The Department continues to make outreaches to constituent groups.

Please answer the following outstanding questions from my February 28, 2025, letter regarding the disbanding of Task Force KleptoCapture, the Kleptocracy Team, and Kleptocracy Asset Recovery Initiative.

1. When DOJ disbanded Task Force KleptoCapture, what happened to cases already begun by the Task Force?

   RESPONSE: On February 7, 2025, Attorney General Bondi disbanded Task Force KleptoCapture as part of her Total Elimination of Cartels and Transnational Criminal Organizations (TCOs) Memorandum. Cases were reviewed and handled consistent with administration and Department priorities and policies. The Department remains committed to using its civil and criminal enforcement authorities to investigate, arrest, and prosecute those who seek to evade economic countermeasures, including sanctions and export restrictions.

   a. Please provide a detailed summary of the number of cases pending, their status in litigation, whether forfeiture or consent to forfeiture has been secured, and dollar amount of assets involved for each case.

      RESPONSE: It would not be appropriate for me to comment on pending cases.

2. When DOJ disbanded the Kleptocracy Team and Kleptocracy Asset Recovery Initiative, what happened to cases already begun by the Team and Initiative?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 1.

a. Please provide a detailed summary of the number of cases pending, their status in litigation, whether forfeiture or consent to forfeiture has been secured, and dollar amount of assets involved for each case.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 1(a).

3. Congress specifically appropriated $67 million in 2022 to support the work of Task Force KleptoCapture. Please describe how much, if any, funding remained unspent for the Task Force as of February 5, 2025.

RESPONSE: Based on my understanding, as of June 30, 2026, the Department had obligated $47.9 million of the $67 million appropriated by Congress.

4. Please describe whether the disbanding of Task Force KleptoCapture, the Kleptocracy Team, and the Kleptocracy Asset Recovery Initiative resulted in any reduction in the number of attorneys, investigators, or support staff in any DOJ office or component.

RESPONSE: Tens of thousands of dedicated prosecutors and personnel work at the Department, and oftentimes there is no single driver for staffing and resource considerations. Meanwhile, the Department remains committed to using its civil and criminal enforcement authorities to investigate, arrest, and prosecute those who seek to evade economic countermeasures, including sanctions and export restrictions. Arrests and prosecution will be sought when supported by the facts and the law.

Please answer the following outstanding questions from my March 11, 2025, letter regarding DOJ's investigation of the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund.

1. Before beginning its own investigation, did DOJ or FBI (i) request that Treasury terminate its agreement with Citibank pursuant to the terms of that agreement; or (ii) understand that EPA had requested that Treasury terminate its agreement with Citibank pursuant to the terms of that agreement?

RESPONSE: Under longstanding Department policy, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on the existence or progress of any criminal investigation.

2. Please produce all evidence predicating a criminal investigation of the administration of and distribution of funds from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, including any seizure warrant applications and accompanying affidavits and exhibits.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 1.

3. Did any EPA officials or staff make recommendations to DOJ regarding a criminal investigation into the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 1.

a. If so, who?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 1.

b. Please provide copies of any such recommendations.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 1.

4. Which U.S. Attorney's offices did then-Acting Deputy Attorney General Bove approach to open an investigation or seek a warrant application related to the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund?

RESPONSE: I cannot confirm or deny the existence of an investigation at the Department of Justice.

a. Did any office agree to open such an investigation or move to freeze funds?

RESPONSE: I cannot confirm or deny the existence of an investigation at the Department of Justice.

b. If yes, which office, and who signed off? Please provide all relevant documents.

RESPONSE: I cannot confirm or deny the existence of an investigation at the Department of Justice.

5. Has DOJ obtained a court order freezing grant funds disbursed through the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund?

RESPONSE: The termination of grant funds disbursed through the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund is subject to ongoing litigation before the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. *See Climate United Fund v. Citibank, N.A.*, No. 25-5122 (D.C. Cir.). As such, under longstanding Department policy, it would be inappropriate for me to comment further on matters in pending litigation.

a. If yes, which court and on what grounds?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 5.

b. Please provide a copy of any such order.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 5.

6. Have any DOJ or FBI officials communicated with EPA Administrator Zeldin, EPA Acting Deputy Administrator Chad McIntosh, any persons in the Administrator's or Deputy Administrator's offices, any persons affiliated with the so-called "Department of Government Efficiency," or EPA's Office of Inspector General about investigating the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund? Please provide copies of all such communications.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 1.

7. Please provide copies of all information requests or other correspondence from then-Interim U.S. Attorney Ed Martin to recipients of grants from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund.

   RESPONSE: The matters concerning the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund have been the subject of litigation and investigative activity. It would not be appropriate for me to produce investigative correspondence in this setting.

Please answer the following outstanding questions from the July 28, 2025, letter from Ranking Member Durbin and me regarding your interviews with Ghislaine Maxwell and DOJ's review of files related to Jeffrey Epstein.

1. Please provide a detailed explanation of why DOJ believes Ms. Maxwell would be truthful now after arguing in court about her "willingness to brazenly lie under oath about her conduct." What has changed since this 2020 assessment by the first Trump Administration?

   RESPONSE: Ms. Maxwell provided detailed responses during the interview, and the Department evaluated all information received against the broader record. I cannot comment on the credibility of specific statements to preserve the integrity of any potential further federal actions.

2. Please provide a detailed explanation of what information DOJ believes Ms. Maxwell has that could answer questions and suspicions the public has about Jeffrey Epstein that it did not obtain prior to her 2020 arrest and indictment.

   RESPONSE: An audio recording as well as a written transcript of my interview with Maxwell is available on the DOJ's Epstein library web page. The areas of inquiry speak for themself.

3. Please provide a detailed explanation of why DOJ concluded in the July 7 memorandum that there is "no incriminating 'client list'" before seeking to question Ms. Maxwell.

   RESPONSE: At the time of the release of materials under the Act, the Department possessed no evidence of prosecutorial conduct against individuals under federal law. This Department remains steadfast in its commitment to pursue any and all investigative leads in the Epstein matter and all matters involving child and sex trafficking when there is evidence to suggest a federal crime occurred.

4. Please provide all previous recordings, transcripts, reports of investigations, FD-302s, or other notes from prior interviews of Ms. Maxwell.

RESPONSE: The Department has produced all known responsive records under the EFTA.

5. Please provide the complete terms of the limited immunity proffer to Ms. Maxwell to secure her cooperation with the July 24-25, 2025 interviews.

   RESPONSE: The Department has produced all known responsive records under the EFTA.

6. Please provide a complete description of any other agreement, oral or written, DOJ has entered into with Ms. Maxwell regarding this or any future interviews.

   RESPONSE: The Department has produced all known responsive records under the EFTA.

7. Please provide a complete list of every division at DOJ that your office pulled from to review the FBI's redactions in the Epstein-related records.

   RESPONSE: The Department utilized more than 500 employees to conduct the review and apply redactions. The sections from which the reviewers worked included, the Criminal Division, the Civil Division, the National Security Division, the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties, the Office of Information Policy, FBI, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of Florida, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Northern District of New York, the Office of the Associate Attorney General, the Office of the Deputy Attorney General, and the Office of the Attorney General.

8. Please provide the number of attorneys your office assigned to review the FBI's redactions in the Epstein-related records and a calculation of personnel hours dedicated to this task.

   RESPONSE: The Department utilized more than 500 employees to conduct the review and apply redactions. The sections from which the reviewers worked included, the Criminal Division, the Civil Division, the National Security Division, the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties, the Office of Information Policy, FBI, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of Florida, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Northern District of New York, the Office of the Associate Attorney General, the Office of the Deputy Attorney General, and the Office of the Attorney General.

9. Please provide the Microsoft SharePoint online collaborative file that your office maintained that logged the mentions of President Trump and others in the Epstein-related records reviewed by DOJ and FBI.

   RESPONSE: The Department has produced all known responsive records under the EFTA.

Please answer the following outstanding questions from my August 7, 2025, letter regarding the transfer of Ghislaine Maxwell.

1. Please provide all documents related to the redesignation and transfer of Ghislaine Maxwell from FCI Tallahassee to FPC Bryan, including any documents involving:

    a. Deputy Attorney General Todd Blanche, any member of the Office of the Deputy Attorney General, or any other Department of Justice official not employed by the Bureau of Prisons.
    b. Requests, and the disposition of such requests, for the redesignation and transfer of Ms. Maxwell.
    c. Requests, and the disposition of such requests, for waiver of any Public Safety Factors associated with Ms. Maxwell's designation or redesignation.
    d. Any decision to waive, as applied to Ms. Maxwell, the standard procedures for submissions of an inmate transfer request as detailed in Chapter 7 of the Bureau's Program Statement 5100.08, Inmate Security Designation and Custody Classification.
    e. Any transfer codes associated with Ms. Maxwell's redesignation and transfer.
    f. Ms. Maxwell's security point score; custody level; and any requests for, applications of, and reasons for Management Variables associated with Ms. Maxwell's placement as of June 1, 2025.
    g. Ms. Maxwell's security point score; custody level; and any requests for, applications of, and reasons for Management Variables associated with Ms. Maxwell's placement as of August 1, 2025.

    RESPONSE (as to all subparts): The Department has produced all known responsive records under the EFTA.

Please answer the following questions from the September 3, 2025, letter from Ranking Member Durbin, Senator Schiff, and me regarding the hiring of Jared Wise.

1. Please provide the following information:

    a. A list of all DOJ officials who proposed, reviewed, or approved Mr. Wise's appointment at DOJ.

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 8(a).

    b. All documents and communications dated or occurring after January 20, 2025, between Mr. Martin and Mr. Wise relating to the charges against Mr. Wise for his conduct at the Capitol on January 6, 2021, or his pardon from President Trump.

    RESPONSE: I am not personally in possession of any such documents or communications.

c. All documents and communications dated or occurring after January 20, 2025, between Mr. Martin and Mr. Wise relating to any prospective role for Mr. Wise at DOJ or its components.

RESPONSE: I am not personally in possession of any such documents or communications.

d. A detailed description of Mr. Wise's relationship with Mr. Martin while Mr. Wise was a defendant subject to charges for his conduct at the Capitol on January 6, 2021.

RESPONSE: I have no insight into the referenced relationship and therefore am unable to provide such a description.

e. A detailed description of Mr. Wise's role at DOJ, including all officials to whom he reported.

RESPONSE: Mr. Wise served as a senior advisor in the Deputy Attorney General's office and was assigned various matters related to the ending of the Biden Administration's weaponization of the federal government.

f. A detailed description of all so-called "weaponization" matters that were within Mr. Wise's portfolio at DOJ.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 1(e).

g. A detailed description of the clearance level, if any, provided to Mr. Wise, including all specific compartments.

RESPONSE: I am unaware of the clearance level, if any, provided to Mr. Wise.

Please answer the following outstanding question from my March 9, 2026, letter regarding DOJ's compliance with the Epstein Files Transparency Act.

1. Please confirm that DOJ has, since my March 9, 2026, request, preserved any existing and future records, documents, and materials related to DOJ's compliance with the Epstein Files Transparency Act with respect to the sexual assault allegations referenced in that March 9 letter, including any materials related to DOJ's decision to withhold these records.

RESPONSE: The Department has produced all known responsive records under the EFTA.

Please answer the following outstanding questions from my March 16, 2026, letter regarding "Operation Trip Knot."

1. Is Operation Trip Knot an ongoing investigation? If not, when did DOJ officially close that investigation?

   RESPONSE: Consistent with longstanding Department policy, I cannot comment on investigations.

2. Did Operation Trip Knot contribute to any arrests, indictments, criminal cases, or referrals to foreign prosecutors? If so, please detail the actions taken and dispositions.

   RESPONSE: Consistent with longstanding Department policy, I cannot confirm or discuss specific operational details, outcomes, arrest, indictment, or referrals publicly.

3. Please provide all records or other materials that relate to both Operation Trip Knot and the matters covered under Section 2(a) of the Epstein Files Transparency Act, subject to the exemptions in Section 2(c) of the Act. To the extent DOJ has previously withheld such records, please explain its reasons for doing so with respect to each record.

   RESPONSE: The Department has produced all known responsive records under the EFTA.

Please answer the following outstanding question from my March 16, 2026, letter regarding DOJ's proposed rule entitled "Review of State Bar Complaints and Allegations Against Department of Justice Attorneys."

1. Please confirm that DOJ has, since my March 16, 2026, request, preserved any existing and future records, documents, and materials related to this proposed rule, including any materials related to DOJ's development of and decision to issue this proposed rule.

   RESPONSE: The Department complies with federal records-preservation laws including the Federal Records Act.

Please answer the following outstanding questions from my April 13, 2026, letter regarding the departure of former Attorney General Bondi.

1. Please provide a copy of the notification provided by Ms. Bondi to the relevant ethics official pursuant to 5 C.F.F. § 2635.607.

   RESPONSE: Ethics filings and notifications are handled by career ethics officials under the applicable regulations. It would not be appropriate for me to produce such records in this setting.

2. Please provide copies of any determinations granting to Ms. Bondi an exemption under 18 U.S.C. § 208.

   RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 1. Any such determinations are handled by career ethics officials under the applicable authorities.

3. On what date did Ms. Bondi's employment at the Department of Justice terminate? If she was still a Department of Justice employee as of April 13, 2026, what was her title and on what date did she leave the Department?

   RESPONSE: I assumed the role of Acting Attorney General on April 2, 2026.

4. On what date did you officially assume the role of Acting Attorney General?

   RESPONSE: I assumed the role of Acting Attorney General on April 2, 2026.

5. Under what statutory authority are you now serving as Acting Attorney General?

   RESPONSE: 28 U.S.C. § 508 provides that "[i]n case of a vacancy in the office of Attorney General, or of his absence or disability, the Deputy Attorney General may exercise all the duties of that office, and for the purpose of section 3345 of title 5 the Deputy Attorney General is the first assistant to the Attorney General."

6. When was former Attorney General Bondi's new "important private sector role" first discussed and finally agreed to?

   RESPONSE: I have no knowledge of the former Attorney General's private employment arrangements.

Please answer the following outstanding question from the May 26, 2026, letter from Ranking Member Durbin and me regarding the proposed "Anti-Weaponization Fund" and purported "Settlement Agreement" in *Trump v. IRS*.

1. Please confirm that DOJ has, since our May 26, 2026, request, preserved any existing and future records, documents, and materials related to the Fund and "Settlement Agreement," including any materials related to DOJ's development of and decision to create the Fund and enter into the "Settlement Agreement."

   RESPONSE: The matter you reference is currently the subject of ongoing litigation, as such it would be inappropriate for me to comment or otherwise commit to doing anything related to the same.

Please answer the following outstanding questions from my June 23, 2026, letter regarding the transfer of Ghislaine Maxwell and changes to BOP policy.

1. Please confirm that DOJ has, since my June 23, 2026, request, preserved all records related to the May 6, issuance of Change Notice 3 to Program Statement 5100.09, Inmate Security Designation and Custody Classification.

   RESPONSE: The Department has produced all known responsive records under the EFTA.

2. Please provide the following information:

    a. All documents related to the initiation and development of any portions of Change Notice 3 regarding the authority of the Attorney General to designate or redesignate the place of a prisoner's imprisonment.

    RESPONSE: The Department has produced all known responsive records under the EFTA.

    b. All documents related to the exercise of the Attorney General's authority to designate or redesignate the place of a prisoner's imprisonment since May 6, 2026.

    RESPONSE: The Department has produced all known responsive records under the EFTA.

Please answer the following outstanding question from my June 30, 2026, letter regarding communications with certain judges.

1. Please provide copies of all communications, direct or indirect, between any DOJ political appointees and D.C. Circuit Judges Neomi Rao or Gregory Katsas since January 20, 2025, excepting pleadings filed in litigation and statements made in open court.

    RESPONSE: I understand that you have a pending request to the Department of Justice under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) for this information. The Department is processing the request and will provide a response. In the alternative, I would refer you to the Department's Office of Legislative Affairs, which can work with you to provide further information.

Please answer the following outstanding questions from my July 1, 2026, letter regarding the "Anti-Weaponization Fund" and purported "Settlement Agreement" in *Trump v. IRS*.

1. Please provide a copy of all memoranda prepared by the IRS discussing defenses against the plaintiffs' claims in *Trump v. Internal Revenue Service*, No. 1:26-cv-20609 (S.D. Fla.).

    RESPONSE: The memoranda requested are records of the IRS, and requests for them are properly directed to the Department of the Treasury. To the extent such litigation memoranda exist, they would also implicate attorney-client privilege and work-product protections and may contain return information protected from disclosure by statute.

2. Please provide a copy of IRS's referral policy regarding referral of cases and legal defense to DOJ.

RESPONSE: The requested policy is a record of the IRS, and the request is properly directed to the Department of the Treasury. My understanding is that the IRS's referral procedures are set out in the publicly available Internal Revenue Manual.

3. Please provide all correspondence between DOJ and IRS personnel regarding *Trump v. Internal Revenue Service*, No. 1:26-cv-20609 (S.D. Fla.).

   RESPONSE: The Department will respond to the Committee's requests for records through its ordinary process. Correspondence concerning this litigation implicates attorney-client privilege, work-product, and deliberative-process protections and may contain return information protected from disclosure by statute.

4. Please provide all memoranda prepared in response to the inquiry regarding whether there was "fraud on the court" in *Trump v. Internal Revenue Service*, No. 1:26-cv-20609 (S.D. Fla.).

   RESPONSE: The matter you reference is currently the subject of ongoing litigation, as such it would be inappropriate for me to comment or otherwise commit to doing anything related to the same.

5. Which DOJ personnel negotiated the tax amnesty and legal immunity provisions in the May 19, 2026, addendum? Please name all DOJ personnel involved in these negotiations.

   RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

Senate Judiciary Committee
Nomination Hearing
July 15, 2026
Questions for the Record
Senator Amy Klobuchar

For Todd Blanche, Nominee to be Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice

1. I've heard from several domestic violence groups in my state who have experienced significant delays in receiving grant awards or hearing back on their grant applications, forcing them to make difficult decisions like cutting staff even as the demand for their services remains high.

   - Will you commit to expediently releasing grant funds that have been appropriated to help organizations serve survivors?

     RESPONSE: Yes. We are reviewing funding recommendations and distributing money on a rolling basis.

2. State election administrators, including Minnesota's Secretary of State, have stated they have not received the intelligence briefings, trainings, and technical assistance their offices have regularly received from the Justice Department and other federal agencies in election years to help them prepare for secure elections amid emerging threats.

   - How many classified briefings, scenario planning activities, or other intelligence sharing activities has the Department held since February 2026 with state and local election officials across the country to ensure they are well-prepared to administer safe, secure elections and respond to emergent threats?

     RESPONSE: During the hearing, you asked for more information about whether pre-election coordination efforts between state and federal election officials were not taking place at their standard pace and practice. I am committed to ensuring fair, safe elections and to answering your questions. I welcome further conversation with you on this topic.

3. When we met a few weeks ago in my office, we discussed ensuring full cooperation between federal law enforcement and state investigators in the killings of Renee Good and Alex Pretti. The Department shared evidence with state investigators last week.

   - Will you pledge to continue complete information sharing and cooperation between the Justice Department and state investigators in these cases?

     RESPONSE: As with any investigation, federal law enforcement will work with State and locals as appropriate. DHS-OIG, FBI, and the U.S. Attorney's office have been and will run these investigations professionally and in appropriate coordination with State and local partners.

4. When asked about White House involvement in the settlement of the case against Live Nation-Ticketmaster for monopolization, you said that you may work with the White House counsel on settlements but that "I'm mostly [] saying they were not part of it." But, public reporting[1] and Live Nation itself disclosed to a federal court[2] that there were multiple meetings between Live Nation, the White House, and the Office of the Deputy Attorney General. And, Live Nation's CEO spoke with President Trump regarding the settlement.

   - Did you or anyone at the Justice Department receive any advice, instructions or requests from anyone at the White House regarding the monopolization case against Live Nation?

     RESPONSE: The decision to resolve claims against Live Nation was the Department's. I will not describe internal Executive Branch communications. The disclosures required by the Tunney Act are available on the public docket.

   - Were you part of any of these meetings or discussions?

     RESPONSE: As I testified, I was not directly part of these discussions.

5. On April 25, 2025, the Department of Justice changed the guidance that set limitations on the Department's ability to subpoena materials from journalists. Previous guidance permitted subpoenaing a journalist only "[w]hen necessary to prevent an imminent or concrete risk of death or serious bodily harm." The new guidance allows the Justice Department to subpoena journalists for "unauthorized disclosures that undermine President Trump's policies."

   - The 2025 guidance states that prior to subpoenaing journalists the Attorney General will determine that "prosecutors had made all reasonable attempts to obtain the information from alternative sources." Did you do so prior to subpoenaing the New York Times on July 10, 2026—only three days after the reporting in question was published?

     RESPONSE: Pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e)(2)(B), I am prohibited from discussing any matters occurring before a federal grand jury.

6. Associate Attorney General Woodward has reportedly told the Antitrust Division that he wants to settle more cases, directing staff to avoid trials.

   - How does announcing to corporate defendants that they won't be taken to trial for anticompetitive behavior serve consumers and protect competition?

     RESPONSE: I won't comment on purported reporting based on anonymous sources. I will say that the Antitrust Division in this Department of Justice has strived to achieve

[1] Mattioli et al., *The Threats and Bare-Knuckle Tactics of MAGA's Top Antitrust Fixer*, Wall Street Journal (Mar. 20, 2026), https://www.wsj.com/us-news/law/lobbyists-antitrust-trump-davis-f6a02e04?mod=Searchresults&pos=1&page=1.

[2] DEFENDANTS' DESCRIPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS AND CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE PURSUANT TO 15 U.S.C. § 16(g), United States v. Live Nation Entertainment, Inc. and Ticketmaster LLC, Case No. 1:24-cv-3973-AS, Dkt. No. 1534 (June 22, 2026).

immediate results for the American people rather than subject our citizens to protracted litigation with uncertain results. The Department stands ready to litigate any matter where enforcement is necessary to protect competition. However, in practice, the Division resolves most antitrust concerns by engaging with parties who voluntarily take steps to alleviate them through structural and behavioral remedies. If a settlement can be reached that equally furthers the public interest, DOJ can and should pursue that solution. Our settlements are always, as they must be, reached based on the facts, the law, and in the best interests of the American people.

7. Since returning to office, President Trump has directed the Justice Department to engage in political prosecutions of his perceived enemies. You have said: "That is his right and, indeed, it is his duty to do that."

   - Do you believe it is your duty as Attorney General to facilitate that regardless of facts and law?

     RESPONSE: As long as I am the Deputy Attorney General, Acting Attorney General, or if confirmed, the Attorney General, the Department of Justice will follow the facts and the law.

   - Do you believe that all investigatory and prosecutorial decisions during this Administration have been made based solely on facts and law?

     RESPONSE: Yes.

8. In January, the Republican-appointed Chief Judge in Minnesota found that the Department of Homeland Security violated at least 97 court orders in just the month of January.

   - Do you agree that it is unacceptable for the government to defy court orders, including those the Department may disagree with?

     RESPONSE: I will always advise a client, including agencies of the Executive Branch, to comply with court orders that are in force and applicable to them.

9. Congress established the HIDTA Program within the Office of National Drug Control Policy to facilitate interagency collaboration and flexibility for state and local law enforcement to respond to emergent threats in their regions. The Administration plans to move HIDTA to the Department of Justice.

   - How does the Department plan to ensure that any potential move maintains the interagency collaboration and regional flexibility that have made the HIDTA program so successful?

     RESPONSE: The Department remains committed to supporting the HIDTA programs through DEA and FBI Task Force integration, which collaborate directly with state and local police; intelligence sharing; and prosecutions intended to disrupt and dismantle drug

trafficking organizations. Regardless of where the grant program is housed, the Department will continue to support these successful programs that make our communities safer and limit the harm caused by illegal drugs.

10. For more than 30 years, the *Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances ("FACE") Act* has protected patients, providers, and facilities that provide reproductive health services. Despite an increase in violence against reproductive health providers, the Justice Department has dropped active *FACE Act* cases and fired several DOJ lawyers who successfully prosecuted people under this law.

    - Will you commit to fully enforcing the *FACE Act* and prosecuting those who violate this law by harassing, threatening, or committing violence against reproductive health care patients and providers?

      RESPONSE: I take seriously the responsibility of the Attorney General to protect the rights of every American under our laws. If confirmed, I will enforce our laws with fairness and impartiality.

11. I thank the Department for its support of the *Honoring Our Fallen Heroes Act*. I understand the PSOB office is beginning to process applications from the families of fallen first responders.

    - Can you describe the steps the Department is taking to ensure that the families of first responders who passed away from service related cancers have their applications and benefits processed in a timely manner?

      RESPONSE: The PSOB Program provides death and education benefits to survivors of fallen law enforcement officers, firefighters, and other first responders, and disability benefits to officers catastrophically injured in the line of duty and education benefits to their families. OJP receives more than 1,200 applications each year, working closely with survivors, injured officers, and employing agencies to process applications and adjudicate eligible claims. The PSOB Office also collaborates with national law enforcement, firefighter, and first responder organizations to assist with preparation of PSOB applications and offer survivor peer support, counseling services, and other resources to survivors of fallen law enforcement officers, firefighters, and other first responders nationwide.

      Over the last four weeks, the Department's Office of Justice Programs has finalized more than three times the number of PSOB Program death claim determinations in comparison to the previous nine-month period providing over $96 million in benefits to eligible surviving families of fallen public safety officers. The Department is committed to doing our part to support officers and their families and keeping up this momentum for current and future PSOB applicants, including those who have passed away from service-related cancers.

12. I appreciate that the Department has already prosecuted cases under the *TAKE IT DOWN* Act

which I led with Senator Cruz, and obtained convictions for those who publish A-I generated deepfakes in violation of this law.

- Does the Department need additional resources or authorities to continue prosecuting those who publish non-consensual explicit images?

  RESPONSE: The Department is committed to prosecuting violations of the Take It Down Act. The Department appreciates the resources Congress has given us to address this serious criminal activity. The President's FY 2027 budget request regarding combatting child exploitation and human trafficking reflects the Department's determination to increase our efforts to prosecute those who violate the Act. The Department supports funding reflected in the President's FY 2027 budget, as it would allow us to hire more prosecutors and fund additional critical technology to combat this scourge.

Nomination of Todd Blanche to be
Attorney General for the United States
Questions for the Record
Submitted July 17, 2026

QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR COONS

1. Do you believe that the Senate Judiciary Committee has a responsibility to evaluate executive nominees to the best of its ability, including by asking questions on the record to make each nominee's unique background and viewpoint clear to the American people?

   RESPONSE: Yes, this has been a part of the confirmation process for many decades now.

2. Do you believe that you, as the nominee to serve as the Attorney General for the United States, have a responsibility to the American people to give full and complete answers to the Committee's questions to the best of your ability and in good faith?

   RESPONSE: Yes, subject to any applicable laws, privileges, and Departmental policies that may limit the disclosure of information.

3. Do you believe you fulfilled this responsibility with the answers you have provided to my questions for the record?

   RESPONSE: Yes.

   a. Did you receive assistance from staff in the White House, the Department of Justice, or any other organization in writing your responses to these questions? If so, from whom did you receive assistance and what was the nature of the assistance you received?

      RESPONSE: My answers to each question are my own. Consistent with the practice of past nominees, I drafted answers to these questions with the assistance of attorneys from the Department of Justice, and Executive Office of the President personnel. Where relevant, I consulted prior Department practice and legal guidance, including the Justice Manual and publicly available legal materials.

4. 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: I was not asked to pledge personal loyalty to the President as a condition of my nomination. My oath is, and will remain, to the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

5. In a February 2025 memo to all Department of Justice employees, former 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 former Attorney General Bondi?

    RESPONSE: Article II of the Constitution gives the President the Executive power, making him the head of the Executive branch. The Department of Justice is part of the Executive branch.

    b. What does it mean to serve at the will and pleasure of the President?

    RESPONSE: Article II of the Constitution gives the President the Executive power, making him the head of the Executive branch. The Department of Justice is part of the Executive branch. The President has the constitutional authority to fire any Executive Branch official who "serve[s] at the will and pleasure of the President" for any reason or no reason at all so long as he does not fire the individual based on a ground specifically forbidden by federal law."

    c. Is serving at the will and pleasure of the President the same thing as being one of the President's lawyers?

    RESPONSE: No.

    d. Who does the Department of Justice work for?

    RESPONSE: The Department of Justice seeks to do justice every day on behalf of the American people. In addition, Article II of the Constitution gives the President the Executive power, making him the head of the Executive branch. The Department of Justice is part of the Executive branch.

    e. Would you consider yourself President Trump's lawyer, if confirmed?

    RESPONSE: No.

    f. At your confirmation hearing, in response to a question from Senator Kennedy about whether you were President Trump's friend, you said, "I'm his lawyer—was his lawyer." What did you mean by this statement?

    RESPONSE: My testimony made clear that I was President Trump's personal lawyer at one time and that now I serve as Deputy Attorney General of the United States.

6. On February 5, 2025, former Attorney General Bondi issued fourteen memoranda addressed to "all Department of Justice employees." If confirmed, would you revoke or modify any of these memoranda? Which ones?

   RESPONSE: The Department's policies are always subject to potential review. I do not have specific revisions to announce at this time, and any changes I make would be consistent with the law and the Department's mission.

7. When it is appropriate for the Attorney General of the United States to refuse to follow a directive of the President?

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

8. Does the President, under the terms of his oath, the Constitution, and applicable law, have the authority to order the FBI to initiate an investigation into a specific individual?

   RESPONSE: Article II of the Constitution gives the President the Executive power, making him the head of the Executive branch. The Department of Justice, including the FBI, is part of the Executive branch. All decisions regarding investigations are made consistent with long-standing Department of Justice policy.

9. I assume that if you are confirmed, you will always uphold your oath to support and defend the Constitution and that you would follow the law. How would these commitments inform your response if your role as the Attorney General for the United States required you to follow a policy directive that was unconstitutional? Please include references to any specifically applicable provisions in your answer.

   RESPONSE: I respectfully reject the premise that I would be required to carry out an unconstitutional directive. My oath, prescribed by 5 U.S.C. § 3331 and required by Article VI of the Constitution, binds me to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. Consistent with that oath and the Take Care Clause of Article II, I would not implement a directive I concluded was unconstitutional; I would say so and act consistent with the law.

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

    RESPONSE: The Constitution charges the President to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States," U.S. Const. art. II, § 1, cl. 8, and to "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed," *id.* § 3. Since the Judiciary Act of 1789, the Attorney General has been authorized "to give his advice and opinion upon questions of law when required by the President of the United States." If confirmed, I would give my advice and opinions on questions of law when required to assist the President in his duties under the Constitution.

11. During an interview on Steve Bannon's War Room podcast on April 18, 2026, you stated that "there's this model out there that somehow the Department of Justice is independent from the President of the United States. That is not true," and compared the Attorney General to other Cabinet officials who are not independent of the President.

    a. Do you stand by that statement?

       RESPONSE: Yes.

    b. Where do you draw the line between legitimate presidential supervision of the executive branch and improper political influence over the administration of justice?

       RESPONSE: The Constitution provides relevant guidance regarding the separation of powers and constitutional authority. Article II of the Constitution gives the President the Executive power, making him the head of the Executive branch. The Department of Justice, like every Department in the Executive branch, is part of the Executive branch.

12. 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: I will always advise a client, including agencies of the Executive Branch, to comply with court orders applicable to them. The proper recourse for a party that disagrees with an order is to seek reconsideration, appeal, or a stay.

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

       RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 12.

    b. Have you ever instructed, advised, or allowed a subordinate to disregard a court order?

       RESPONSE: I have always advised clients, including agencies of the Executive Branch, to comply with court orders applicable to them.

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

       RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 12.

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

RESPONSE: I respectfully reject that premise. If confirmed, I will continue to always uphold my oath to support and defend the Constitution and I would follow the law.

13. Please describe one policy enacted at the Department by former Attorney General Bondi that you plan to maintain if you are confirmed as Attorney General.

RESPONSE: I intend to maintain the Department's intensified focus on violent-crime and fraud enforcement, which has produced significant results for the American people.

14. Please describe one policy enacted at the Department by former Attorney General Bondi that you plan to discontinue or modify if you are confirmed as Attorney General.

RESPONSE: As I testified, I intend to streamline the Department's grant-administration process so that grantees experience a smoother, more efficient application process, while preserving the distinct functions of the underlying programs.

15. During your confirmation hearing, you told me that "President Trump trusts me to give him counsel. Counsel does not mean I'm a yes man."

    a. What did you mean by this statement?

    RESPONSE: I meant that the President is entitled to candid legal advice, and that providing candid advice sometimes requires telling the President that a proposed course is unwise or unlawful, even when that advice is unwelcome.

    b. Please provide one example where you demonstrated that you are not President Trump's "yes man."

    RESPONSE: I reject the implications of this question. I do not think it appropriate to detail the substance of my confidential communications with the President. As a general matter, and as I testified, there have been occasions on which the advice I gave differed from the course initially under consideration.

16. I assume that if you are confirmed, you will ensure that any law enforcement activities carried out by your office will only be undertaken where there is a proper basis under the facts and law. How would this commitment inform the actions you take in response to the President calling on the Department via social media, a press conference, or other means, to investigate, sue, and/or prosecute a political opponent? Explain.

RESPONSE: At the Department of Justice, all decisions regarding investigations and prosecutions must be made based on the facts and the law. Article II of the Constitution gives the President the Executive power, making him the head of the Executive branch. The Department of Justice is part of the Executive branch.

a. How would you respond to the President calling on the Department via social media, a press conference, or other means, to investigate, sue, and/or prosecute an individual or corporation where that action was not justified by the facts and the law?

RESPONSE: I respectfully reject the premise of this question. If confirmed, I will always uphold my oath to support and defend the Constitution, and I would follow the law.

b. How would you respond to the President calling on the Department via social media, a press conference, or other means, to drop a case or investigation where that action was not justified by the facts and the law?

RESPONSE: I respectfully reject the premise of this question. If confirmed, I will always uphold my oath to support and defend the Constitution, and I would follow the law.

17. Can the Department of Justice bring criminal charges to serve political purposes?

RESPONSE: Prosecutions of violations of federal criminal law are pursued based on the facts, applicable law, the Justice Manual, and the Principles of Federal Prosecution.

a. How should the Attorney General determine if criminal charges are being brought to serve political purposes?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 17.

b. If you determined that criminal charges were being brought to serve political purposes, what would you do next?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 17.

18. If confirmed, what procedures would you put in place to avoid politicization of the Department of Justice and ensure consultation with career attorneys?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 17.

19. When it comes to conducting yourself ethically, who in the legal profession do you see as a role model?

RESPONSE: I have been most influenced by the career prosecutors and supervisors I served alongside in the United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York, who modeled the principle that a prosecutor's obligation is to seek justice and to follow the facts and the law.

20. What case or legal matter are you most proud of having worked on during your career?

RESPONSE: I am proud of the work I did as an Assistant United States Attorney in the Southern District of New York prosecuting violent gangs and narcotics-trafficking organizations, which removed dangerous offenders from communities and made those communities safer.

21. If confirmed, will you commit to appearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee on an annual basis for an oversight hearing?

    RESPONSE: If confirmed, I will work with the Committee's leadership to accommodate appropriate requests to appear for oversight hearings while balancing the Department's responsibilities.

22. Last year, the United States Sentencing Commission finalized an amendment to the federal sentencing guidelines on supervised release that went into effect this past November. I co-led a bipartisan group including Sens. Lee, Cramer, Wicker, and Tillis and Reps. Hunt and Moore, who advocated for this change, noting that it will improve federal reentry in a way that promotes rehabilitation and public safety.

    a. Have you ensured, and will you commit to continuing to ensure, that the Criminal Division, United States Attorneys, and line prosecutors throughout the Department are trained on this amendment and will account for it in their sentencing recommendations as well as in how they respond to requests for early termination of supervised release?

       RESPONSE: As with any amendments to the Sentencing Guidelines, the Department provided appropriate information about the amendments to the Department's prosecutors and will make the Sentencing Commission's trainings available where appropriate.

23. My Senate Judiciary Committee colleagues and I have repeatedly called for Special Counsel Jack Smith to testify before the Committee. Would you support the Committee holding a hearing with Smith—publicly and under oath—so that Senators' questions about his investigations into President Trump's actions can be answered?

    RESPONSE: As a general matter, I defer to the Committee's authority to set its own hearing priorities for matters within its jurisdiction and to invite witnesses it chooses.

24. In September 2025, the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) terminated its collective bargaining agreement with the Council of Prison Locals 33, the union representing BOP corrections officers, and said that the union contract had become "an obstacle to progress instead of a partner in it."

    a. In what specific ways did BOP conclude that the union contract had become an obstacle to progress?

RESPONSE: The BOP's termination of its collective bargaining agreement with Council of Prison Locals 33 is currently in litigation. As a result, I cannot comment.

b. What is the legal basis for terminating the collective bargaining agreement?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 24(a).

c. How will the BOP work to provide protections to corrections officers in the absence of the collective bargaining agreement?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 24(a).

25. During your tenure as Deputy Attorney General, thousands of employees (upwards of 16,000 employees by some counts) have left the Department, including at least a third of senior career leaders. The Civil Rights Division has lost roughly 75% of its career attorneys. Similarly, the Federal Programs Branch has lost nearly two-thirds of its staff. What is the Department doing to compensate for these staffing losses and to safeguard its ability to uphold the law?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice has implemented a comprehensive Strategic Hiring Plan designed to direct resources to the areas of greatest need while strengthening operational efficiency. The Plan prioritizes the hiring of attorneys, agents, and correctional officers to support national security, homeland security, and public safety missions. Components are actively recruiting using all available hiring flexibilities and offering incentives to retain experienced personnel. Department leadership continually reviews and updates the Plan to ensure a steady pipeline of qualified applicants for critical positions.

To further address staffing shortfalls, the Department has expanded nationwide recruitment, deployed targeted internal reassignments, and implemented signing and retention bonuses. Together, these measures safeguard the Department's ability to carry out its core missions and uphold the rule of law.

26. The Public Integrity Section has gone from 36 attorneys down to two. Moreover, historically the Department's Justice Manual has required that prosecutors in local U.S. Attorney's offices consult with the Public Integrity Section on federal criminal matters related to violations of campaign financing laws, federal patronage crimes, or corruption of the election process. But this requirement has been suspended "for revision" since June 2025. I am concerned that suspending the consultation requirement appears to shift authority in public corruption cases away from career Department lawyers to U.S. Attorneys hand-picked by the President.

a. When will the revision of the consultation requirement be completed?

RESPONSE: The entire Justice Manual is currently being reviewed to ensure that it is updated with current law and reflects Administration priorities. Because it covers many components within DOJ, this task takes time for each component to review and recommend revisions. Currently there is no anticipated date of completion.

b. Will U.S. Attorney's offices still be required to consult the Public Integrity Section going forward?

RESPONSE: U.S. Attorneys are the chief federal law enforcement officers of each district, statutorily entrusted by the President of the United States to enforce federal law across the country. U.S. Attorneys report directly to the Office of the Deputy Attorney General, and not to any other litigating component at the Department of Justice.

27. In September 2025, the Cato Institute published a piece entitled, "ICE Has Diverted Over 25,000 Officers From Their Jobs," available at https://www.cato.org/blog/ice-has-diverted-over-25000-officers-their-jobs. The piece includes statistics that several thousand Department personnel have provided support to ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations, including the majority of agents at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

a. Do you agree with the figures provided in the Cato piece? If not, what are the correct figures, and can you provide updated figures as of today?

RESPONSE: While I can confirm that Department personnel have supported ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations, I am not in a position to assess the accuracy of the figures in the article linked above.

b. What is your response to the concerns raised in the piece that these diversions are harming efforts to address violent crime, drugs, and gun trafficking?

RESPONSE: Respectfully, those assertions collapse on the facts. The United States has the lowest murder rate since 1900. Violent crime arrests by FBI are up 184 percent. The ATF has seized more than 44,000 illegal firearms. Since January of last year, the DEA has seized more than 5,000 kilograms of fentanyl powder, 55 million fentanyl pills, and 240,000 kilograms of methamphetamine.

28. During your confirmation hearing, I asked you why the Department has not released the Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) opinion reportedly providing the legal justification for U.S. military strikes on boats in the Caribbean. You responded that the Department made the head of OLC available to explain the decision, but you did not provide reasoning for why the written opinion itself has not been provided (even with redactions or in a classified setting) or a timeline for when it would be provided.

a. When will you make the written opinion itself available for Members of Congress to review?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice provided unprecedented access to the head of OLC to discuss the legal basis behind these strikes in an appropriate classified setting, including allowing every member of Congress who wished to do so the ability to review the memorandum. Consistent with principles of executive privilege, the confidential nature of the attorney-client relationship, and the classified information discussed in the document, it would be inappropriate to comment further on legal advice that the Department may or may not have given to the President or other Executive Branch officials.

b. When will you make the written opinion itself available for the public to review?

RESPONSE: Pursuant to Executive Order 12146 and directives from prior Attorneys General, OLC continuously reviews for publication selected opinions that explain legal principles important to the Executive Branch. In doing so, however, it remains mindful of the confidential nature of the advice it provides and the classified nature of the information upon which it relies. The opinion in question will not be made public until the client to whom it was addressed consents, and the information it contains is declassified.

29. During your confirmation hearing, you indicated that you would continue to examine whether the March 17, 2026, FISA Court opinion concerning Section 702 compliance deficiencies could be declassified and agreed that Section 702 oversight and reauthorization are important issues. Please provide an update on the status of that review.

a. Does the Department intend to declassify and release the opinion? If so, on what timeline?

RESPONSE: There is a statutory deadline of 180 days, which has not yet passed. The Department of Justice and Office of the Director of National Intelligence have been working diligently with the Intelligence Community to process the opinion for declassification and public release as quickly and responsibly as possible. We anticipate being able to make the public release in advance of the statutory deadline.

b. If not, what specific national security interests justify continued classification despite bipartisan congressional requests for its release?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 29(a).

30. At the White House roundtable about Antifa on October 8, 2025, President Trump was asked if he had "given any more thought to possibly suspending habeas corpus to not only deal with these insurrectionists across the nation but also to continue rapidly

deporting illegal aliens." Trump responded that he would "rather leave that to [then-Homeland Security Secretary] Kristi [Noem]."

a. At a Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee hearing on May 20, 2025, former Secretary Noem told Senator Hassan that "habeas corpus is a constitutional right that the president has to be able to remove people from this country." Is that definition correct?

RESPONSE: I cannot speak for former Secretary Noem regarding her interpretation of habeas corpus, and it would not be appropriate for me to do so.

b. What is habeas corpus?

RESPONSE: Habeas corpus is a procedural device, typically through a petition for a writ, used to evaluate the legality of executive detention.

c. Does the Secretary of Homeland Security have authority under the Constitution to suspend habeas corpus?

RESPONSE: The Secretary of Homeland Security is not mentioned in the Constitution, and the Constitution, Article I, section 9, clause 2, does not expressly state who has the authority to suspend the "Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus." Historically, it has been suspended by either the President or a statutory enactment.

d. Does the president have authority under the Constitution to suspend habeas corpus?

RESPONSE: The Constitution, Article I, section 9, clause 2, does not expressly state who has the authority to suspend the "Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus." Historically, it has been suspended by either the President or a statutory enactment.

31. At a September 30, 2025, event with U.S. military commanders, President Trump said that he told War Secretary Pete Hegseth that the U.S. "should use some of these dangerous cities as training grounds for our military." Would it be legal to send active-duty troops to U.S. cities for "training"?

RESPONSE: As this question indicates, President Trump's statement was made in September 2025. I am unaware of any deployment of military forces consistent with that statement in the intervening nine months. While there are limitations on the use of military forces to enforce federal law, *see, e.g.,* 18 U.S.C. § 1385, without more context than provided in this question, I am unable to provide an opinion as to whether such a hypothetical deployment would run afoul of such limitations.

32. On September 20, 2025, President Trump made a post on Truth Social directing former Attorney General Bondi to prosecute FBI Director James Comey, Senator Adam Schiff, and New York Attorney General Letitia James, saying "[w]e can't delay any longer. . . . They impeached me twice, and indicted me (5 times!), OVER NOTHING. JUSTICE MUST BE SERVED, NOW!!!" Five days later, Comey was indicted on charges of making a false statement and obstruction related to his testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee in 2020. Although that indictment was later dismissed after a federal court concluded that the prosecutor who brought the case had been unlawfully appointed, the Department appealed the dismissal and subsequently obtained a second indictment against Comey in April 2026 on unrelated charges stemming from a since-deleted Instagram post featuring seashells arranged to spell "86 47."

    a. The Department's website lists "Independence and Impartiality" as core values of the Department. What do you believe Department independence means?

       RESPONSE: At the Department of Justice, all decisions regarding investigations and prosecutions must be made based on the facts and the law. Article II of the Constitution gives the President the Executive power, making him the head of the Executive branch. The Department of Justice is part of the Executive branch.

    b. Based on your tenure as Deputy Attorney General and Acting Attorney General, is it your testimony that President Trump's message had no impact on the Department's decisions to prosecute James Comey?

       RESPONSE: At the Department of Justice, all decisions regarding investigations and prosecutions must be made based on the facts and the law. Article II of the Constitution gives the President the Executive power, making him the head of the Executive branch. The Department of Justice is part of the Executive branch. I will not comment further as this matter is under active investigation and prosecution.

33. I am concerned about threats against members of the judiciary, which have risen dramatically in recent years. In fact, on July 14, 2026, U.S. Supreme Court Justices Elena Kagan and Amy Coney Barrett testified before the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees on the need to increase funding for judicial security.

    In his response to one of my questions for the record upon his nomination in May 2025, U.S. Marshals Service Director Gadyaces Serralta wrote: "Protecting the federal judicial process is the primary mission for the U.S. Marshals Service. This mission is more important than ever due to the escalating volatility and severity of threats against public officials and the judicial process in recent years."

    a. Do you agree with Director Serralta's statement?

       RESPONSE: Yes.

b. What concrete steps is the Department taking to help the U.S. Marshals Service best protect federal judges?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice, including the United States Marshals Service, takes its obligation to protect federal judges very seriously. The Department has been focused on empowering federal prosecutors and law enforcement officers to investigate violent crime, including threats against federal judges. By prioritizing public safety, the Department directly supports the United States Marshals Service in protecting federal judges.

c. How, if at all, does the Department work with state and local law enforcement to help protect state judges?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice works to ensure the safety of all Americans. While state and local law enforcement are responsible for the direct security of state judges, the Department routinely works with state and local partners to further public safety. Through the National Center for Judicial Security, the United States Marshals Service trains state and local partners on matters of judicial security.

34. In testimony at her Senate Judiciary Committee oversight hearing on October 7, 2025, former Attorney General Bondi described the administration as facing "unprecedented judicial attacks since President Trump took office. We have been sued more than 420 times. Lower court judges have issued more than 90 temporary restraining orders against our policies – more than the prior four presidencies combined. This has been a coordinated wave of judicial overreach designed to halt an agenda that won the popular vote and all seven battleground states less than a year ago."

a. Do you agree with this characterization?

RESPONSE: Yes.

b. Does a president winning "the popular vote and all seven battleground states" mean that all of the administration's policies are legal and should be upheld in court?

RESPONSE: I respectfully disagree with the premise of your question. The quote provides a factual description of the unprecedented litigation facing President Trump's agenda in court.

35. At a Federalist Society event in November 2025, you asked young lawyers to join "a war" against judges, saying, "We need you, because it is a war, and it's something we will not win unless we keep on fighting." Do you think that the Department of Justice is engaged in a war against federal judges? If not, what did you mean by your statement?

RESPONSE: No. The Department is not at war with the federal judiciary, and my remarks were not directed at judges. I was speaking to the broader effort to restore the Department's core mission of enforcing the law and keeping communities safe. I respect the essential role of the federal courts, and the Department litigates its disagreements through the judicial process.

36. On September 16, 2025, in response to a question posed by a reporter from ABC News, President Trump said, "we'll probably go after people like you because you treat me so unfairly. It's hate. You have a lot of hate in your heart. Maybe they'll come after ABC. Maybe they'll have to go after you."

    a. Do you think that negative media reports about President Trump constitute hate speech?

       RESPONSE: No.

    b. Has President Trump directed or encouraged the Department to target media organizations or individual reporters that he believes treat him unfairly?

       RESPONSE: No.

37. On May 26, 2025, President Trump pardoned former Virginia sheriff Scott Jenkins, who was sentenced to ten years in prison for conspiracy, honest services fraud, and accepting $75,000 worth of bribes. The same day, Trump's pardon attorney Ed Martin posted on X, "No MAGA left behind," with another post thanking Trump for pardoning Jenkins. Martin's post is still up today.

    a. Do you think it is appropriate to suggest that whether someone supports the "MAGA" movement is relevant to whether they should receive a pardon?

       RESPONSE: The President possesses unconditional and exclusive pardon authority for federal crimes under the Constitution. Regardless of whether an individual agrees or disagrees with a particular pardon, it remains the President's exclusive, Constitutional authority.

    b. Will you ask Martin to take down the post? If not, why not?

       RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 37(a) above.

    c. If you are confirmed, will you keep Martin employed at the Department?

       RESPONSE: It is not appropriate for me to comment on personnel matters.

38. On September 5, 2025, I joined nine of my Senate Judiciary Committee colleagues in sending you a letter asking for further information about the extreme departures from Department process that led to the proposed settlement in Hewlett Packard Enterprise's

$14 billion acquisition of Juniper Networks, Inc. We did not receive a substantive response.

a. Are you able to provide more context on the proposed settlement now?

RESPONSE: The Department's explanation of the proposed settlement is set forth in the Tunney Act filings, including the Competitive Impact Statement. *See* https://www.justice.gov/atr/case/us-v-hewlett-packard-enterprise-co-and-juniper-networks-inc.

b. It has been reported that former Assistant Attorney General for the Antitrust Division Gail Slater opposed settling this case, but she was overruled by Bondi's Chief of Staff, Chad Mizelle. Were you consulted on the approval of this proposed settlement? If yes, please explain when this took place and describe the extent of your involvement.

RESPONSE: I will not characterize the internal views of individual officials. Where I participated in the Department's decisions, I have described that participation truthfully to this Committee.

c. Recent reporting similarly indicates that Department leadership closed its antitrust investigation into Paramount Skydance's acquisition of Warner Bros. Discovery before career staff completed their review or presented a formal recommendation, and that career attorneys who had spent months investigating the transaction were excluded from drafting the Department's public explanation for closing the investigation. Were you consulted on that decision, and if so, what role did you play?

RESPONSE: As I testified, I was part of the decision to close that investigation. I won't comment on purported reporting based on anonymous sources.

d. Will you commit to ensuring that the Antitrust Division makes decisions based on the facts and the law without undue influence from corporate interests? If yes, what specific changes will you make to ensure this?

RESPONSE: Yes. Enforcement decisions will be made on the facts and the law through the Department's ordinary process.

39. You signed a May 19, 2026, release order that extends sweeping immunity to President Trump, his sons, and the Trump Organization from claims by the federal government relating to any matters "currently pending or that could be pending" before any federal agencies.

a. Who first proposed the idea of the Department executing an order to grant President Trump immunity from tax liability?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

b. Please explain your statement to Senator Cornyn at the hearing that the release order "binds only the IRS and by extension the Treasury" and not other agencies, despite the last line reading "before Defendants ***or other agencies or departments***" (emphasis added).

RESPONSE: The May 19, 2026 release speaks for itself.

c. What does the term "Lawfare" as used in the release order mean?

RESPONSE: The May 19, 2026 release speaks for itself. It expressly incorporates capitalized terms defined in the settlement agreement, including "Lawfare."

d. What does the term "Weaponization" as used in the release order mean?

RESPONSE: The May 19, 2026 release speaks for itself. It expressly incorporates capitalized terms defined in the settlement agreement, including "Weaponization."

e. Is this release order still in effect?

RESPONSE: Yes.

f. Will you withdraw this sweeping immunity order, and if not, why not?

RESPONSE: I do not agree with your characterization of the document as a "sweeping immunity order." It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

g. Do you agree that, under 26 U.S.C. § 7217, titled "Prohibition on executive branch influence over taxpayer audits and other investigations," it is a crime for the President or any White House employee to request the IRS "terminate an audit or other investigation of any particular taxpayer with respect to the tax liability of such taxpayer"? If so, did any of the discussions or actions leading to the creation of the release order violate this statute?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

40. On June 2, 2026, Senator Graham posted on X proposing the creation of a "weaponization fund that will be available to those who can prove their claim against the federal government through the Federal Tort Claims Act." Associate Attorney General Stanley Woodward replied, "[w]e're on it," but then deleted the post. On June 11, *The Atlantic* reported that "the work is being kept quiet while the Trump administration waits for opposition to the fund to blow over" and "while the Senate considers Blanche's nomination." The reporting also stated, "One Republican former member of Congress told [the reporter] that he and others had been assured that the administration's public statements about the weaponization fund being abandoned were 'all part of the plan; nothing has changed.'"

    a. Aside from the Anti-Weaponization Fund and the May 19, 2026, tax immunity order, does the Department of Justice or White House have any alternative plans to compensate individuals who feel they have been the target of government weaponization?

    RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed, no funds have been transferred, no claims have been received, and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

    b. After you publicly announced that you would drop the Anti-Weaponization Fund, have you or anyone in the Department of Justice made any private assurances to anyone about future compensation they might receive?

    RESPONSE: I can only speak for myself, but no.

    c. Is the statement from the Republican former member of Congress above that "he and others had been assured that the administration's public statements about the weaponization fund being abandoned were 'all part of the plan; nothing has changed" accurate? If not, was the former member of Congress lying?

    RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed, no funds have been transferred, no claims have been received, and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

    d. If an individual sues the government due to supposed weaponization—such as under the *Federal Tort Claims Act*—will the Department defend against such a claim to the full extent of the law?

    RESPONSE: Every claim submitted pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act is reviewed on the merits and addressed by the Torts Branch of the Civil Division. The compromise and/or settlement of any claim is made only in the best interest of the United States.

41. The *New York Times* reported that on March 25, 2026, President Trump stated the following at a National Republican Congressional Committee event: "The time has also come for Republicans to pass a tough new crime bill that imposes harsh penalties for dangerous repeat offenders, cracks down on rogue judges. We got rogue judges that are criminals. They are criminals, what they do to our country. The decisions that they hand down and hurt our country."

    a. Is it a crime for a judge to rule against President Trump's desired outcome in a particular case?

    RESPONSE: No.

    b. Is it possible for a judge's decision to be correct, as a matter of fact and law, even if it differs from President Trump's desired outcome?

    RESPONSE: Yes. It is also possible for a decision to be *incorrect* as a matter of fact and law when it differs from the President Trump's desired outcome.

    c. Do you agree with President Trump that we need a "tough new crime bill" that "cracks down on rogue judges"?

    RESPONSE: I agree with the President that too many federal judges have abandoned their role as neutral arbiters and have substituted their partisan policy preferences for the correct legal outcome because they disagree with the President. This view is backed up by the Administration's record on the Supreme Court's emergency docket, where the Court has vacated or stayed 24 lower court orders directed against the Administration. As of June 2026, the Civil Division has filed over 120 motions to stay unlawful injunctions entered by district courts. In its first 100 days (and prior to the Supreme Court's decision in *CASA*), district courts entered at least 25 nationwide injunctions against the Second Trump Administration. According to the Congressional Research Service, in the entirety of their presidencies, there were only 12 nationwide injunctions in the Bush Administration, 19 in the Obama Administration, and 28 in the Biden Administration. There were 64 in the entire first Trump Administration.

    d. Do you think statements like those made by President Trump quoted above make federal judges more or less safe?

    RESPONSE: The Department of Justice is fully committed to ensuring the safety of all members of the federal judiciary.

42. President Trump has repeatedly made other statements disparaging and attacking judges.

    a. In May 2025, President Trump posted on Truth Social calling judges who have ruled against him "monsters who want our country to go to hell."

i. Do you agree with President Trump that judges who rule against the president are "monsters who want our country to go to hell"?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 41(c).

b. In February 2026, President Trump said that the Supreme Court justices who ruled against his tariffs were "unpatriotic and disloyal to our Constitution."

i. Do you agree with President Trump that Justice Barrett is unpatriotic?

RESPONSE: Like the President, I was disappointed with the Court's ruling in *Learning Resources, Inc. v. Trump*. The briefs and arguments of the United States in that case strongly supported the President's view that the challenged tariffs were entirely lawful. I share the President's frustration that the Court did not accept our arguments.

ii. Do you agree with President Trump that Justice Barrett is disloyal to the Constitution?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 42(b)(i).

iii. Do you agree with President Trump that Justice Gorsuch is unpatriotic?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 42(b)(i).

iv. Do you agree with President Trump that Justice Gorsuch is disloyal to the Constitution?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 42(b)(i).

43. A recent analysis found that 96% of President Trump's clemency grants in his second term have gone to people who didn't meet longstanding Department guidelines for clemency requests, including a five-year wait after conviction or demonstrated remorse for their crimes. In President Trump's first term, that number was just 14%.

a. Can you explain why that number has changed so dramatically?

RESPONSE: The President possesses unconditional and exclusive pardon and clemency authority for federal crimes under the Constitution. The Department is committed to timely and carefully reviewing all clemency applications to make recommendations to the President in support of his authority. There has been no departure from this long-standing process.

b. If confirmed, will you recommit to making sure grants of clemency adhere to Department guidelines?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 43(a) above.

44. Earlier this year—just as we were going to war with Iran—the FBI terminated at least 10 agents and analysts with expertise handling Iranian counterterrorism cases.

    a. Did you approve these terminations?

    RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to discuss personnel matters.

    b. Have you hired 10 new agents with experience tackling Iranian counterintelligence cases?

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 44(a).

    c. If you have hired replacements, do those agents speak Farsi?

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 44(a).

45. Jared Wise was hired as a senior advisor by the Department to work with the so-called "Weaponization Working Group." Prior to being hired by the Department, Wise berated Capitol Police officers on January 6, 2021, calling them "Nazi" and "Gestapo," and yelled at other rioters to quote, "kill 'em!"

    a. Who made the decision to hire Wise at the Department?

    RESPONSE: I was not involved in the hiring of Mr. Wise. It would otherwise be inappropriate for me to comment on personnel matters within the Department of Justice.

    b. What were Wise's duties at the Department?

    RESPONSE: Mr. Wise served as a senior advisor in the Deputy Attorney General's office and was assigned various matters related to the ending of the Biden Administration's weaponization of the federal government and specifically the Department of Justice.

    c. Do you agree that the officers protecting the Capitol on January 6 were "Nazi[s]"?

    RESPONSE: Law enforcement officers are heroes, and I will support them each and every day that I work at the Department of Justice.

    d. Do you think that people who advocate for the murder of law enforcement officials are suitable for employment at the Department?

RESPONSE: Violence against law enforcement officers is abhorrent. Threats of such violence is just as abhorrent. Under my leadership, any violation of federal law along those lines will be prosecuted.

46. I am proud to lead the *Safer Supervision Act* with Senators Lee, Wicker, Cramer, Tillis, Lankford, and Cornyn, and with broad support from law enforcement and groups across the political spectrum. The bill would reform our federal supervised release system in a way that reduces waste and improves public safety, including by (1) ensuring that courts are more thoughtful about when and how supervised release is imposed so resources be focused in a way that best addresses public safety, (2) creating positive incentives for rehabilitation through a presumption of early termination for individuals who after serving a significant portion of their supervision term have demonstrated good conduct and compliance and shown that termination would not jeopardize public safety, and (3) providing more discretion for courts when considering revocation for certain violations. I appreciated your testimony on our bill. Could you please elaborate further on your position?

    RESPONSE: I appreciate the leadership from Senators Coons, Lee, Wicker, Cramer, Tillis, Lankford, and Cornyn on the *Safer Supervision Act*. I support the legislation's balanced approach to federal supervised release reform. It would promote more judicious imposition of supervision terms to concentrate limited resources on cases posing genuine public safety risks, establish incentives for successful rehabilitation via early termination after demonstrated compliance, and grant courts greater flexibility in handling certain revocation matters. These proposals align with my prior testimony and ongoing priorities at the Department to enhance efficiency, reduce recidivism, and strengthen community safety.

47. The theft of American intellectual property, particularly by foreign adversaries such as China, poses a significant threat to U.S. innovation, economic competitiveness, and national security.

    a. If you are confirmed, how will the Department address these threats to American innovation?

        RESPONSE: China has been stealing American intellectual property for decades. We finally have a President and an Administration willing to do something about it. The best way to prevent intellectual property theft is to deny bad actors access to the intellectual property in the first place. This means aggressively prosecuting cybercrime and holding companies accountable when they lack appropriate safeguards. The Department is doing this already by, among other things, using the False Claims Act to pursue government contractors that misrepresent their cybersecurity compliance, fail to implement mandated security controls, or cover up data breaches.

    b. How do you see Department prosecutors working with FBI agents, other federal agencies, our international allies, and U.S. businesses to protect American IP?

RESPONSE: The Department has several key touch points with other federal agencies, international allies, and American industry to protect our intellectual property. The touch points include the National Cyber Investigative Joint Task Force, which is composed of multiple federal intelligence, military, and law enforcement agencies—along with local law enforcement and international and private industry partners.[1] The task force serves as the government's central hub for coordinating, integrating, and sharing information related to cyber threat investigations. Touch points also include the Criminal Division's Computer Crime & Intellectual Property Section.[2] This section routinely works with U.S. Attorney's Offices, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other domestic and international law enforcement partners to investigate and prosecute cybercrimes that cross jurisdictions.

In July, an alleged member of a criminal cyber hacking group was arrested in Finland and extradited to the United States to face federal criminal conspiracy charges in the Northern District of Illinois.[3] The arrest and extradition involved successful coordination among many law enforcement partners.

48. My *NDO Fairness Act* with Senator Lee would raise the standard that the Department must satisfy in order to gag third-party tech companies from notifying users that their digital records have been handed over to the government. This would create parity between the standards for the digital search and seizure of information with the standards for physical search and seizure. Do you agree with me and Senator Lee that there is a problem with certain NDOs being rubber stamped and not being justified by the circumstances?

RESPONSE: If you would like, the Department's Office of Legislative Affairs would be happy to initiate the process of evaluating the *NDO Fairness Act* for a Statement of Administration Policy. It would be inappropriate to give my personal opinion of the Bill separate from the established Department process.

49. Do you commit, as the Administrator of the General Services Administration has done, that FBI's new headquarters will be an ISC Level V facility?

RESPONSE: I take the security of the FBI headquarters seriously and commit to working as appropriate with relevant stakeholders and authorities, including GSA and FBI, to ensure FBI's headquarters is secured in a manner consistent with its security and operational needs.

---

[1] Nat'l Cyber Investigative Joint Task Force, Fed. Bureau of Investigation, https://www.fbi.gov/investigate/cyber/national-cyber-investigative-joint-task-force.
[2] About CCIPS, U.S. Dep't of Just., Crim. Div., Comput. Crime & Intell. Prop. Section, https://www.justice.gov/criminal/criminal-ccips/about-ccips.
[3] U.S. Dep't of Just., Alleged Member of Criminal Cyber Hacking Group "Scattered Spider" Arrested in Finland and Extradited to the United States (July 1, 2026), https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/alleged-member-criminal-cyber-hacking-group-scattered-spider-arrested-finland-and-extradited.

a. Will you commit that there will be no requests for waivers or exceptions to ISC Level V security protocols to ensure that the FBI headquarters meets the highest security standards?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 49.

50. Does the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center have current capacity to meet FBI's security and operational needs, including protection from threats given the dense urban setting, utility systems sufficient to support secure compartmented networks, and electrical systems to support redundant classified operations?

RESPONSE: I am not in a position to offer a comprehensive capacity assessment of the Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center. My understanding is that some modifications to these spaces would be necessary, as would be expected, as determined by appropriate government authorities. Otherwise, please see my response to Question 49.

a. If not, what structural changes or utility upgrades are necessary to meet security and operational needs?

RESPONSE: Please see my responses to Questions 49 and 50.

b. Have those costs been factored into the $1.4 billion cost estimate for the move?

RESPONSE: Please see my responses to Questions 49 and 50.

51. Despite the administration's bluster about cracking down on fraud, in 2025, fines collected from anti-money laundering violations were down 54%, investigations into tax fraud schemes were down 63%, and 25,000 federal agents—including those who investigated white collar crimes—were diverted to immigration enforcement.

a. Do you think that redirecting career prosecutors and FBI and IRS agents who investigated fraud and other white collar crimes to immigration enforcement shows that the administration is really focused on fighting fraud?

RESPONSE: In addition to supporting critical public safety initiatives, contributing to significant drops in homicide and violent crime rates nationwide, the Department of Justice has created the National Fraud Enforcement Division—the first new division at the Department in 20 years—to root out fraud across the country and design the first comprehensive and coordinated plan to protect taxpayer dollars. The creation of the National Fraud Enforcement Division in 2026 followed record-setting fraud efforts in 2025.

b. Was it your decision to pull back on the Department's investigations into white collar criminals? If not, who made that decision?

RESPONSE: I have presided over the creation of the National Fraud Enforcement Division, the first new division at the Department of Justice in 20 years, to root out fraud across the country and design the first-ever comprehensive and coordinated plan to protect taxpayer dollars from white-collar criminals and other fraudulent actors.

c. Do you think it's fair to the Americans who pay their taxes that the Department isn't trying to catch tax cheats?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice is actively and zealously prosecuting individuals who commit tax offenses, and the first-ever National Fraud Enforcement Division has been charged with protecting the financial integrity of our government and the tax system that supports it.

52. The Department reportedly plans to consolidate the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), the Office of Justice Programs, and the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services into one centralized grantmaking structure. But Congress established in the *Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2022* that OVW shall "not [be] subsumed by any other office." Please explain how the Department's plan does not violate this provision.

RESPONSE: The Office of Legal Counsel evaluated the relevant statutes and authorities and determined that this important government efficiency initiative complies with existing law. OVW will remain a distinct office within the new grants component.

53. Illegal products from China have flooded the U.S. market in recent years that ignore virtually all applicable laws and regulations. This Committee has held hearings on illicit e-vapor products coming from China. Recently, the U.S. Department of Transportation's National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) confirmed counterfeit and defective airbags from China are being found in U.S. cars, leading to serious injuries and deaths. Will you commit to leading the Department to take the strongest legal actions possible against those responsible for the manufacture, distribution, or sale of these illegal products?

RESPONSE: Americans should never have to worry about counterfeit products from China endangering their lives. Under my leadership, the Department has and will continue to prioritize trade fraud. As of earlier this month, the Trade Fraud Task Force had surpassed $1 billion in recoveries and charged losses.[4] We will not stop, and we will use the full extent of the law to pursue those responsible for the manufacture, distribution, and sale of illegal products.

In September 2025, the Department announced that two Chinese nationals had pled guilty to participating in a large-scale, trans-Pacific scheme concerning fraudulent "returns" of

[4] U.S. Dep't of Just., *Trade Fraud Task Force Surpasses $1 Billion in Recoveries and Charged Losses in Less Than One Year* (July 14, 2026), https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/trade-fraud-task-force-surpasses-1-billion-recoveries-and-charged-losses-less-one-year.

thousands of counterfeit technology products.[5] The conspiracy involved fraudulent returns and attempted returns of around 27,645 counterfeit devices, causing at least $16,239,254 in actual losses.

That same month, the Department, along with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, announced the seizure of more than 2.1 million illicit vaping products taken from five distributors and six retailers across seven different states.[6]

54. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce estimates that piracy costs the American economy between $29.2 billion and $70.1 billion and between 230,000 and 560,000 jobs every year. According to the International Intellectual Property Alliance (IIPA), the core copyright industries—which include film and television, music, publishing, and video games—employ 9.6 million American workers. Since 2021, the *Protecting Lawful Streaming Act* (PLSA) has enabled U.S law enforcement to target large, for-profit U.S.-based criminal streaming services by charging them with felonies—a meaningful step both in prosecuting and deterring mass online piracy. How do you view the role of IP protection as it relates to illicit streaming? How do you plan to use the PLSA to fight piracy?

RESPONSE: The unauthorized broadcast of content violates intellectual property rights and fuels many criminal organizations. It can also subject viewers to malware attacks and unsecure connections that can compromise personal and financial data. The Department takes these threats seriously, though they often make for difficult investigations given that the location of servers, the location of domain name registrations, and/or the locations of perpetrators may be outside federal jurisdiction.

In June, the Criminal Division seized nearly 400 sites that were engaged in the unauthorized streaming of matches in the FIFA World Cup Finals in violation of U.S. copyright law.[7] The action was part of Operation Offsides, led by the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center, targeting digital piracy domains associated with the World Cup. The Department intends to use all available tools to pursue these types of cases. The Protecting Lawful Streaming Act is one such tool and provides a helpful deterrent.

55. In its "Made in China 2025" plan as well as its "China Standards 2035" plan, China makes clear its intention to supplant the United States as the global technology leader, particularly in critical and emerging technologies like artificial intelligence, 5G/6G, semiconductors, quantum computing, and biotechnology. One think tank has reported that China is currently leading the United States in the development of 37 of 44 critical

[5] Chinese Nationals Plead Guilty to Fake Apple Device Return Fraud that Conned the Technology Giant Out of More Than $16 Million, U.S. Dep't of Just. (Sept. 3, 2025), https://www.justice.gov/usao-cdca/pr/chinese-nationals-plead-guilty-fake-apple-device-return-fraud-conned-technology-giant.
[6] More Than Two Million Illicit Vaping Products Seized in Nationwide Sweep, U.S. Dep't of Just. (Sept. 25, 2025), https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/more-two-million-illicit-vaping-products-seized-nationwide-sweep.
[7] U.S. Dep't of Just., United States Seizes Hundreds of Internet Domains Used to Illegally Stream World Cup Matches (June 26, 2026), https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/united-states-seizes-hundreds-internet-domains-used-illegally-stream-world-cup-matches.

and emerging technologies. China has also shown that it will use its legal system to benefit domestic industries and gain an unfair advantage over U.S. innovators. If the United States is to meet the challenge presented by China, we must aggressively pursue pro-innovation policies that incentivize long-term private investment in critical and emerging technologies.

a. Do you commit to pursuing pro-inventor patent policies that will correct the trajectory of our country and help us reclaim our place as the undisputed world leader in technology?

RESPONSE: The Department is implementing a pro-patent framework for intellectual property enforcement. We believe that strong, enforceable patent rights encourage, rather than stifle, innovation.

The Department has and will continue to be involved in cases where we can support patentees' ability to seek injunctive relief to block patent infringement. We did exactly that in February, in coordination with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.[8] A thorough evaluation of whether a patent owner is entitled to injunctive relief is a fundamental aspect of the rights a patent confers.

The Department can also support patent owners by leveraging the Intellectual Property Section of the Civil Division. The Intellectual Property Section represents the United States in cases involving a patent, copyright, trademark, or trade secret. Attorneys in the Intellectual Property Section have a degree in one of the physical sciences or in an engineering field and are eligible for admission to practice before the United States Patent and Trademark Office in patent matters—and approximately half are U.S. Patent and Trademark bar members.[9] These team members are an essential aspect of pursuing pro-inventor patent policies, and we will deploy their capabilities where appropriate.

b. Will you stand up to China and other countries that use their legal systems to gain unfair advantage over U.S. innovators? If so, how?

RESPONSE: Yes. There are a number of levers available to the Administration to fight back against the unfair advantage gained through the Chinese government's manipulations of its legal system. For one, the Administration can use trade authority to level the scales. It can also use export controls and visa restrictions to limit our enemies' access to American innovation. The Department helps enforce those policies by, among other things, prosecuting cases involving trade or visa fraud. We have and will continue to do so.

[8] U.S. Patent & Trademark Off., *USPTO and DOJ File Statement of Interest Reaffirming the Importance of Incentives to Innovate* (Feb. 27, 2026), https://www.uspto.gov/about-us/news-updates/uspto-and-doj-file-statement-interest-reaffirming-importance-incentives.
[9] U.S. Dep't of Just., Intellectual Property Section, https://www.justice.gov/civil/intellectual-property-section.

The Chinese government knows that, all things being even, China cannot out-innovate America. This is why the Chinese government relies so heavily on unfair advantages gained through legal systems and cybercrime, which they use to steal American intellectual property. We can cut off their access to American innovation by preventing key information from ever leaving the country. Again, this is why prosecuting trade fraud, visa fraud, and cybercrimes will remain a priority of the Department so long as I am leading it.

Questions for the Record for Hon. Todd Blanche
Submitted by Senator Richard Blumenthal
July 17, 2026

1. At your hearing I referenced a lawsuit filed by the Iranian American Legal Defense Fund alleging that the Trump Administration has adopted a policy of collaborating with the Islamic Republic of Iran to provide details on asylum applicants and those that have requested withholding of removal or relief under the Convention Against Torture.

    a. When did you first learn of these allegations?

    RESPONSE: I cannot comment on ongoing litigation.

    b. Have you previously approved, reviewed, discussed, advised, objected to, or otherwise participated in any policy, arrangement, legal analysis, or decision concerning the disclosure of such information?

    RESPONSE: Any activity related to this question, if performed, would be subject to privilege.

    c. Did the Office of the Attorney General, Office of the Deputy Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, Civil Division, Executive Office of Immigration Review, U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia, or another DOJ component review or advise on such conduct?

    RESPONSE: I do not have personal knowledge of those offices advising on such conduct.

        i. Was any written legal opinion, memorandum, authorization, or decision document prepared?

        RESPONSE: I do not have personal knowledge of the preparation of such a document.

    d. If so, without disclosing privileged legal advice, identify the DOJ offices involved, the dates of their involvement, the officials responsible for the ultimate decision, and whether DOJ's involvement occurred before or after any alleged disclosure.

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 1(c).

2. Title 8, Code of Federal Regulations Section 208.6(a), prohibits disclosure by the DOJ of information contained in or pertaining to any application for refugee admission, asylum, withholding of removal under section 241(b)(3) of the Act, or protection under regulations issued pursuant to the Convention Against Torture's implementing legislation.

a. Did DOJ or any of its components, including the Executive Office of Immigration Review (EOIR), provide asylum, withholding, Convention Against Torture (CAT), credible-fear, or reasonable-fear information from Iranian nationals to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) or the Department of State (State) for purposes of:

   i. Repatriation of such nationals?

      RESPONSE: I do not have personal knowledge of those offices providing such information to State. As a party to proceedings adjudicated by EOIR, DHS has access to and receives the same information that EOIR does. Outside of that context, I do not have personal knowledge of any DOJ office providing such information to DHS.

   ii. Deportation of such nationals?

      RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 2(a)(i).

   iii. Arranging meetings with such nationals and Iranian officials?

      RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 2(a)(i).

b. Did DOJ or any of its components transmit such information directly or indirectly to an Iranian official or the Iranian Interests Section?

   RESPONSE: I do not have personal knowledge of DOJ transmitting such information to an Iranian official or the Iranian Interests Section.

c. If DOJ supplied information to DHS or State, what restrictions, if any, governed the use of such information and its onward disclosure?

   RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 2(a)(i).

d. Did DOJ require confirmation that the receiving components would comply with applicable federal regulations?

   RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 2(a)(i).

e. Was written consent for disclosure obtained from any affected Iranian national?

   RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 2(a)(i).

f. If the answers are presently unknown, will you order an investigation and provide my office with a verified supplemental response?

RESPONSE: As I testified in the hearing, we will handle the suit and underlying allegations appropriately.

3. When asked if you would investigate these allegations at your hearing, you stated that, "if the lawsuit needs to be answered and part of that includes investigation, absolutely."

    a. If your investigation reveals illegal disclosures, will you decline to defend in Court the individuals within the Executive Branch who exceeded their authority by giving this information to the Iranian regime?

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 2(f).

4. If confirmed, will you adopt and disseminate a DOJ policy prohibiting disclosure of protected information under 8 C.F.R. § 1208.6(a), to an applicant's country of feared persecution unless the applicant provides informed written consent or the disclosure is supported by an express, contemporaneous authorization from the legally responsible official?

    RESPONSE: If confirmed, the Department will continue to follow all applicable privacy laws.

    a. If you will not make this commitment, please explain why and describe the alternative safeguards you would implement.

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 4.

5. The Executive Office of Immigration Review court in Hartford, Connecticut has been plagued by a number of issues impacting fair adjudications, including delays in filing acceptance by the EOIR electronic system, failure to provide adequate notice of hearings, and unwarranted *in absentia* removal orders including at least three occasions in which *pro se* respondents were left waiting in Webex rooms for hours without admittance leading to erroneous *in absentia* removal orders against them.

    a. Will you commit to providing my office with a briefing from relevant EOIR Hartford staff on these issues?

    RESPONSE: If confirmed, the Department would welcome discussing a briefing for your office concerning our Executive Office for Immigration Review court in Hartford, Connecticut.

6. On June 2, 2026, in testimony before a subcommittee of the U.S. House of Representatives, you stated, with respect to the so-called "Anti-Weaponization Fund" ("the Fund"): "We are not moving forward with the fund, period." During your confirmation hearing, on July 15, 2026, you again asserted: "The Weaponization Fund is dead; it's not moving forward."

The settlement agreement that created the Fund expressly states that it "may be modified only with the written agreement of the Parties"—that is, both the Department of Justice and President Trump and his family. Yet, you claimed to be able to assuage Congress's concerns about the Fund by unilaterally declaring that it had been eliminated, even though neither President Trump nor his counsel have indicated that they have agreed to this action, either verbally, or in writing, as required by the terms of the settlement agreement.

a. Is there a written modification to the terms of the settlement agreement eliminating the Weaponization?

RESPONSE: No.

i. If so, please produce a copy of the modification with your responses.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 6(a).

ii. If not, has the Department proposed such a modification to President Trump's legal team?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

7. At no point in the litigation did attorneys for the Department enter a notice of appearance.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 6(a)(ii).

a. Please identify the lawyers at the Department who were responsible for handling this litigation.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 6(a)(ii).

i. Please identify whether each of these attorneys was a political appointee of this Administration or a civil service DOJ employee.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 6(a)(ii).

b. Given the highly unusual circumstances in this case – namely the President and his family suing the U.S. Government of which is he the leader – did you take any steps to insulate this team from White House or other political pressure? If so, please describe those steps.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 6(a)(ii).

c. Were any DOJ personnel asked to take responsibility for the settlement of this case and decline to do so?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 6(a)(ii).

8. In Judge Williams's decision voiding the settlement of the case, she noted that in comparable cases arising from the same facts, the Department vigorously defended the cases and sought dismissal for, among other reasons, statutes of limitations, preemption, sovereign immunity, and failure to plead damages. In President Trump's case, in contrast, the Department failed to assert any defenses to the President's claims and instead entered the purported settlement.

   a. Who at the Department was responsible for the decision not to assert defenses or otherwise defend against the President's claims?

   RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 6(a)(ii).

9. On May 18, 2026, the Department of Justice announced a settlement of President Trump's lawsuit against the IRS, and included an agreement to establish a nearly $1.8 billion fund to compensate supposed victims of alleged weaponization of law enforcement. That document was executed by Daniel Epstein, on behalf of President Trump, by Associate Attorney General Stanley Woodward on behalf of the Department, and by Chief Executive Officer Frank Bisignano on behalf of the IRS.

   The following day, the Department released a purported addendum to that agreement, signed only by you, that sought to provide the President and his family with blanket immunity from IRS claims and audits for prior tax years.

   a. Were the provisions of the tax immunity addendum part of the original settlement agreement or were they added on after the announcement and release of the original agreement on May 18?

   RESPONSE: The documents speak for themselves. It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

   b. If so:

      i. Why were the tax immunity provisions not included in the original settlement document?

      RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 6(a)(ii).

      ii. Why was the tax immunity addendum executed on a unilaterally?

      RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 6(a)(ii).

10. Under oath at his nominations hearing in January 2025, Director Kash Patel promised me that he would not retaliate against Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) employees who had worked on cases contrary to President Trump's interest. Yet, after taking office, he almost immediately engaged in sweeping firings of agents assigned to investigations into the president's misconduct and attempted to obtain a list of all FBI agents that worked on the January 6 investigations. You later bragged about his actions during an appearance at the Conservative Political Action Committee (CPAC).

    a. Would you support an investigation by the Department of Justice Office of the Inspector General (DOJ OIG) into Director Patel's alleged retaliatory firings?

    RESPONSE: The Inspector General has independent statutory authority to determine which matters within the Office's jurisdiction to investigate, and I respect that independence. It is not my role to direct the Inspector General's docket, and I would neither impede nor attempt to influence the Office's exercise of its judgment. A number of the personnel actions referenced are the subject of pending civil litigation, and I will not characterize them here.

    b. Will you commit that the Department will fully cooperate with such an investigation if opened?

    RESPONSE: I am committed to ensuring that the Department cooperates consistent with applicable law, including the production of records and access to personnel as required, subject only to legal limitations such as applicable privileges that would apply to any such review.

11. In April, The Atlantic reported that Director Kash Patel's alleged excessive drinking and unexplained absences have interfered with his job performance, including rendering him unavailable to respond to emerging threats.[1] Members of his security detail reportedly have had difficulty waking him because of his apparent intoxication. On one occasion, they even reportedly made a request for SWAT-style "breaching equipment" because Patel was unresponsive behind locked doors. Moreover, the reporting indicates that Patel's attendance at the office has been inconsistent—causing delays in decision-making in ongoing investigations.

    Director Patel's tenure has also been marked with reporting about his alleged broader inattentiveness and focus on the perks, rather than the substance, of the job. He attended the men's hockey gold medal game at the Milan Olympics and a "VIP snorkel" tour at the Pearl Harbor memorial—swimming next to the U.S.S. Arizona, which holds the remains of more than 900 Navy sailors and Marines who died at Pearl Harbor—both on purported

[1] Sarah Fitzpatrick, *The FBI Director is MIA*, THE ATLANTIC, Apr. 17, 2026, https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/2026/04/kash-patel-fbi-director-drinking-absences/686839/.

work travel.[2] Ahead of an international intelligence conference, he reportedly focused on setting up a helicopter tour and jet skiing rather than in-office meetings with allies.[3]

a. Do you agree that the Director of the FBI must be available and capable of performing the duties of the role at all times?

RESPONSE: I reject wholly the premise of this question. The Director of the FBI must be able to perform the duties of the office, and Director Patel does.

b. I have requested that DOJ OIG open an investigation into Director Patel's alleged misconduct. Would you support such an investigation?

RESPONSE: The Inspector General has independent statutory authority to determine which matters within the Office's jurisdiction to investigate, and I respect that independence. It is not my role to direct the Inspector General's docket, and I would neither impede nor attempt to influence the Office's exercise of its judgment.

c. Do you commit that the Department will fully cooperate with such an investigation, if opened.

RESPONSE: Yes. If the Inspector General opens an investigation, I am committed to ensuring that the Department cooperates consistent with applicable law, subject only to legal limitations such as applicable privileges.

12. In May, MS NOW reported that Director Patel has artificially inflated the Bureau's arrest statistics and manipulated the FBI's Most Wanted list to expand the appearance of accomplishments.[4] He reportedly imposed new policies that change the way the Bureau catalogs arrests that make arrests appear to have increased, but failed to clarify those changes before publicly touting the FBI's arrest record under his tenure. The Bureau also reportedly manipulated its Most Wanted list to add fugitives mere days or even just hours before their anticipated capture—creating a false impression of steady progress on that list and of Patel's leadership.

a. I have also requested that DOJ OIG open an investigation into Director Patel's alleged manipulation of FBI arrest statistics and the Most Wanted list. Would you support such an investigation?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 11(b).

---

[2] *Id.*; Jim Mustian, Eric Tucker, & Michael Biesecker, *Emails show FBI Director Kash Patel's Hawaii trip included 'VIP snorkel' at a Pearl Harbor memorial*, AP, May 14, 2026, https://apnews.com/article/fbi-kash-patel-snorkel-hawaii-pearl-harbor-192a81cde7a5879aab747bc0ba4b78b9.

[3] Emily Bazelon & Rachel Poser, *A Year Inside Kash Patel's F.B.I.*, THE NEW YORK TIMES, Jan. 22, 2026, https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2026/01/22/magazine/trump-kash-patel-fbi-agents.html.

[4] Carol Leonnig & Ken Dilanian, *FBI insiders: Kash Patel is 'padding the stats' to boost his record of arrests*, MS NOW, May 13, 2026, https://www.ms.now/news/fbi-insiders-kash-patel-is-padding-the-stats-to-boost-his-record-of-arrests.

b. Do you commit that the Department will fully cooperate with such an investigation, if opened.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 11(c).

13. In May 2025, David Gentile was sentenced to seven years in prison for his role in a fraud scheme that raised almost $1.8 billion and defrauded over ten thousand investors.[5] Gentile was also ordered to pay over $15.5 million in forfeiture.[6] Gentile's sentence was commuted in November 2025 by President Trump, just twelve days after he began serving his sentence.[7] The circumstances surrounding that commutation, reportedly including payments of $2.5 million or more to intermediaries with close ties to President Trump who helped Mr. Gentile secure a pardon, were sufficiently suspicious for the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Eastern District of New York to reportedly open an investigation into the commutation.[8] That investigation appears to have been closed following pressure from your office.[9]

a. When did you become aware of the Eastern District of New York's investigation into the circumstances around the commutation of David Gentile's sentence?

RESPONSE: I respectfully disagree with the characterization in this question, which is premised on anonymous press reporting. However, consistent with longstanding Department policy, I cannot confirm or deny the existence of any investigation, and it would be inappropriate for me to comment on any investigative matter or discuss any internal and confidential deliberations.

b. Did anyone outside the Department of Justice contact you or anyone in your office concerning the investigation into Mr. Gentile's commutation?

RESPONSE: I am not aware of any such communications.

i. If so, please identify the person or persons who contacted you and describe the nature of those discussions.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 13(b).

---

[5] Sentencing Memorandum of the United States at 12, United States v. Gentile, No. 21-cr-00054 (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 21, 2025), ECF No. 539 at 7, https://static01.nyt.com/newsgraphics/documenttools/4ec42e53e412e0e3/c324f8f4-full.pdf.

[6] Restitution Motion of the United States, United States v. Gentile, No. 21-cr-00054 (E.D.N.Y. Jun. 10, 2025), ECF No. 610, https://www.politico.com/f/?id=0000019a-e5e8-da2c-af9f-ffe9ff0f0000;

[7] Santul Nerkar and Kenneth P. Vogel, *Fraudster's Victims Are Seething After Trump Commuted His Sentence*, N.Y. TIMES (Dec. 12, 2025), https://www.nytimes.com/2025/12/12/nyregion/david-gentile-trump-commutation.html.

[8] Kenneth P. Vogel, Nicole Hong and William K. Rashbaum, *Trump Administration Shuttered a Criminal Probe Into Fraudster's Clemency*, N.Y. TIMES (June 21, 2026), https://www.nytimes.com/2026/06/21/us/politics/trump-fraudster-priest-investigation-brooklyn.html.

[9] *Id.*

c. Did you receive a request or instruction from President Trump, any White House official, or anyone else affiliated with President Trump, to end the investigation into Mr. Gentile's commutation?

RESPONSE: I respectfully reject the premise of this question; however, it would be inappropriate for me to answer this question further to the extent that doing so would violate applicable privilege.

d. Did Associate Deputy Attorney General Aakash Singh contact the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, Joseph Nocella, Jr., to discuss the investigation into Mr. Gentile's commutation?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 13(a).

i. Did you direct Mr. Singh to contact Mr. Nocella?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 13(a).

ii. Did you discuss the call with Mr. Singh before it occurred?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 13(a).

iii. Did you discuss the call with Mr. Singh after it occurred?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 13(a).

iv. Was the investigation into the circumstances surrounding Mr. Gentile's commutation dropped after the call between Mr. Singh and Mr. Nocella?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 13(a).

14. At the end of President Trump's first term, he engaged in a relentless campaign to pressure the Department of Justice to help him overturn the results of the 2020 election. Ultimately, the Attorney General at the time—William Barr—recognized the truth, stood up to President Trump, and declared what career DOJ attorneys and FBI agents had been saying the whole time: There was no "fraud on a scale that could have effected a different outcome in the [2020] election," so Joe Biden had won. Barr then resigned rather than indulge President Trump's continued baseless election conspiracies.

Barr's successor, Jeffrey Rosen, similarly discerned truth from falsehood and recognized that President Trump had lost the election. Therefore, when President Trump sought to have DOJ help him overturn the election by installing the election conspiracist Jeffrey Clark as Attorney General, Rosen and other senior DOJ officials stopped him by threatening to resign en masse if he did so.

Previous Attorneys General were willing speak truth to power by stating the simple fact that the 2020 election was not stolen and Joe Biden won it. You refused to do the same during your nomination for Deputy Attorney General in your responses to questions for the record. In response to a question asking whether President Trump lost the 2020 election, you provided only the canned and non-responsive answer: "Former President Joseph Biden was sworn in as our 46th President on January 20, 2021, and there was a peaceful transition of power on that day."

The following questions will give you another opportunity to provide basic factual answers about the outcomes of our democratic process—this time, hopefully, in a direct and responsive manner.

a. Who won the 2020 election?

RESPONSE: On January 7, 2021, Congress certified that Joseph Biden won the majority of electoral votes.

b. Who won the popular vote in the 2020 election?

RESPONSE: Generally, each State (and the District of Columbia) effectively allocates their electoral votes (Maine and Nebraska are exceptions) to the candidate recognized by the appropriate election officer as having received the most popular votes in the jurisdiction. When the popular votes of each State and the District of Columbia recognized by the appropriate election officer are combined, Joseph Biden received the greatest number of popular votes.

c. Who won the electoral college in the 2020 election?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 14(a).

d. Who won the 2024 election?

RESPONSE: On January 6, 2025, Congress certified that Donald Trump won the majority of electoral votes.

e. Who won the popular vote in the 2024 election?

RESPONSE: Generally, each State (and the District of Columbia) effectively allocates their electoral votes (Maine and Nebraska are exceptions) to the candidate recognized by the appropriate election officer as having received the most popular votes in the jurisdiction. When the popular votes of each State and the District of Columbia recognized by the appropriate election officer are combined, Donald Trump received the greatest number of popular votes.

f. Who won the electoral college in the 2024 election?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 14(d).

g. On May 17, 2026, you claimed on Fox News that there is a "ton of evidence" that the 2020 election was rigged against President Trump. Yet, none of the more than sixty cases President Trump filed in courts nationwide in an attempt to overturn the election results have succeeded—and the majority never even made it to trial.

i. Do you still believe that there is a "ton of evidence" that the 2020 election was rigged?

RESPONSE: I stand by the statement I made on May 17, 2026.

ii. Beyond the evidence courts have already rejected, what proof do you have to support your claim that the election was rigged against President Trump?

RESPONSE: As I stated on May 17, 2026, there are several outstanding investigations. Consistent with longstanding rules and guidelines of the Department, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on outstanding investigations.

15. In 2017, over 10,000 9/11 victims and families filed suit against the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for its alleged role in the 9/11 terror attacks, a lawsuit enabled by an act of Congress in enacting the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act in 2016. Those families have long fought for the disclosure of FBI files regarding Saudi connections to the 9/11 plot—files that would help them in their fight to hold the Saudi government responsible for its role in the deaths of their loved ones. That lawsuit is heading to trial after a District Court judge in New York ruled last year against the Kingdom's motion to dismiss, largely based on evidence that the families have been able to amass through the UK government, not ours.

During a meeting at the White House on September 11, 2019, President Trump promised 9/11 families that he would open up the files. But like so many of his promises, he failed to live up to it. Trump's own Attorney General, Bill Barr, and other senior national security officials invoked the state secrets privilege to keep the files hidden—an immense insult to the families. This was especially shocking to the families since President Trump told Fox News in 2016 that Saudi Arabia "blew up the World Trade Center."

When President Biden took office, he ordered a widescale declassification review that resulted in the release of hundreds of additional documents that should have long ago been disclosed. But even that effort was incomplete, and so much remains withheld. With the 25th anniversary of September 11th now less than two months away, justice and accountability still elude 9/11 families and the public at large.

a. If confirmed, will you commit to meeting with 9/11 families and their representatives?

RESPONSE: I recognize the profound and enduring significance of the September 11, 2001 attacks for the victims' families. I believe that the families of the victims of the attacks on September 11 deserve justice. If confirmed, I would welcome the opportunity to discuss the matter further with appropriate officials at the Department regarding meeting with the 9/11 families and their representatives.

b. If confirmed, will you commit to expediting the release of documents still being withheld by the Department of Justice?

RESPONSE: I believe it would be inappropriate for me to make any commitment with respect to the declassification of any government records without having first consulted with appropriate officials within the Department of Justice as well as with other relevant authorities in other affected agencies. I will ensure that the Department handles this litigation consistent with its legal obligations, the rule of law, and the interests of justice, and that the families' concerns are heard through appropriate channels.

16. Will you commit to meeting with the survivors of the heinous crimes of Jeffrey Epstein, Ghislaine Maxwell, and their associates?

RESPONSE: In addition to previous meetings DOJ leadership and officials have had with victims and their counsel over the last 15 months, I met with several victims of Jeffrey Epstein and their counsel on July 16, 2026, including Dani Bensky who testified at my confirmation hearing. I remain committed to engaging with victims of Jeffrey Epstein through appropriate legal channels.

17. Will you make a public apology to the survivors whose personally identifiable information was exposed in the Department's botched released under the Epstein Files Transparency Act?

RESPONSE: I already apologized for any mistakes that were made for any inadvertent disclosure of victim PII during my testimony on July 15, 2026. See Transcript, page 112, lines 9-22**.** Every individual is unique and may react differently to the disclosure of PII. Disclosure of victim PII may cause emotional distress, reputational harm, or unwanted contact. Victims' wellbeing is paramount, and DOJ regrets any harm caused by the inadvertent disclosure of PII.

18. What instructions were given to Department employees to redact the files released under the Epstein Files Transparency Act?

RESPONSE: Yes. The Department provided training on privacy, redaction protocols, and victim-identifying information. The Attorney Review Protocol for Epstein Files is publicly available on the Epstein Library on the DOJ's website.

a. Who was involved in developing those instructions?

RESPONSE: The Attorney Review Protocol for Epstein Files and other training materials were developed by and in consultation with experienced DOJ and FBI personnel, many of whom are privacy specialists.

b. What processes were in place to prevent survivors' information being released?

RESPONSE: The Department provided training on privacy, redaction protocols, and victim-identifying information. The Attorney Review Protocol for Epstein Files is publicly available on the Epstein Library on the DOJ's website.

i. Why did these processes fail?

RESPONSE: After its release of responsive materials, the Department immediately initiated a comprehensive review to identify and correct instances where victim names or PII were inadvertently disclosed. This included pulling affected documents, making additional redactions, establishing a dedicated victim tip line for reporting issues, coordinating with victims' counsel, and implementing enhanced redaction protocols for subsequent or re-released materials. We take victim privacy extremely seriously and continue to rectify any errors promptly.

c. Why were survivors' names not redacted in the released documents when the Department was given a list of survivors' names to redact?

RESPONSE: See subpart (a) above.

d. What processes were in place to prevent abusers' information being redacted?

RESPONSE: Consistent with the EFTA, no process was in place to prevent abusers' information from being redacted.

i. Why did these processes fail?

RESPONSE: After its release of responsive materials, the Department immediately initiated a comprehensive review to identify and correct instances where victim names or PII were inadvertently disclosed or where abuser information was inadvertently not disclosed. This included pulling affected documents, making or removing additional redactions, establishing a dedicated tip line for reporting issues, coordinating with victims' counsel, and implementing enhanced redaction protocols for

subsequent or re-released materials. We take victim privacy extremely seriously and continue to rectify any errors promptly.

19. Was anyone at DOJ disciplined, removed, or referred for investigation as a result of the redaction failures? If not, why not?

RESPONSE: Any mistakes made concerning redactions were inadvertent. After its release of responsive materials, the Department immediately initiated a comprehensive review to identify and correct instances where victim names or PII were inadvertently disclosed. This included pulling affected documents, making additional redactions, establishing a dedicated victim tip line for reporting issues, coordinating with victims' counsel, and implementing enhanced redaction protocols for subsequent or re-released materials. We take victim privacy extremely seriously and continue to rectify any errors promptly. Commenting on any personnel matters such as any removal or other discipline would be inappropriate.

20. Who approved the withholding of documents responsive to the *Epstein Files Transparency Act*?

RESPONSE: All known responsive documents under the Act have been released.

e. How many pages of responsive documents has the Department withheld?

RESPONSE: All known responsive documents under the Act have been released.

21. Have any investigative leads been closed without survivor notification or consultation? If so, why?

RESPONSE: Consistent with longstanding Department policy, I cannot comment on the status of investigations.

22. You served as an Assistant United States Attorney (AUSA) in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York between 2006 and 2014. Between 2008 and 2013, you served in the Violent Crimes Unit, including in various leadership positions.

As an AUSA, you handled cases involving violations of federal firearms laws and firearms offenses. In fact, at least three of the matters you listed on your Senate Judiciary Questionnaire as being the most significant matters you personally litigated were prosecutions involving firearms.

a. Do you believe federal firearms laws should be enforced?

RESPONSE: The Department's role is to enforce that laws that Congress has enacted.

b. Do you believe federal firearms offenses should be prosecuted?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(a).

c. Do you agree that violations of 18 U.S.C. § 922(a)(1)(A) for unlicensed dealing, manufacturing, or importing should be prosecuted?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(a).

d. Do you believe all laws prohibiting or otherwise regulating large-capacity magazines are unconstitutional?

RESPONSE: I defer to the measured judgment of Congress on whether the NFA should be repealed or weakened. The Department's duty is to defend the constitutionality of the laws passed by this body. Under Department of Justice policy and relevant privileges, I am unable to comment on matters that are in active litigation.

e. Do you believe that it should be legal for the general public to buy machine guns?

RESPONSE: Congress has prohibited the general public from possessing machine guns under 18 U.S.C. § 922(o).

f. Do you believe that laws banning the following individuals from owning guns are unconstitutional:

i. Convicted murderers?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(a).

ii. Convicted rapists?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(a).

iii. Convicted violent domestic abusers?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(a).

iv. Convicted mass shooters?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(a).

g. Recent reporting from ProPublica on ATF referrals for and Department prosecutions of gun trafficking and trafficking-related charges revealed that "ATF referrals for common trafficking-related charges . . . decreased 15% in 2025 from 2024," and that "in the first year of the Trump Administration, the DOJ declined

30% more referrals from the ATF for the main trafficking-related charges than it had the year prior."

RESPONSE: I understand that ATF disputes the figures included in this reporting. The Department is fully committed to eradicating violent crime, taking illegal firearms off the street, and preventing illegal firearms from entering the hands of gangs and cartels.

h. How many firearms trafficking investigations did ATF have open on January 20, 2025, under 18 U.S.C. § 922(a)(1)(A)?

RESPONSE: I do not have this information available to me, and I am not in a position to provide investigation figures for any specific date without confirming the underlying data with ATF, as well as any other relevant Department components. I would refer you to the Department's Office of Legislative Affairs for information reflecting ATF records.

i. How many of those investigations have since been closed?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

1. How many of the closed investigations were referred to DOJ for prosecution?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

2. If any closed investigations were not referred to DOJ for prosecution, please provide an explanation of why not.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

ii. Of the investigations referred to the Department:

1. How many have been prosecuted by the Department?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

a. In each of the cases prosecuted by the Department, what charge or charges were brought and what was the disposition?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

2. If the Department did not prosecute all of the referrals, please explain why not.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

i. How many firearms trafficking investigations has ATF opened since January 20, 2025, under 18 U.S.C. § 922(a)(1)(A)?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

i. How many of those investigations have since been closed?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

1. How many of the closed investigations were referred to DOJ for prosecution?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

2. If any closed investigations were not referred to DOJ for prosecution, please provide an explanation of why not.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

ii. Of the investigations referred to the Department:

1. How many have been prosecuted by the Department?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

a. In each of the cases prosecuted by the Department, what charge or charges were brought and what was the disposition?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

2. If the Department did not prosecute all of the referrals, please explain why not.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

j. How many firearms trafficking investigations did ATF have open on January 20, 2025 under 18 U.S.C. § 932?

RESPONSE: Please see my response Question 22(h)

i. How many of those investigations have since been closed?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

1. How many of the closed investigations were referred to DOJ for prosecution?

   RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

2. If any closed investigations were not referred to DOJ for prosecution, please provide an explanation of why not.

   RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

ii. Of the investigations referred to the Department:

1. How many have been prosecuted by the Department?

   RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

   a. In each of the cases prosecuted by the Department, what charge or charges were brought and what was the disposition?

      RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

2. If the Department did not prosecute all of the referrals, please explain why not.

   RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

k. How many firearms trafficking investigations has ATF opened since January 20, 2025 under 18 U.S.C. § 932?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

i. How many of those investigations have since been closed?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

1. How many of the closed investigations were referred to DOJ for prosecution?

   RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

2. If any closed investigations were not referred to DOJ for prosecution, please provide an explanation of why not.

   RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

ii. Of the investigations referred to the Department:

1. How many have been prosecuted by the Department?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

a. In each of the cases prosecuted by the Department, what charge or charges were brought and what was the disposition?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

2. If the Department did not prosecute all of the referrals, please explain why not.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

l. How many firearms trafficking investigations did ATF have open on January 20, 2025 under 18 U.S.C. § 933?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

i. How many of those investigations have since been closed?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

1. How many of the closed investigations were referred to DOJ for prosecution?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

2. If any closed investigations were not referred to DOJ for prosecution, please provide an explanation of why not.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

ii. Of the investigations referred to the Department:

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

1. How many have been prosecuted by the Department?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

a. In each of the cases prosecuted by the Department, what charge or charges were brought and what was the disposition?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

2. If the Department did not prosecute all of the referrals, please explain why not.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

m. How many firearms trafficking investigations has ATF opened since January 20, 2025 under 18 U.S.C. § 933?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

i. How many of those investigations have since been closed?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

1. How many of the closed investigations were referred to DOJ for prosecution?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

2. If any closed investigations were not referred to DOJ for prosecution, please provide an explanation of why not.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

ii. Of the investigations referred to the Department:

1. How many have been prosecuted by the Department?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

a. In each of the cases prosecuted by the Department, what charge or charges were brought and what was the disposition?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

2. If the Department did not prosecute all of the referrals, please explain why not.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

n. How many firearms trafficking investigations did ATF have open on January 20, 2025 under any other federal statute?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

i. Under which statute was each case being investigated?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

ii. How many of those investigations have since been closed?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

1. How many of the closed investigations were referred to DOJ for prosecution?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

2. If any closed investigations were not referred to DOJ for prosecution, please provide an explanation of why not.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

iii. Of the investigations referred to the Department:

1. How many have been prosecuted by the Department?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

a. In each of the cases prosecuted by the Department, what charge or charges were brought and what was the disposition?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

2. If the Department did not prosecute all of the referrals, please explain why not.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

o. How many firearms trafficking investigations has ATF opened since January 20, 2025 under any other federal statute?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

i. Under which statute was each case being investigated?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

ii. How many of those investigations have since been closed?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

1. How many of the closed investigations were referred to DOJ for prosecution?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

2. If any closed investigations were not referred to DOJ for prosecution, please provide an explanation of why not.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

iii. Of the investigations referred to the Department:

1. How many have been prosecuted by the Department?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

a. In each of the cases prosecuted by the Department, what charge or charges were brought and what was the disposition?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

2. If the Department did not prosecute all of the referrals, please explain why not.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 22(h).

23. Federal law requires licensed importers and manufacturers of firearms to "identify by means of a serial number engraved or cast on the receiver or frame of the weapon . . . each firearm imported or manufactured by such importer or manufacturer." Federal, state, and local law enforcement use these serial numbers to trace firearms recovered at crime scenes. Firearms that lack serial numbers, which can be constructed out of parts, from kits, or even 3D-printed, are considered to be untraceable.

Between 2017 and 2023, law enforcement recovered 92,702 untraceable firearms, with a 44% increase in recoveries in 2022 and 2023 over the prior five years.

a. Please describe your familiarity and/or experience with untraceable firearms.

RESPONSE: I am familiar with the general legal enforcement landscape surrounding so-called untraceable firearms, to include privately made firearms that lack serial numbers, the challenges they pose for tracing efforts, and the relevant statutory and regulatory framework. If confirmed, I would continue to rely on the expertise of the ATF's professionals and Department's components to ensure the relevant statutes are faithfully enforced.

b. Do you agree that untraceable firearms constitute a threat to public safety?

RESPONSE: Firearms in the hands of criminals and prohibited persons pose a threat to public safety and the rule of law. If confirmed, my focus will continue to be enforcing the laws Congress has enacted and supporting the tools that help law enforcement address these concerns.

v. If so, please describe the steps the Department of Justice will take under your leadership, if confirmed, to address this threat, and how the Department will support ongoing state and local law enforcement efforts to do the same.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 23(b).

vi. If not, please explain why not.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 23(b).

24. At your nomination hearing, Senator Cruz asked, "Fentanyl became the leading cause of death for Americans between the ages of 18 to 45. Is that correct?" You answered, "That is correct."

a. What is the leading cause of death for Americans between the ages of 1 and 19?

RESPONSE: The Senator and I are correct that the leading cause for Americans ages 18 to 45 is drug overdose, largely driven by synthetic fentanyl. For the ages 1 to 19, it is the third leading cause of death. This is why the Trump Administration has made it a priority to smash the cartels fueling this scourge on our cities and towns, and I am pleased to report that because of our efforts, the rates of drug overdose are finally beginning to decline.

25. In 2024, the Department of Justice issued a guide to the safe storage of firearms. The National Rifle Association and National Shooting Sports Federation both support safe storage of firearms. Twenty-six states, including Florida and Connecticut, have enacted laws related to the storage of firearms in order to prevent unauthorized access by children and, in some cases, prohibited persons, as well as gun theft.

a. Please describe your familiarity and/or experience safely and securely storing firearms.

RESPONSE: The safe storage of firearms is critical to reducing unauthorized access by children and prohibited persons, reducing the likelihood of accidental injury, and deterring firearms theft.

b. Do you agree that firearms should be stored safely and securely to prevent unauthorized access by children and prohibited persons, as well as gun theft?

RESPONSE: Yes. Personal responsibility should be an important aspect of lawful gun ownership. I defer to the measured judgment of Congress on whether to regulate firearm storage laws. The Department's duty is to defend the constitutionality of the laws passed by this body.

i. If so, will you commit, if you are confirmed, to continue the Department's work to promote the safe and secure storage of firearms in order to prevent unauthorized access and theft?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 25(b).

ii. If not, please explain why not.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 25(b).

26. In early 2025, DOJ instructed its Civil Rights Division to dismiss, with prejudice, pending abortion-related Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act (FACE Act) prosecutions and further instructed that "future abortion-related FACE Act prosecutions and civil actions will be permitted only in extraordinary circumstances," and that such actions require "authorization from the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division.

a. Did you help write this instruction?

RESPONSE: No. I did not work in the Department at the time that memorandum was issued in January 2025.

b. Did you request this instruction be written?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 26(a).

c. Since this instruction was written, has the Department brought any abortion-related FACE Act cases?

RESPONSE: The Department is currently litigating three matters under the FACE Act:

United States v. Armstrong, Case No. 0:26-cr-00025-LMP-DLM (D. Minn.)
Oropesa v. United States, Case No. 25-1262 (S. Ct.).
United States v. Party for Socialism and Liberation New Jersey, et al., 25-16049 (D.N.J.)

d. Since this instruction was written, has the Department brought any crisis pregnancy center-related FACE Act cases?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 26(c).

27. Fiscal Year 2025 funds for human trafficking victim services have been delayed since October 1, 2025, resulting in thousands of survivors losing access or being at risk of losing access to lifesaving services.

a. Will you commit to awarding these funds immediately upon assuming the office?

RESPONSE: We are reviewing funding recommendations and distributing money on a rolling basis.

b. Will you also pledge to release the Fiscal Year 2026 funds, which are also delayed, before the fiscal year ends?

RESPONSE: The Department will promptly publish its FY26 NOFOs for OVW, OJP, and COPS grants. The Department encourages communities across the country to apply for grant funding to support law enforcement and to visit the respective websites for more information.

28. The Trafficking Victims Protection Act requires that five percent of TVPA authorized funds be spent on training and technical assistance to ensure survivors have access to safe services and federal funds are spent effectively. The Fiscal Year 2025 Notices of Funding for this program included only 1.4 percent of funds for training and technical assistance, in violation of the statute.

a. Will you commit to allocating five percent of TVPA authorized funds on training and technical assistance, as required by statute?

RESPONSE: If confirmed, I will ensure that the Department administers TVPA-authorized funding consistent with applicable statutory requirements.

29. The Department of Justice's Community Relations Service (CRS) historically provided facilitation, mediation, training, and consultation services to help communities strengthen their problem-solving abilities and capacity to prevent and respond to conflict, tension,

and hate crimes On September 29, 2025, CRS employees received a reduction-in-force notice.

a. Is the CRS still operationally active at DOJ?

RESPONSE: CRS is still operationally active at the Department. It has been realigned as a separate unit under the Executive Office for United States Attorneys (EOUSA). CRS is currently performing its minimum statutory functions.

i. If so, how many employees are dedicated in their employment functions to its work?

RESPONSE: There is one employee at CRS.

30. If confirmed, will you commit to making investigatory and prosecutorial decisions based solely on the facts, the law, and the interests of justice, without regard to undue influence from White House officials?

RESPONSE: Yes.

a. If confirmed, will you commit to limiting communications with White House officials to only those communications regarding ongoing investigations and prosecutions that warrant White House involvement or knowledge sharing, and do not pose conflicts of interest?

RESPONSE: Article II of the Constitution gives the President the Executive power, making him the head of the Executive branch. The Department of Justice is part of the Executive branch, and thus it communicates with the White House regarding a variety of topics. The Department of Justice will treat those communications in a way consistent with its efforts to seek to do justice every day on behalf of the American people.

b. If confirmed, will you commit to reporting, to the appropriate ethics officer, any attempts by political officials to influence investigatory and prosecutorial decisions of which you are a part?

RESPONSE: I will follow all applicable federal laws and Department of Justice policies and procedures regarding ethics obligations.

c. If confirmed, will you allocate investigatory and prosecutorial resources based on public safety priorities and the severity of crimes rather than political considerations?

RESPONSE: Yes.

31. If confirmed, will you commit to making investigatory and prosecutorial decisions without being influenced by the impermissible considerations described in Section 9-27.260 of the Justice Manual?

RESPONSE: Yes.

a. Specifically, if confirmed, will you commit to making investigatory and prosecutorial decisions without being influenced by an individual's political association, activities, or beliefs?

RESPONSE: Yes.

b. If confirmed, will you commit to reporting, to the appropriate ethics officer, any investigatory and prosecutorial decisions that you are aware were made under the influence of impermissible considerations?

RESPONSE: I will follow all applicable federal laws and Department of Justice policies and procedures regarding ethics obligations.

32. If confirmed, will you commit to consulting and following the recommendation of career ethics officials to determine whether your recusal is required from any investigation or prosecution where you have a personal, financial, or professional conflict of interest?

RESPONSE: In the event of any potential conflict of interest, I will consult with the appropriate Department of Justice ethics officials and act consistent with governing regulations.

a. If confirmed, will you commit to avoiding participation in political activities that could compromise the appearance of prosecutorial neutrality?

b. If confirmed, will you commit to consulting and following the recommendation of career ethics officials to determine whether your recusal is required in matters involving former clients, former employers, or organizations with which you have had significant professional relationships?

c. If confirmed, will you commit to consulting and following the recommendation of career ethics officials to determine whether your recusal is required in matters involving family members, personal friends, social acquaintances, or individuals with whom you have ongoing personal relationships?

d. If confirmed, will you commit consulting and following the recommendation of career ethics officials to determine whether your recusal is required in matters involving individuals, organizations, or entities to which you or your family members have made contributions or provided political support?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 32. I will consult with the Department's ethics officials and act consistent with governing regulations with respect to each of the categories identified in subparts (a) through (d), and I will avoid participation that would compromise the appearance of prosecutorial neutrality.

33. If confirmed, will you commit to ensuring "that the laws be faithfully executed[?]"

RESPONSE: Yes.

a. If confirmed, will you commit to ensuring that investigatory and prosecutorial decisions are made without regard to the race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, political affiliation, or socioeconomic status of defendants or victims?

RESPONSE: Yes.

b. If confirmed, will you commit to holding corporations and their executives accountable for criminal conduct without regard to their political connections or economic influence?

RESPONSE: Yes.

c. If confirmed, will you prioritize the prosecution of civil rights violations and hate crimes as important federal law enforcement priorities?

RESPONSE: Yes. Enforcing the federal civil rights laws, including hate-crime statutes, is an important responsibility of the Department.

34. Are you aware that the Attorney General is bound by the policies set forth in the Department of Justice's (DOJ's) Justice Manual?

RESPONSE: Yes.

a. If confirmed, will you commit to ensuring that you and your Department fully comply with *Brady* disclosure requirements and provide defendants with all exculpatory evidence?

RESPONSE: Yes. The Department's constitutional and ethical disclosure obligations, including under *Brady v. Maryland*, must be honored.

b. If confirmed, will you ensure that high-profile defendants receive the same prosecutorial treatment as other defendants charged with similar crimes?

RESPONSE: Yes.

c. If confirmed, will you ensure that plea agreements are fair, proportionate, and serve the interests of justice?

RESPONSE: Yes.

d. If confirmed, will you commit to making sentencing recommendations based on established DOJ policies and the individual circumstances of each case?

RESPONSE: Yes.

e. If confirmed, will you make decisions about appeals based on legal merits rather than political considerations?

RESPONSE: Yes.

35. If confirmed, will you commit to ensuring that public statements about ongoing investigations comply with DOJ policies and do not prejudice pending cases?

RESPONSE: Yes. Whether as Deputy Attorney General or if confirmed as Attorney General, I will continue to abide by sections 1-7.400, 1-7.600, and 1-7.610 of the Justice Manual to ensure public statements do not prejudice cases.

36. If confirmed, will you cooperate fully with congressional oversight, including but not limited to requests for documents and data and participation in hearings?

RESPONSE: Yes, under my leadership, the Department and its Office of Legislative Affairs will continue to be responsive to congressional oversight requests consistent with applicable laws and Department policies.

37. If confirmed, will you commit to maintaining robust internal controls and oversight mechanisms to prevent prosecutorial misconduct?

RESPONSE: Yes.

a. If confirmed, will you protect federal employees who report misconduct or raise legitimate concerns about prosecutorial decisions?

RESPONSE: Yes.

38. If confirmed, will you commit unequivocally to ensuring that you and your Department will fully comply with all lawful court orders, including orders requiring the production of documents, testimony of witnesses, or other forms of cooperation with judicial proceedings?

RESPONSE: I will always advise a client, including agencies of the Executive Branch, to comply with court orders applicable to them.

a. If confirmed, will you personally ensure that any court orders directed to your Department are promptly reviewed by appropriate legal staff and that compliance deadlines are met without requiring judicial intervention or contempt?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 38.

39. Were you in Washington, D.C. on January 6, 2021?

RESPONSE: No.

a. Were you inside the U.S. Capitol or on the U.S. Capitol grounds on January 6, 2021?

RESPONSE: No.

40. The Antitrust Division been the subject of repeated allegations of undue influence by outside lobbyists that resulted in preferential treatment, weak settlements, and wrongly abandoned cases, including through interactions with and the influence of Associate Attorney General Stanley Woodward.

a. Were you involved in any deliberations over the DOJ's actions in the review or resolution of investigations or cases involving the Livenation/Ticketmaster, HPE/Juniper, Paramount/Warner Brothers, or Compass/Anywhere mergers. If so, describe any role that you had with respect to the DOJ's decision to settle or clear these cases?

RESPONSE: As the Deputy Attorney General and the Acting Attorney General of course I was involved in the Department's review of the mergers and litigation you reference. I support all decisions made by the Antitrust Division and am proud of the results we have achieved for the Trump Administration.

b. What steps do you plan to take to investigate allegations of interference in the enforcement of antitrust laws, or ensure that the Antitrust Division is insulated from inappropriate political influence or lobbying in its law enforcement duties?

RESPONSE: I am confident the Antitrust Division will carry out its mission of enforcing our antitrust laws without fear or favor and am proud of the results we have achieved for the Trump Administration.

c. What steps will you take to ensure that all lobbying and contacts with parties is disclosed, even where DOJ declines to bring a case.

RESPONSE: Officials within the Antitrust Division, like all divisions within the Department, will always follow applicable laws, regulations, and/or ethics guidance.

41. The cryptocurrency exchange Binance has been accused of facilitating transactions with Iran, Russia, and terrorist organizations that may breach sanctions and money laundering laws, as well as its 2023 consent agreement with the DOJ.

    a. What steps will the DOJ take to investigate such claims and ensure that Binance and other cryptocurrency entities are not facilitating money laundering to Iran, Russia, and terrorist organizations.

    RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on specific law enforcement matters. However, the Department will not tolerate illegal efforts to manipulate the U.S. financial system, including by foreign actors or terrorist organizations.

    b. Public reporting also indicates that Binance failed to report these breaches to the DOJ and ignored internal compliance reports that VIP accounts were engaged in transactions that would violate U.S. laws. In its prior settlement, Binance agreed to pay $4.3 billion in penalties and its CEO, Changpeng Zhao, was sentenced to four months in prison. What steps will the DOJ take to ensure that repeat corporate offenders, such as the allegations involving Binance indicate, face increasing deterrent penalties, and do not receive preferential treatment or leniency.

    RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on specific law enforcement matters. However, I am committed to ensuring there is even-handed enforcement of the law, as guided by the individual facts and circumstances of each case, including with respect to corporate offenders.

    c. Reporting form earlier this month revealed an internal DOJ memo telling prosecutors to expect reduced cooperation from Binance. In light of Binance's troubled history complying with AML/BSA laws, what actions will DOJ take to ensure Binance remains in compliance with its legal obligations under its 2023 DOJ monitorship and otherwise.

    RESPONSE: I am not familiar with, and it would otherwise be inappropriate for me to comment on, this "reporting." Moreover, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on potential enforcement matters before the Department. Otherwise, please refer to my response to Question 41(a).

42. Earlier this month, public reporting revealed that Chinese online retailer Alibaba and its U.S. payment processing company failed to prevent dangerous drugs, chemicals, and pill presses from being sold to American consumers, despite being warned of compliance problems. The Department's case against Alibaba started in the first Trump administration, continued through the Biden administration, and moved towards resolution this year. Rather than listen to the urgings of career prosecutors advising the Department enter into a deferred prosecution agreement with the company, forcing it to admit its felony wrongdoings, the case was resolved with a nonprosecution agreement in which the company only admitted to committing lesser misdemeanor violations.

a. Were you involved in the decision to resolve the case against Alibaba?

RESPONSE: Any such internal DOJ discussions regarding an individual case or investigation would necessarily involve privileged communications.

b. Please explain why the case was resolved in the way it was.

RESPONSE: The Department resolves cases consistent with the facts and law surrounding each individual case. Any such internal DOJ discussions regarding an individual case or investigation would necessarily involve privileged communications.

c. Why was the recommendation of career prosecutors not followed?

RESPONSE: Any such internal DOJ discussions regarding an individual case or investigation would necessarily involve privileged communications.

d. Is the Trump DOJ not committed to ensuring the safety of the American marketplace?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice under President Trump's leadership is committed to ensuring the integrity and safety of the American marketplace, American consumers, and American businesses.

43. In April 2025, DOJ issued an updated memorandum governing the limitations of the agency's ability to subpoena materials from journalists and news organizations under Title 28, Code of Federal Regulations Section 50.10.

a. Has the DOJ made any additional modifications to this policy since that time?

RESPONSE: No.

b. What are the current procedural protections in place to ensure DOJ personnel comply with the aforementioned regulations, including, but not limited to, mandatory consultations with the criminal division?

RESPONSE: All Department of Justice personnel are required and expected to comply with Department policies and regulations.

44. In January 2026, the FBI conducted a raid on the home of Washington Post Reporter Hannah Natanson. These actions indicate that the DOJ has failed to abide by the Privacy Protection Act of 1980, which strictly limits the availability of search warrants for journalists' work product unless there is probable cause to believe the journalist committed the offense to which the materials relate.

a. Has the DOJ removed or weakened any internal procedures to ensure compliance with the Privacy Protection Act?

RESPONSE: No.

b. If confirmed, will you commit to ensuring that all personnel in DOJ comply with this crucial safeguard?

RESPONSE: I will commit to ensuring that all personnel in the Department of Justice comply with all applicable laws.

c. How many search warrant applications has the DOJ sought concerning journalists? Of applications sought, how many have been rejected?

RESPONSE: Pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e)(2)(B), I am prohibited from discussing any matters occurring before a federal grand jury.

Senator Mazie K. Hirono
Senate Judiciary Committee

Nomination Hearing
Questions for the Record for Todd Blanche

1. At your confirmation hearing, we had the following exchange:

Hirono: Mr. Blanche, over the course of the past five months, the New Mexico Department of Justice has talked to your staff about getting access to information for its investigation into alleged crimes at Jeffrey Epstein's Zorro Ranch. Will you and your team continue to cooperate with the New Mexico Department of Justice and help it get the information it needs?

Blanche: Yes, we're continuing to work with them, and, yes, yes.

a. Does that commitment to continue working with the New Mexico Department of Justice (NMDOJ) to help it get the information it needs for its Zorro Ranch investigation include providing unredacted Epstein-related records in DOJ's possession that are relevant to NMDOJ's investigation?

RESPONSE: The Department works cooperatively with state law enforcement partners on matters of mutual interest while carefully balancing federal law, privileges, victim privacy, and the terms of the EFTA. Unredacted or sensitive records are not shared broadly to avoid compromising ongoing federal interest, active investigations, or protected information. Any specific requests for access are handled through established intergovernmental channels and evaluated on a case-by-case basis consistent with applicable law.

i. If yes, will you commit to producing ALL responsive records within 30 days? If unable to commit to this timeline, please explain why not.

RESPONSE: See response to subpart (a).

ii. If no, please explain why not.

RESPONSE: See response to subpart (a)

iii. Do you agree that access to unredacted records would assist NMDOJ's investigation, for example by enabling investigators to identify potential witnesses, evaluate relevant documentary evidence, and develop leads necessary to advance its work?

RESPONSE: I cannot comment on what may or may not be helpful to another agency. See also response to 1(a).

b. Does that commitment to continuing to work with NMDOJ to help it get the information it needs for its Zorro Ranch investigation include petitioning a court or courts to lift any relevant protective orders that may exist to the extent necessary to provide relevant records to NMDOJ?

RESPONSE: See response to Question 1(a).

i. If no, please explain why not.

RESPONSE: See response to Question 1(a).

ii. I understand that representatives from DOJ asked NMDOJ to engage in DOJ's Touhy process to obtain relevant records and information for NMDOJ's Zorro Ranch investigation. **If DOJ viewed existing protective orders or other legal authorities as an impediment to cooperation, why did representatives from DOJ ask NMDOJ to engage in the Touhy process in the first place?**

RESPONSE: The Touhy process is governed by regulation after the Supreme Court opinion, *United States ex rel. Touhy v. Ragen*, 340 U.S. 462 (1951), and provides that no present or former employee of the Department of Justice may testify or produce Departmental records in response to subpoenas or demands of courts or other authorities issued in any state or federal proceeding without obtaining prior approval by an appropriate Department official. In addition to the Touhy process, DOJ cooperates with state and local law enforcement. See also response to 1(a).

c. **Throughout the process of NMDOJ requesting records over the past five months, which DOJ officer(s) or employee(s) made the decisions to decline to produce or fail to produce relevant records and on what basis was each denial made?** To the extent you claim that the *Privacy Act of 1974* prevents you from answering this question, please explain how this can be the case in light of the exception for congressional inquiries contained in the *Privacy Act*. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552a(b)(9).[1]

RESPONSE: See response to Question 1(a).

[1] Of course, the name of a federal employee performing a particular role is not a personnel record protected by the *Privacy Act of 1974* in the first place. However, given prior outlandish claims that the *Privacy Act* applies to a similar request, *see* Responses of Harmeet Dhillon to Questions from Sen. Coons, available at https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/committee-activity/hearings/ending-illegal-dei-discrimination-and-preferences-enforcing-our-civil-rights-laws, it seemed prudent to point out this exception, which DOJ apparently has been unable to locate within the U.S. Code. To the extent you claim that the exception noted above does not apply, please explain how the record of which employee made a certain decision is a personnel record protected by the *Privacy Act of 1974*.

d. In line with your commitment at the hearing to continue cooperating with NMDOJ, will you commit that the Department will not seek conditions on NMDOJ's use of records—such as "for reference only" limitations or restrictions on use in charging decisions or in evidence—that would prevent NMDOJ from using these records in its criminal investigation and any resulting prosecution?

RESPONSE: See response to Question 1(a).

e. Are you aware of any directive or instruction from the White House—written or verbal, express or implied—that would limit, delay, or condition DOJ's cooperation with NMDOJ's investigation?

RESPONSE: See response to Question 1(a).

2. **How many indictments have been returned against the perpetrators of crimes in the Epstein files?** If the indictments have been made public, please include links.

RESPONSE: To my knowledge, federal indictments were returned against Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell. Those indictments are available on public dockets. Consistent with longstanding Department policy, I cannot comment on the status of any current investigations.

3. **Did you swear an oath to the support and defend the Constitution of the United States?**

RESPONSE: Yes.

4. **Have you sworn any similar oath to the President of the United States? If so, explain.**

RESPONSE: No. My oath is to support and defend the Constitution.

5. **If confirmed, will your highest duty be to the Constitution of the United States or to the President of the United States?**

6. When DOJ released the Epstein files following passage of the Epstein Files Transparency Act, it went through a botched redaction process that exposed survivors' names and identifying information while concealing the names of perpetrators.

   a. **What was your involvement with the release of the Epstein files?**

RESPONSE: As Deputy Attorney General, I oversaw the day-to-day operations of the Department. This included efforts to collect, review, redact, and release materials response under EFTA.

b. **Did you review specific redactions before release?**

RESPONSE: As Deputy Attorney General, I oversaw the day-to-day operations of the Department. This included efforts to collect, review, redact, and release materials response under EFTA.

c. **How many individuals worked on the application of redactions?**

RESPONSE: As stated in my January 30, 2026 letter to Congress, more than 500 members of the DOJ were involved in reviewing documents.

d. **How many individuals had supervisory approval over redactions before files were released?**

RESPONSE: As stated in my January 30, 2026 letter to Congress, the review process contained multiple levels of review before files were released.

e. You have testified repeatedly that there were attorneys assigned around the clock to correct mistaken non-redactions.

i. **How many attorneys were assigned to this task in total?**

RESPONSE: As stated in my January 30, 2026 letter to Congress, more than 500 members of the DOJ were involved in reviewing documents.

ii. **How many attorneys were assigned to this task on an average shift?**

RESPONSE: See response to subpart (e)(i).

iii. **How long was the average shift for an attorney assigned to this task?**

RESPONSE: See response to subpart (e)(i).

iv. **How many non-attorneys were assigned to this task in total?**

RESPONSE: See response to subpart (e)(i).

v. **How many non-attorneys were assigned to this task on an average shift?**

RESPONSE: See response to subpart (e)(i).

vi. **How long was the average shift for a non-attorney assigned to this task?**

RESPONSE: See response to subpart (e)(i).

vii. **How many attorneys are currently assigned to this task?**

RESPONSE: To my knowledge, the Department has a team of about 10 DOJ members monitoring requests for redaction errors for evaluation, correction, and re-publication.

viii. **How many non-attorneys are currently assigned to this task?**

RESPONSE: See response to subpart (e)(vii).

f. **Did DOJ cross-check the names of identified survivors before allowing documents to be released to the public?**

RESPONSE: Yes.

g. **Was Artificial Intelligence used in the redaction or processing of the Epstein files?** If so, explain the tasks for which it was used.

RESPONSE: No artificial intelligence was used in the process of collecting, reviewing, redacting, and publishing files responsive under EFTA.

h. **Do you take responsibility for the harm caused to survivors whose identities and imagery were disclosed?**

RESPONSE: After its release of responsive materials, the Department immediately initiated a comprehensive review to identify and correct instances where victim names or PII were inadvertently disclosed. This included pulling affected documents, making additional redactions, establishing a dedicated victim tip line for reporting issues, coordinating with victims' counsel, and implementing enhanced redaction protocols for subsequent or re-released materials. We take victim privacy extremely seriously and continue to rectify any errors promptly.

i. **Does the DOJ take responsibility for the harm caused to survivors whose identities and imagery were disclosed?**

RESPONSE: After its release of responsive materials, the Department immediately initiated a comprehensive review to identify and correct instances where victim names or PII were inadvertently disclosed. This included pulling affected documents, making additional redactions, establishing a dedicated victim tip line for reporting issues, coordinating with victims' counsel, and implementing

enhanced redaction protocols for subsequent or re-released materials. We take victim privacy extremely seriously and continue to rectify any errors promptly.

j. **What processes have been updated within DOJ to ensure that these mistakes do not happen again?**

RESPONSE: See response to subpart (i).

7. **How many individuals identified by victims in the Epstein files have been interviewed by the FBI or DOJ?**

RESPONSE: I cannot comment on any ongoing investigations or leads. The FBI pursued all investigative leads in its investigations into Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell. If any evidence is provided to the Department suggesting a federal crime occurred, the Department will investigate and prosecute that matter.

8. During Day 2 of your confirmation hearing on July 16, 2026, in response to the question "Would you say that Mr. Blanche exhibits a rather dismissive attitude towards all of you and the Epstein crimes?" Epstein survivor Dani Bensky responded, "One thousand percent yes." **Since serving in your role as Deputy Attorney General and Acting Attorney General, how many Epstein victims have you personally met with? When did that meeting or those meetings take place?**

RESPONSE: In addition to previous meetings DOJ leadership and officials have had with victims and their counsel, I met with several victims of Jeffrey Epstein and their counsel on July 16, 2026, including Dani Bensky who testified at my confirmation hearing. I remain committed to engaging with victims of Jeffrey Epstein through appropriate legal channels.

9. During your hearing before this Committee on July 15, 2026, you testified that your staff would schedule meetings with Epstein survivors. You stated, "I will get it done today if that's necessary. My point is there's somebody here who can meet with them today, get their information and arrange to meet with them, absolutely." You went on to say, "We remain available to meet with any victim or their representative at any time." **Did your staff contact Epstein survivors or their counsels and schedule meetings on July 15, 2026?**

RESPONSE: In addition to previous meetings DOJ leadership and officials have had with victims and their counsel, I met with several victims of Jeffrey Epstein and their counsel on July 16, 2026, including Dani Bensky who testified at my confirmation hearing. I remain committed to engaging with victims of Jeffrey Epstein through appropriate legal channels.

a. **Since July 15, how many Epstein survivors have you personally met with?**

RESPONSE: See response to Question 9.

b. **Since July 15, how many family members of deceased Epstein victims have you personally met with?**

RESPONSE: See response to Question 9.

10. **Since July 15, At this point in time, how many Epstein victims have you personally met with?**

RESPONSE: See response to Question 9.

a. **How many meetings have you conducted in total?**

RESPONSE: See response to Question 9.

b. **When did those meetings take place?**

RESPONSE: See response to Question 9.

c. **Had you met with any victims personally before July 15?**

RESPONSE: See response to Question 9.

11. **Do you acknowledge that states have the right to conduct independent criminal investigations relating to crimes conducted by and connected to Jeffery Epstein within their own jurisdictions?**

RESPONSE: Consistent with the Tenth Amendment and other laws, states have the authority to conduct their own independent investigations based upon their own state law.

12. You promised transparency regarding the Epstein investigation.

a. What specific legal basis justifies continuing to withhold some Epstein-related documents from Congress, survivors, and the public?

RESPONSE: All known responsive documents not otherwise privileged have been released. As explained in my letters to Congress, common law protects against the dissemination of certain privileged materials.

b. Do you believe the Epstein Files contain no meaningful evidence of additional wrongdoing by others? If yes, explain the basis of this conclusion.

RESPONSE: Consistent with the long-standing principles of federal prosecution as outlined in the Justice Manual, several experienced prosecutors and

investigators have reviewed the materials and determined that additional prosecutions are unavailable at this time. If additional evidence of any federal crime is identified in the future, the DOJ will evaluate that evidence in accordance with long-standing policy. The FBI pursued all investigative leads in its investigations into Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell which resulted in two indictments for Epstein and Maxwell and the conviction of Maxwell for multiple felony counts.

c. Did DOJ or the FBI open investigative files on every individual identified by victims, witnesses, financial records, or internal DOJ memoranda in connection with Jeffrey Epstein's trafficking operation? If no, explain why not.

RESPONSE: The FBI pursued all investigative leads in its investigations into Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell. If any evidence is provided to the Department suggesting a federal crime occurred, the Department will investigate and prosecute that matter. I cannot comment on any open investigations.

d. Does DOJ currently consider any investigation of an individuals identified in the Epstein files as an active investigation?

RESPONSE: Consistent with longstanding Department policy, I cannot comment on active investigations.

e. Survivors have repeatedly reported allegations to federal authorities over many years. **Why should survivors believe DOJ is seriously evaluating investigative leads now if many of these names, records, and allegations were already known to the government years ago?**

RESPONSE: The allegations at hand span over 30 years in multiple jurisdictions. The FBI pursued all investigative leads in its investigations into Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell. If any evidence is provided to the Department suggesting a federal crime occurred, the Department will investigate and prosecute that matter.

13. You have stated that the DOJ's review of the Epstein Files "is over." **How many documented victims are implicated in the Epstein Files?**

RESPONSE: As stated in my December 19, 2025 letter to Congress: "As part of the review and production, the Department solicited counsel for any victims of Jeffrey Epstein and invited counsel to provide us with the names of victims, whether previously identified or not. This process resulted in over 1,200 names being identified as victims or their relatives."

14. In early June, the New York Times released an article highlighting how senior members of the Trump administration gathered in the Situation Room to discuss the

release of the Epstein files as a "reputational problem" rather than a criminal investigation. **Did you attend those meetings?**

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on conversations I had, or did not have, with White House officials.

15. Deutsche Bank records reportedly document approximately $755 million across 186 Epstein-related transactions involving more than 95 shell entities. **Has DOJ conducted a comprehensive financial crimes or money laundering analysis based on those transaction chains?**

    RESPONSE: The FBI pursued all investigative leads in its investigations into Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell including financial crimes. If any evidence is provided to the Department suggesting a federal crime occurred, the Department will investigate and prosecute that matter.

16. **On January 28, 2026, I led several colleagues in a letter to you asking questions regarding the serious conflict of interest posed by your decision to scale back the Department of Justice's cryptocurrency enforcement efforts while you personally held substantial amounts of cryptocurrency.[2] We wrote a follow-up letter to you last month.[3] Neither letter has received a response. I incorporate the contents of those letters by reference and repeat here the same questions:**

    a. **In a statement issued on January 23, 2026, DOJ represented on your behalf that "this was appropriately flagged, addressed, and cleared in advance."[4] Please describe in detail the facts underlying that statement. At a minimum, please explain:**

        i. **What was "appropriately flagged"?**
        ii. **To whom was "this . . . appropriately flagged"?**
        iii. **By whom was "this . . . appropriately flagged"?**
        iv. **How was "this . . . addressed"?**
        v. **How was "this . . . cleared"?**
        vi. **By whom was "this . . . cleared"?**

    RESPONSE: As the Department stated, the matter was appropriately flagged, addressed, and cleared in advance with the Department's ethics officials. It would

[2] Letter to Deputy Att'y Gen. Todd W. Blanche from Sens. Hirono, Durbin, Warren, Whitehouse, Coons, & Blumenthal (Jan. 28, 2026), https://www.hirono.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/20260128ltrfromsenatorstodagrecryptocurrencyconflicts.pdf.
[3] Letter to Acting Att'y Gen. Todd W. Blanche from Sens. Hirono, Warren, & Durbin (June 9, 2026).
[4] Corey G. Johnson, *Complaint Accuses Trump's Criminal Attorney of 'Blatant' Crypto Conflict in His Role at DOJ*, PROPUBLICA (Jan. 23, 2026), https://www.propublica.org/article/todd-blanche-complaint-conflict-of-interest.

not be appropriate for me to itemize privileged internal ethics communications, but I acted consistent with the guidance I received.

b. Did you receive a written determination pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 208(b)(1) in advance of issuing your April 7, 2025 memorandum regarding cryptocurrency enforcement? If so, please provide a copy.

RESPONSE: Yes, but such determinations are not subject to disclosure.

c. Did you communicate with agency ethics officials or anyone else within DOJ or the federal government about the propriety of issuing your April 7, 2025 memorandum regarding cryptocurrency enforcement while holding substantial cryptocurrency assets? If so, please provide all records reflecting or relating to such communications.

RESPONSE: I addressed the matter with the Department's ethics officials. It would not be appropriate for me to produce privileged ethics communications.

d. Did you communicate with representatives of any companies active in the cryptocurrency industry between March 5, 2025 and April 7, 2025? If so, please provide all records reflecting or relating to such communications.

RESPONSE: I have no recollection of any such communications.

e. **Why did you wait until May 31, 2025 to begin disposing of your cryptocurrency holdings when you had promised to do so "as soon as practicable" more than three months earlier?[5]**

RESPONSE: Divestiture of these holdings required time to accomplish in an orderly manner, and I completed the process consistent with my commitment and the applicable requirements.

f. Why did you fail to recuse yourself from the decision to issue the April 7, 2025 memo regarding cryptocurrency enforcement?

RESPONSE: The April 7, 2025 memorandum set general enforcement priorities and did not constitute a particular matter having a direct and predictable effect on my personal financial interests within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 208. The matter was reviewed with, and cleared by, the Department's ethics officials in advance.

[5] Letter to Designated Agency Ethics Official Jolene Ann Lauria from Todd Blanche (Feb. 10, 2025), https://extapps2.oge.gov/201/Presiden.nsf/PAS+Index/0E4C3EB0ACE8404785258C30003217F2/$FILE/Blanche%2C%20Todd%20%20finalEA.pdf.

17. **For every DOJ grant program appropriated for FY25 and FY26 which have <u>not</u> had a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) posted, please indicate (1) why the program has not had a NOFO posted and (2) when the NOFO will be issued.**

RESPONSE: The Department will promptly publish its FY26 NOFOs for OVW, OJP, and COPS grants. The Department encourages communities across the country to apply for grant funding to support law enforcement and to visit the respective websites for more information.

18. U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Virginia Todd Gilbert resigned after allegedly being told by DOJ officials that he would be fired for not pursuing criminal charges after an investigation into whether Biden administration officials mishandled classified documents relating to the 2016 Russia investigation.

    a. Did you in any way communicate with Todd Gilbert prior to his resignation?

    RESPONSE: Any President of the United States may appoint and terminate the employment of any U.S. Attorney for any reason. Any U.S. Attorney may resign from their position for any reason. Any such internal DOJ communications or discussions related to such matters would necessarily be privileged.

    b. If you did communicate with Gilbert, what was the nature of the communication? Describe when this communication occurred, what means was used, and what was discussed.

    RESPONSE: Any President of the United States may appoint and terminate the employment of any U.S. Attorney for any reason. Any U.S. Attorney may resign from their position for any reason. Any such internal DOJ communications or discussions related to such matters would necessarily be privileged.

    c. Did you ask Gilbert to conduct the investigation or bring criminal charges?

    RESPONSE: I cannot confirm or deny the existence of an ongoing criminal investigation at the Department of Justice. Any such internal DOJ communications or discussions related to such matters would necessarily be privileged.

19. On May 18, 2026, you established the Anti-Weaponization Fund as part of your Settlement Agreement in *Trump v. Internal Revenue Service*.

    a. In paragraph C, you state that the U.S. Department of the Treasury shall "direct a payment of $1,776,000,000 to an account for the sole use by the Anti-Weaponization Fund." **Is that correct?**

    RESPONSE: The document speaks for itself.

b. **Has the U.S. Department of the Treasury complied with this paragraph?**

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed, no funds have been transferred, no claims have been received, and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

c. **Has DOJ issued a writing, including an email, memorandum, or other document, to the U.S. Department of the Treasury informing them not to comply with this paragraph?**

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed, no funds have been transferred, no claims have been received, and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

d. **If DOJ has not issued a writing informing the Treasury Department not to comply with this paragraph, when will you do so?**

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed, no funds have been transferred, no claims have been received, and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

e. **At your confirmation hearing, you confirmed to me that you have rescinded the Attorney General Order dated May 18, 2026 setting out parameters for the Anti-Weaponization Fund. On what date did you rescind this order?**

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed, no funds have been transferred, no claims have been received, and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

20. On May 19, 2026, you executed an addendum as part of your Settlement Agreement in *Trump v. Internal Revenue Service*. Your memo stated in paragraph C, "The United States RELEASES, WAIVES, ACQUITS, and FOREVER DISCHARGES each of the Plaintiffs from, and is hereby FOREVER BARRED and PRECLUDED from prosecuting or pursuing, any and all claims, counterclaims, causes of action, appeals, or requests for any relief, including injunctive relief, monetary relief, damages, examinations or similar or related reviews, appeals, debt relief, costs, attorney's fees, expenses, and/or interests, whether presently known or unknown, that—as of the Effective Date of the Settlement Agreement—have been or could have been asserted by Defendants against any of the Plaintiffs or related or affiliated individuals (including, without limitation, family or others filing jointly), or parties including trusts, parent, sister, or related companies, affiliates, and subsidiaries, by reason of,

with respect to, or in connection with, or which arise out of (1) any matters that were raised or could have been raised in the Case or the Pending Agency Claims; (2) Lawfare and/or Weaponization; or (3) any matters currently pending or that could be pending (including tax returns filed before the Effective Date) before Defendants or other agencies or departments."

a. **Is that correct?** If not, please provide corrected text.

RESPONSE: The May 19, 2026, release speaks for itself.

b. **What is the Effective Date of the Settlement Agreement?**

RESPONSE: The May 19, 2026, release speaks for itself.

c. **Does this document provide immunity for crimes committed after the Effective Date of the Settlement Agreement?**

RESPONSE: The May 19, 2026, release speaks for itself.

d. **Define "affiliated individuals" under this document.**

RESPONSE: The May 19, 2026, release speaks for itself.

e. **Define "Lawfare" under this document.**

RESPONSE: The May 19, 2026, release speaks for itself.

f. **Define "Weaponization" under this document.**

RESPONSE: The May 19, 2026, release speaks for itself.

g. **Under whose authority was the document issued?**

RESPONSE: The May 19, 2026, release speaks for itself.

h. **Does the power to grant this agreement derive from the President's powers under Article II in the U.S. Constitution?**

RESPONSE: I do not understand this question. All executive power derives from Article II of the U.S. Constitution.

i. **Can the President pardon themselves?**

RESPONSE: The question calls for a legal hypothetical for which it would be inappropriate for me to answer.

21. In 2023, unanimous federal juries convicted leaders of the Proud Boys and Oath Keepers of seditious conspiracy against the United States. **Is this correct?**

    RESPONSE: In 2022 and 2023, members of the Proud Boys and Oath Keepers were convicted of seditious conspiracy against the United States.

22. During your July 15, 2026, nomination hearing, you claimed you never discussed pardons or clemency for members of the Proud Boys and Oath Keepers with President Trump, that "other people in the office" handled it, and that you only talked to Trump about it "when it was dead."
    a. **Is that correct?**

       RESPONSE: The question conflates two different subjects. My testimony that a matter was handled by "other people in the office," and that I spoke with the President about it only after it was resolved, concerned the settlement of the tax-return litigation — not any pardon or clemency decision. As to pardons and clemency, the President has plenary constitutional authority and is not obligated to consult me, and I do not think it appropriate to detail my communications with the President.

    b. **Who were the "people in the office" who handled this matter?**

       RESPONSE: As noted, that reference concerned the settlement of the tax-return litigation, which was handled by attorneys within the Department. I do not think it appropriate to identify individual Department personnel in this setting.

23. On July 8, 2026, defendant Matthew Goettsche (*United States v. Goettsche*, No. 2:19-cr-00877 (D.N.J.)) informed court of a pending resolution with DOJ of charges against him for his role in an alleged crypto network scheme that involved $722 million. The filing reported that the parties "have reached an agreement in principle."
    a. **Is this correct?**
    b. **Does this agreement in principle include all charges against Mr. Goettsche being dropped, as has been reported?**
    c. **Who was the highest authorizing individual within DOJ for the agreement in principle with Mr. Goettsche?**
    d. **Who is Bradford Cohen?**
    e. **Does Brandford Cohen have a past relationship with President Trump or his organizations?**
    f. **Who is Brett Tolman?**
    g. **Does Brett Tolman have a past relationship with President Trump or his organizations?**
    h. **What role did the Deputy Attorney General's office (i.e., your office) play in bringing this case to resolution?**

i. DOJ has said you are still seeking recovery for the victims of this crypto network scheme. **Will the victims in that case be made whole now that DOJ is dropping the charges?**

RESPONSE: All of the subparts to Question 18 pertain to an ongoing criminal prosecution in the District of New Jersey. I cannot comment on an ongoing criminal prosecution at the Department of Justice beyond what is available in public DOJ filings and hereby incorporate the positions of the United States from said filings in this response.

24. On May 29, 2026, former Attorney General Pam Bondi testified under oath that you were "in charge of the process and the entire release of the Epstein files." **Is that true? If not, please explain why you disagree with her statement and include specifics about your role with respect to the process and release of the Epstein files.**

RESPONSE: As Deputy Attorney General, I oversaw the day-to-day operations of the Department. This included efforts to collect, review, redact, and release materials response under EFTA.

25. Bias-motivated mass-casualty violence has repeatedly targeted communities based on perceived identities. For example, the 2021 Atlanta-area spa shootings, which killed eight people, six of them Asian women. Analysis of FBI's preliminary 2025 hate crime data by Asian Americans Advancing Justice | AAJC found that anti-Asian hate crimes remain approximately 2.5 times higher than pre-pandemic levels, with record-high of levels anti-Sikh and anti-Hindu hate crimes. **Will you invest investigative and prosecutorial resources against bias-motivated hate without consideration of a group's political alignment?**

RESPONSE: The Civil Rights Division aggressively prosecutes hate crimes. Political alignment of the victim is never a consideration in charging decisions.

26. Following the spike of anti-Asian hate crimes during the pandemic, the Department of Justice dedicated significant resources to expand language access, including translating public-facing resources into additional Asian languages, improving access to victim services, and strengthening engagement with limited-English-proficient communities. In March 2025, Executive Order 14224 revoked Executive Order 13166, and DOJ subsequently rescinded its Limited English Proficiency guidance and suspended LEP.gov.

a. **What actions have you taken to improve language access to DOJ hate crime resources?**

RESPONSE: Executive Order 14,224 designated English as the official language of the United States. Attorney General Pam Bondi then issued a memorandum to all Federal agencies about the implementation of Executive

Order 14,224. *See* Memorandum from the Attorney General, *Implementation of Executive Order No. 14,224: Designating English as the Official Language of the United States of America* (July 14, 2025), https://www.justice.gov/ag/media/1407776/dl.

The Department of Justice has taken and will continue to take steps to ensure that it properly implements Executive Order 14,224, the Attorney General's memorandum, and applicable Federal law. As a result of these efforts, the Department has obtained lengthy sentences for individuals convicted of hate crimes in (among other places) Mississippi, Missouri, and New York.

b. **What actions will you take to improve language access to DOJ hate crime resources?**

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice will continue to take steps to ensure it properly implements Executive Order 14,224, the Attorney General memorandum, and applicable Federal law.

27. On July 15, 2026, during your nomination hearing, you testified under oath that you have "full faith" in FBI Director Patel and the work that he's doing every day. **Is this correct?**

RESPONSE: Yes. Director Patel is a valued member of the Trump Administration and the Department's law enforcement leadership.

28. The Department of Justice Ethics Handbook states that employees are prohibited from habitually using alcohol to excess. **Is that correct?**

RESPONSE: Yes.

29. **Are you aware that senior intelligence officials and media outlets have raised concerns that Director Patel's documented "bouts of excessive drinking" and unexplained absences, yes or no?**

RESPONSE: I respectfully disagree with the premise of your question. I am aware that some media outlets have published unsubstantiated rumors from anonymous sources. My experience with and observations of Director Patel refute these allegations.

30. **Has Director Patel used the FBI jet for personal vacations?**

RESPONSE: Director Patel is required under OMB Circular A-126 to utilize government aircraft for all travel regardless of whether it is official or personal. To my knowledge, the Director has fully complied with use of aircraft and has appropriately reimbursed the government of those trips that were personal in nature. According to the FBI's analysis the Director has taken 41.3% fewer trips to his

personal residence than former Director Wray and 38.9% fewer than Director Comey did to his.

31. **Will DOJ cooperate fully with Chair Grassley's investigation of Director Patel's alleged misconduct?**

    RESPONSE: Yes. Director Patel has nothing to hide.

32. **What sanctions are available at DOJ for employees found to have abused government resources for personal benefit?**

    RESPONSE: DOJ may impose a broad range of sanctions.

33. **Do you have concerns with Director Patel's performance?**

    RESPONSE: No. Director Patel is a valued member of the Trump Administration and the Department's law enforcement leadership.

34. On May 11, 2026, I joined Senator Ed Markey and Senator Jeff Merkley in a letter to you regarding gender-affirming care for individuals with gender dysphoria in Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) custody. To date, we have not received a response.

    a. **Does the BOP plan to monitor and assess the impacts of recent policies that eliminate gender-affirming medical and psychiatric care? If so, how? If not, why not?**

       RESPONSE: BOP's recent policies on inmates with gender dysphoria is currently in litigation. As a result, I cannot comment.

    b. **Since January 20, 2025, how many transgender, non-binary, intersex, and gender diverse individuals have been transferred to a different facility to meet the goal of housing individuals "according to their biological sex?"**

       RESPONSE: BOP's recent policies on inmates with gender dysphoria is currently in litigation. As a result, I cannot comment.

    c. **How is the BOP protecting, monitoring, and assessing the safety of individuals who have been or will be transferred?**

       RESPONSE: BOP's recent policies on inmates with gender dysphoria is currently in litigation. As a result, I cannot comment.

    d. **Has the BOP directed its staff to take a particular approach in psychotherapy to treat gender dysphoria? If so, please describe it and provide any relevant memos, protocols, and training materials.**

RESPONSE: BOP's recent policies on inmates with gender dysphoria is currently in litigation. As a result, I cannot comment.

e. **Given that the BOP has stopped enforcing PREA regulations related to gender identity and collecting data on gender identity, how will the BOP protect the physical and emotional health and safety of incarcerated transgender individuals?**

RESPONSE: BOP's recent policies on inmates with gender dysphoria is currently in litigation. As a result, I cannot comment.

f. **How does the BOP plan to monitor and assess the impact of eliminating protections against sexual violence for this population?**

RESPONSE: BOP's recent policies on inmates with gender dysphoria is currently in litigation. As a result, I cannot comment.

g. **Does the BOP plan to institute a specific process by which transgender individuals may seek assistance or lodge complaints regarding harms they experience from the recent BOP policies and actions implementing President Trump's EO? If so, please describe the process and provide any relevant memos and protocols. If not, please explain why the BOP will not be instituting this process.**

RESPONSE: BOP's recent policies on inmates with gender dysphoria is currently in litigation. As a result, I cannot comment.

h. **Describe the specific criteria the BOP intends to use to determine whether it will allow a "social accommodation" for gender dysphoria. In particular, please explain: (a) the rationale for banning certain items from men's prisons but not women's prisons (e.g., wigs), and (b) how the BOP intends to monitor the use of an item for gender dysphoria versus for other social or medical needs, such as the use of hair removal tools.**

RESPONSE: BOP's recent policies on inmates with gender dysphoria is currently in litigation. As a result, I cannot comment.

35. The Civil Rights Division of DOJ is tasked with enforcing federal laws that prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, disability, religion, and national origin, as well as prosecuting federal hate crimes and official misconduct. During your tenure, the Civil Rights Division has experienced an unprecedented collapse in its legal workforce. Public employee tracking and internal data indicate that 70% to 75% of the division's entire lawyer workforce have resigned, retired early, or been pushed out of the Department.

a. **How many lawyers in the Civil Rights Division have resigned or retired early since you were confirmed?**

RESPONSE: I understand that 317 attorneys have departed the Civil Rights Division since March 2025. It is longstanding Department policy not to comment on personnel matters such as the specific reasons for these departures.

b. **How many of these positions have been filled?**

RESPONSE: Between March 2025 and June 2026, the Civil Rights Division has hired 86 attorneys.

c. **How many attorneys are currently employed in the Civil Rights Division?**

RESPONSE: As of June 2026, there are 185 attorneys in the Civil Rights Division.

i. **How many attorneys are currently employed in the Voting Section of Civil Rights Division?**

RESPONSE: As of June 2026, there are 14 attorneys in the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division.

36. Since last year, DOJ has sued thirty states seeking their full voter lists as part of a campaign to suppress the votes of American citizens. Fifteen of those lawsuits have been resolved by federal judges.

a. **Of the 15 federal district court judges who have ruled on these voter list lawsuits, how many dismissed DOJ's lawsuit, in whole or in part?**

RESPONSE: A district court has not yet ruled in favor of the Government. The Department will appeal as necessary every district court ruling that prevents it from verifying that a state's voter roll is free of ineligible voters. The Department is committed to making sure only eligible voters participate in our elections.

37. At a Federalist Society event, you called for young lawyers to join you in fighting a war. You said, "We need you, because it's a war, and it's something we will not win unless we keep on fighting."

a. **What did you mean by the word "war" in this context?**
If your answer to part a relied on a definition involving litigation, why did you frame the resolution of constitutional disputes in federal courts as a "war"?

RESPONSE: The full context of these comments makes clear that I used the term "war" as a cliché and in its common metaphorical sense to describe the arduous appeals process:

> And it's a war, man. And we, I sit in my office and we were told we lost today. We had an injunction and we're going to appeal. And then my guys, the men and women that work at the Department stay up all night, get an appeal in, stayed, go back to District Court judge. The judge still wants to just do whatever he or she wants to do. You know what? We'll just go back up and get another stay. And that's what we do. And it's happening over and over and over again. […] We need you because it is a war and it is something that we will not win unless we keep on fighting. And it's a cliche because there's a lot of battles that we do lose, but at the end of the day, we are not wrong. Um, and I've said that a couple times and it's true and it's evidenced by the results we're seeing at the Supreme Court and at the Court of Appeals.

38. During your hearing before the Judiciary Committee for your nomination for the role of Deputy Attorney General, you refused to answer my question about why the Department of Justice removed, demoted, and reassigned dozens of experienced nonpolitical career officials in the Criminal Division, National Security Division, and others. You stated reasoning for refusing to answer the question was that you were not yet in the DOJ. Now that you are leading DOJ:

    a. **What have you learned about why DOJ removed, demoted, and reassigned these individuals?**

    RESPONSE: Decisions of this kind are committed to the Attorney General and, if applicable, component leadership and are made in service of the Department's mission and priorities and the President's lawful direction. Some of the specific actions referenced are also the subject of pending litigation. It would not be appropriate for me to characterize the reasoning behind individual personnel decisions or to discuss particular individuals, whose privacy interests I am obligated to respect.

    b. You also refused to commit to reversing these moves and return these individuals to their areas of expertise because you did not want to commit to any decision before consulting with the individuals already at the DOJ. **Now that you have had the opportunity to consult with individuals at the DOJ, why have you not reversed these moves and returned these individuals to their areas of expertise?**

    RESPONSE: Assignment and reassignment of Department personnel rest with the Attorney General and, if applicable, the relevant component heads and are made based on the Department's needs. Without the opportunity to

review any given matter on a case-by-case basis and given that a number of these matters are in active litigation, it would be inappropriate for me to commit to take, or not take, particular personnel actions or to prejudge them in this setting.

39. During your hearing before the Judiciary Committee for your nomination to the role of Deputy Attorney General, Senator Tillis asked whether you would commit, during your tenure as Deputy Attorney General, that "there will not even be a whiff of an investigation that appears to have a political motivation to it." You replied "I commit to that."

    a. **Do you maintain this commitment for your role as Attorney General?**

       RESPONSE: Yes.

    b. **Do you believe that you honored this commitment in your tenure as Deputy Attorney General and Acting Attorney General?**

       RESPONSE: Yes. The Department's law-enforcement activities are undertaken where there is a proper basis under the facts and the law.

    c. **How do you explain the pattern of investigations that occurred during your tenure into political enemies of President Trump after the President suggested investigation into these individuals (including but not limited to Cassidy Hutchinson, George Soros, etc.)?**

       RESPONSE: I do not accept the premise of the question. The Department's investigative and charging decisions are based on the facts and the law, not on public statements by any person, and it would not be appropriate for me to confirm, deny, or discuss specific investigations of particular individuals.

40. Bias-motivated violence in the United States is on the rise, with 2025 being one of the most violent years for American Jews as well as other racial, ethnic, and religious minorities. My bipartisan bill, *Improving Reporting to Prevent Hate Act*, S. 3724, would create a system to assess whether local jurisdictions are credibly reporting hate crime information.

    a. What steps is the FBI taking to ensure that hate crimes - including those against the Jewish community - are thoroughly reported and prosecuted?

    RESPONSE: The FBI is the lead investigative agency for criminal violations of federal civil rights statutes. These crimes are investigated through the civil-rights program in each of the FBI's 56 field offices, in coordination with the Joint Terrorism Task Forces where the facts warrant, and are prosecuted by the United States Attorneys' Offices and the Civil Rights Division where the facts and the law support federal charges. The Bureau works closely with its local, state, tribal, and federal law

enforcement partners around the country in many of these cases. FBI resources, forensic expertise, and experience in identification and proof of hate-based motivations often provide an invaluable complement to local law enforcement. If confirmed, I will ensure that the reporting, investigation, and prosecution of hate crimes, including crimes targeting the Jewish community, remain a priority for the FBI and the Department.

b. Does DOJ need any new tools, legislation, or resources to improve hate crime reporting?

RESPONSE: The Department has strong statutory tools to investigate and prosecute hate crimes, and the President's budget request seeks the resources the Department needs to carry out its law-enforcement mission, including enforcement of civil rights laws. If confirmed, I would welcome the opportunity for the Department to work with you and your staff on this issue, including on your proposed legislation, *Improving Reporting to Prevent Hate Act*, S. 3724. The Department's formal views on S. 3724 would be provided through the Office of Legislative Affairs.

41. DOJ's Community Relations Service (CRS) plays a unique public safety role by helping communities prevent escalation after bias incidents and hate crime through the provision of key services. On September 19, 2025, a Reduction-in-Force notice was sent to all remaining CRS employees. **What is DOJ's plan to sustain CRS's statutory mission and services?**

RESPONSE: The Executive Office for United States Attorneys continues to fulfill CRS's minimum statutorily required mission. We continue to provide assistance, as requested, to community groups and organizations, such as providing deescalation training materials, as appropriate. EOUSA is also currently compiling all the information required for the annual report to Congress.

42. Provide an example of a time, if any, since you became Deputy Attorney General that you have declined to act on a request from the White House.

RESPONSE: I do not think it appropriate to detail confidential internal deliberations. As a general matter, I exercise independent judgment and make decisions based on the facts and the law.

43. **Does the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances (FACE) Act (18 U.S.C. § 248) prohibit harassment, stalking, threatening, or committing acts of violence against reproductive healthcare providers and patients seeking reproductive care?**

RESPONSE: The text of Section 248 speaks for itself.

a. **Is DOJ enforcing the FACE Act with respect to reproductive healthcare providers and patients seeking reproductive care?**

RESPONSE: If confirmed, I will enforce the civil rights laws in accordance with the relevant facts and law to protect the civil rights of all Americans. As with all matters, any decisions regarding whether to charge cases under any applicable laws will be based on a thorough analysis of the facts and the governing law.

b. **How many FACE Act cases have been settled or dismissed since January 2025? Please list each case with an explanation for the case's resolution.**

RESPONSE: To my understanding, three. Before I started at the Department, a memorandum directed that three civil FACE Act cases be dismissed.

c. **How many FACE Act cases is DOJ currently litigating? Please list each case.**

RESPONSE: The Department is currently litigating three matters under the FACE Act:

United States v. Armstrong, Case No. 0:26-cr-00025-LMP-DLM (D. Minn.)
Oropesa v. United States, Case No. 25-1262 (S. Ct.)
United States v. Party for Socialism and Liberation New Jersey, et al., 25-16049 (D.N.J.)

44. **Have you met with or spoken to any activists or organizations about how the DOJ should enforce the FACE Act?**

RESPONSE: If confirmed, I will enforce the civil rights laws in accordance with the relevant facts and law to protect the civil rights of all Americans. As with all matters, any decisions regarding whether to charge cases under any applicable laws will be based on a thorough analysis of the facts and the governing law.

45. Early this year, DOJ fired four Assistant U.S. Attorneys in the Eastern District of Michigan. It was widely reported that their firings were due to their involvement in successfully prosecuting defendants who committed violence against reproductive healthcare clinics. **Can you confirm that this is in fact the reason these AUSAs were fired?**

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate to comment on personnel decisions, particularly ones that may involve ongoing litigation.

a. **If it was not the reason they were fired, please explain the reason.**

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 45.

b. **Did you personally order these AUSAs to be fired?**

RESPONSE: Any such internal DOJ discussions or deliberations related to this matter would necessarily be privileged.

46. While hate crimes are on the rise, this administration terminated hundreds of federal grants dedicated to preventing violence, addressing hate crimes, and keeping communities safe. The president's FY27 budget request for the Department completely eliminated funding for crucial programs that protect communities from hate-driven violence, support victims and survivors of hate crimes, and advance hate crime reporting and prosecution efforts like the Khalid Jabara and Heather Heyer NO HATE Act Program, grants for Community-Based Approaches to Prevent and Address Hate Crime, and the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Grants Program. You justified and defended the president's proposed Department of Justice FY27 budget request before the House and Senate appropriations committees. **What policy rationale and supporting evidence can you provide for the elimination of funding for these crucial programs?**

    RESPONSE: The programs referenced are not the sole and exclusive funding mechanisms dedicated to preventing violence. Additionally, the Department will continue to aggressively investigate instances of violent crime motivated by race, gender, and other protected characteristics.

47. On June 22, 2026, a group of more than 100 former federal and state judges filed a detailed, formal disciplinary complaint against you with the Grievance Committee of the New York City Bar Appellate Division's First Department, requesting appropriate disciplinary action against you.

    a. **Are you are an attorney admitted to practice law in the State of New York?**

        RESPONSE: Yes.

    b. **Are you bound by the New York Rules of Professional Conduct?**

        RESPONSE: Yes.

    c. **Are you aware of the June 22, 2026 ethics complaint?**

        RESPONSE: Yes.

    d. **What is your response to the allegations against you by these 100 former federal and state judges?**

        RESPONSE: I am aware that complaints have been filed, and I disagree with the allegations.

48. **How many professional employees have departed DOJ since you started serving as Acting Attorney General?**

    RESPONSE: Our personnel departures are consistent with the trends of the last three administrations.

49. While serving as Acting Attorney General, you traveled to National Harbor, Maryland, to appear as an official speaker at the Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC). At this event, you agreed with a debunked claim of widespread noncitizen voting and praised the Civil Rights Division's extralegal effort to obtain unredacted state voter rolls.

    a. **Does the Department of Justice policy handbook prohibit senior DOJ officials from speaking at partisan political fundraising events like CPAC?**

       RESPONSE: My outside appearances are reviewed and cleared by the Department's ethics officials for compliance with the Hatch Act and applicable rules. I do not adopt the characterization of the event as a partisan fundraiser.

    b. **When you endorsed sending ICE officers to polling places at the same event, were you speaking in your capacity as a private citizen?**

       RESPONSE: I do not accept the characterization of my remarks in the question.

    c. **What legal authority permits DOJ or ICE to station federal agents at local polling places?**

       RESPONSE: The Department follows all applicable laws governing the presence of federal officers at polling places, including 18 U.S.C. §§ 592 and 593. I am not aware of the Department stationing federal agents at polling places.

50. Several companies that donated to President Trump's White House ballroom are being investigated or are subject to antitrust enforcement by DOJ or the Federal Trade Commission. **Can you assure Americans that the companies that have contributed to the President's ballroom project are not getting, and will not receive, any preferential treatment from the Department of Justice?**

    RESPONSE: Political status, including support for or opposition to any official, is not evidence, and it is not a factor in the Department's enforcement decisions.

51. The Wall Street Journal and Bloomberg have reported that current Acting Assistant Attorney General Stanley Woodward is directing the Antitrust Division to avoid

filing lawsuits in favor of settlements and "has questioned why the DOJ can't simply stop reviewing deals." **Is the policy of DOJ to settle broad classes of cases?**

RESPONSE: No. Each matter is resolved on its own facts and the law. This Department is committed to ensuring a robust and competitive market that benefits all Americans, including creating conditions for business to thrive and lowering prices. Because resources are finite, the Department uses its prosecutorial discretion to litigate only when enforcement is necessary to protect competition. And, in practice, the Division resolves most antitrust concerns by engaging with parties who voluntarily take steps to alleviate them through structural and behavioral remedies. If a settlement can be reached that equally furthers the public interest, DOJ can and should pursue that solution.

52. **Do you acknowledge that EMTALA requires Medicare-funded hospitals to perform emergency abortions when necessary to stabilize the patient?**

    RESPONSE: If confirmed, I will enforce our laws with fairness and impartiality.

53. **Do you acknowledge that EMTALA's stabilizing-treatment requirement preempts state abortion bans? If not, explain your position.**

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 52.

54. **Will DOJ sue states directly to enforce EMTALA preemption?**

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 52.

    a. **If a state refuses to provide emergency abortion care necessary to prevent serious harm to a patient, will you commit to suing the state to enforce EMTALA's stabilizing-treatment provision?**

       RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 52.

55. When you were serving as Deputy Attorney General in March 2025, DOJ dismissed its EMTALA lawsuit against Idaho. **Today, if a pregnant woman in Idaho arrives at an emergency room with a very serious condition only treatable by an emergency abortion but which will not cause imminent death, does federal law under EMTALA require the hospital to provide a stabilizing abortion? Yes or No?**

    RESPONSE: The issue remains the subject of ongoing litigation. It would be improper for me to comment on ongoing litigation.

    a. **Cite the legal basis for your conclusion.**

       RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 55.

56. You are responsible for ensuring that DOJ decisions are made based on the law and facts, not personal relationships, political considerations, or outside influence. **While serving as Deputy Attorney General or Acting Attorney General, have you recused from any matters because of a personal, professional, financial, or political relationship? If so, please identify those matters.**

RESPONSE: Yes. Consistent with the guidance of the Department's ethics officials, I am recused from matters in which I represented the President—the New York, District of Columbia, and Southern District of Florida cases. It would not be appropriate for me to itemize specific investigations beyond the recusals reflected in that guidance.

57. You previously served as President Trump's personal criminal defense attorney.

a. **Under what circumstances would you recuse yourself from matters involving President Trump, members of his family, former clients, business associates, or political allies?**

RESPONSE: In the event of any potential conflict of interest, I consult with the Department's ethics officials and act consistent with governing regulations, and I am recused from matters in which I represented the President.

b. **Will you commit to publicly disclosing recusal determinations whenever legally permissible?**

RESPONSE: I will make appropriate disclosures consistent with the law and the Department's policies.

c. **Will you provide this Committee with notice of any recusal determinations involving matters of significant public interest, including cases involving President Trump, his family, and businesses?**

RESPONSE: I will handle any such matter consistent with the law, the Department's policies, and the confidentiality that may attach to particular matters.

d. **Have you ever disagreed with an ethics determination made by government ethics officials? If so, under what circumstances?**

RESPONSE: In the event of any disagreement, I consult with the Department's ethics officials and act consistent with governing regulations. It would not be appropriate for me to detail internal ethics deliberations.

58. On May 19, you testified at a Senate Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies ("CJS Subcommittee") hearing that there was "no judge" and "no mechanism" for judicial review of the settlement in *Trump v. IRS*. Judge Williams wrote that your testimony was "at best, misleading and, at worst, disingenuous," explaining that the Court remained available to review the agreement had you sought relief.

    a. **Did you mislead the CJS Subcommittee in your May 19th testimony? If not, why not?**

    RESPONSE: No. My testimony speaks for itself.

    b. **Do you agree with the Court's characterization of your testimony? If not, why not?**

    RESPONSE: No. The Court simultaneously acknowledged my testimony was "temporally accurate." My testimony speaks for itself.

59. You launched the Civil Rights Fraud Initiative, encouraging False Claims Act investigations against entities with diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility programs. **How do you distinguish between unlawful discrimination and lawful efforts to promote equal opportunity without creating a chilling effect on organizations attempting to comply with federal civil rights laws?**

    RESPONSE: As Deputy Attorney General and Acting Attorney General, my role is to uphold the law. I make decisions after thoughtful consideration of the facts, evidence, and law. If confirmed, I will continue to do the same.

60. Lorenzo Salgado Araujo was fatally shot by an ICE agent during an enforcement operation in Houston. Reports now indicate he was not the intended target of the operation, and there is no body-camera footage documenting the incident. **Do you believe federal law enforcement officers should wear body cameras?**

    RESPONSE: The Department of Homeland Security sets policy for the wearing of body cameras by ICE agents.

61. Another fatal ICE-involved shooting occurred in Maine, prompting calls for an independent investigation and raising additional questions about transparency in federal immigration enforcement.

    a. **Does DOJ investigate use-of-force incidents by federal law enforcement for potential color of law violations?**

    RESPONSE: If the facts and circumstances warrant, and consistent with applicable law and policy, the Department of Justice will investigate

allegations of unlawful criminal or civil activity, including violations of federal civil rights statutes.

b. **At what point does DOJ determine that a pattern of incidents warrants a broader civil rights or systemic investigation into ICE enforcement practices, rather than treating each shooting as an isolated event?**

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 61(a).

c. **Will DOJ examine whether operational tactics, including the use of unmarked vehicles, mistaken identity, or inadequate de-escalation, contributed to preventable uses of deadly force by federal law enforcement?**

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 61(a).

d. **Will you notify Congress of the findings of any DOJ review into high-profile use-of-force incidents involving federal immigration officers and federal law enforcement, once legally appropriate?**

RESPONSE: Where feasible and legally appropriate, the Department will share relevant information with Congress involving law enforcement.

62. As Deputy Attorney General and Acting Attorney General, you helped lead the *Task Force to Eradicate Anti-Christian Bias*. DOJ's review involved 17 federal agencies, more than 100 stakeholders and alleged victims, and an examination of internal discussions, case files, and prosecutorial decisions. You also stated that the DOJ would work to restore religious liberty "for all Americans of faith."

a. Will you commit to applying the same standards, resources, and level of institutional attention to allegations of discrimination affecting other religions?

RESPONSE: The Task Force to Eradicate Anti-Christian Bias arose from the prior Administration's targeting of peaceful Christians, while ignoring violent, anti-Christian offenses. This Department faithfully applies the law and works to protect religious liberty for all.

63. DOJ plays a key role in investigating First Amendment violations. You have previously said that peaceful protest is protected but suggested that protesters could face federal investigation when their activities appear organized or funded as part of a broader effort to threaten or intimidate.

a. **Under what legal authority can DOJ investigate donors, legal-support organizations, communications staff, transportation providers, bail funds, or nonprofit organizations associated with a protest movement?**

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice is a key defender of the rights enshrined in the First Amendment. The Department's investigative authority into conduct that potentially violates federal criminal law flows from its responsibility to enforce federal law. This Department does not investigate individuals for exercising their constitutional rights. Investigations and prosecutions into potential violations of federal criminal law are pursued based on the facts, all applicable law, the Justice Manual, and the Principles of Federal Prosecution.

b. **Will you commit that individuals and organizations will not be investigated solely because they organize, fund, provide legal assistance to, or participate in constitutionally protected demonstrations?**

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 63(a).

c. **Can attendance at a pro-Palestinian demonstration or membership in a Muslim or Palestinian student organization contribute to the factual predicate for an investigation? If so, under what circumstances?**

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 63(a).

64. **Under what authority can the DOJ investigate the funding, donors, employees, or partner organizations of a nonprofit engaged in lawful advocacy?**

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 63(a).

What is the factual and legal threshold required before the DOJ can investigate a charity, religious institution, humanitarian organization, or civil-rights organization for possible material support or terrorism-related offenses?

RESPONSE: The material support statutes, 18 U.S.C §§ 2339A and 2339B, define the scope of conduct that Congress has criminalized. Otherwise, please see my response to Question 63(a).

65. The Department of Justice is responsible for enforcing the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

a. **Do you support any restrictions on the ADA's protections?**

RESPONSE: The ADA requires equal access for people with disabilities. If confirmed, I will enforce the civil rights laws in accordance with the relevant facts and law, and the Department will continue to defend the rights of all Americans with disabilities, as the law requires.

b. **Do you believe the ADA goes too far in protecting the rights of people with disabilities?**

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 65(a).

c. **If confirmed as Attorney General, how would you maintain or change the way that they Disability Rights Section of the Civil Rights Division has enforced the ADA?**

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 65(a).

66. **What are the limits on the President's power to make recess appointments?**

RESPONSE: The Recess Appointments Clause authorizes the President "to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session." U.S. Const. art. II, § 2, cl. 3. The Supreme Court most recently described its view of the limits on the President's power to make recess appointments in *N.L.R.B. v. Noel Canning*, 573 U.S. 513 (2014).

67. **Do you agree that America is a country built by immigrants?**

RESPONSE: The United States is a nation of citizens and legal immigrants with many different backgrounds who have contributed to the strength and character of the country.

68. **Following the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Trump v. Barbara*, 609 U.S. ____ (2026), what is your understanding of birthright citizenship as protected by the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution?**

RESPONSE: The Supreme Court held in *Trump v. Barbara* that children born in the United States for whom no extraterritoriality fiction applies are citizens at birth under the Fourteenth Amendment's Citizenship Clause.

69. **Do you believe that the DOJ is currently doing enough to ensure that non-English-speaking individuals appearing in immigration court can fully understand the proceedings in which they are participating?**

RESPONSE: EOIR provides professional interpretive services in all appropriate cases.

70. In April, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives announced 34 proposed rules related to firearm regulation. You joined Director Robert Cekada and a number of outside groups at an event to announce these proposals.

a. **For the participants of the event who were not DOJ employees, please list their names, associated organizations, and the date that any employee of that organization was first made aware of the proposed rules.**

RESPONSE: I would refer you to the Department's Office of Legislative for any responsive information reflecting its records.

b. **Please list the other outside organizations or individuals that were made aware of the proposed rules before the announcement.**

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 70(a).

71. In April 2026, Erich Pratt, the Senior Vice President of Gun Owners of America (GOA), testified before the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs regarding the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives. Pratt stated, "[W]e would implore Congress to defund and dismantle the [Bureau]..." The organization has also stated that "all gun laws are unconstitutional" and that the organization is "not going to stop fighting . . . until all gun laws are repealed."

a. **Do you support defunding Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives?**

RESPONSE: No.

b. **Do you support dismantling Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives?**

RESPONSE: No.

c. **Do you support abolishing Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives?**

RESPONSE: No.

d. **Do you believe all gun laws are unconstitutional?**

RESPONSE: If confirmed, I will defend the laws of the United States. I defer to the Judicial Branch in assessing such questions, if presented through a case or controversy.

e. **Do you believe all gun laws should be repealed?**

RESPONSE: If confirmed, I will defend the laws of the United States. I defer to Congress on the prudence of repealing any particular law.

i. **Do you believe the National Firearms Act of 1934 should be repealed?**

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 71(e).

ii. **Do you believe the Gun Control Act of 1968 should be repealed?**

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 71(e).

iii. **Do you believe the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act of 1993 should be repealed?**

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 71(e).

iv. **Do you believe the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act of 2022 should be repealed?**

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 71(e).

72. On March 12, 2018, the Trump White House announced that "President Trump supports legislation and reforms to strengthen background checks and law enforcement operations."

a. **Do you believe that recent Department of Justice budget requests would have maintained the same number of FBI NICS Section personnel as in previous administrations? If not, why not?**

RESPONSE: I have not had occasion to review this particular issue. If confirmed, I will continue to support FBI NICS as a critical and effective law enforcement tool.

b. **If confirmed as Attorney General, will you work to ensure that the records in the FBI's National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) are as complete, accurate, and up-to-date as possible? If not, why not?**

RESPONSE: If confirmed, I will continue to support FBI NICS as a critical and effective law enforcement tool.

73. Last year, 80% of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives' agents were involved, at some point in the year, in immigration enforcement efforts. Agents described this diversion of resources to be "hugely disruptive" and complained that the diversion would result in failed missions and stale leads. According to one analysis, gun prosecutions fell by over 10% in multiple jurisdictions last year.

a. **Do you continue to support the diversion of Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives agents towards immigration enforcement?**

RESPONSE: As Attorney General, I commit to enforcing the law against illegal gun traffickers. Indeed, since the beginning of this administration, ATF has seized more than 44,000 illegal firearms.

b. **Has the diversion of Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives agents impacted any investigations? What leads, if any, have agents been forced to abandon due to the diversion of resources towards immigration enforcement?**

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 73(a).

c. **What training have Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives agents received before working on these immigration enforcement efforts?**

RESPONSE: I understand that ATF agents receive sufficient training to assist in immigration enforcement efforts.

d. **What percentage of immigration enforcement efforts assisted by Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives agents have resulted in the arrest of someone without a felony conviction for a non-immigration related criminal matter?**

RESPONSE: I have not had occasion to investigate this particular statistic. I would refer you to the ATF, which is better positioned to provide a responsive answer.

74. **Do you believe that more should be done to ensure that domestic abusers are not able to obtain firearms? Do you believe that more should be done to ensure that individuals do not retain firearms after they have been convicted of domestic violence?**

RESPONSE: Domestic abuse is horrible and should be universally condemned. I defer to Congress on the appropriate policy for how domestic abusers are treated under the law.

75. In *Korematsu v. United States*, 323 U.S. 214 (1944), the Supreme Court upheld the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II.

a. **Is *Korematsu* still good law?**

RESPONSE: The Supreme Court has stated that "*Korematsu* was gravely wrong the day it was decided, has been overruled in the court of history, and—to be clear—'has no place in law under the Constitution.'" *Trump v. Hawaii*, 585 U.S. 667, 710 (2018).

b. **If the answer to part a of this question is anything other than "Yes" or "No," please explain your understanding of the effect of the opinion in *Trump v. Hawaii*, 585 U.S. 667 (2018), on the continuing force of *Korematsu*.**

RESPONSE: See the above answer to Question 75(a).

c. **If President Trump ordered you as Attorney General to detain a group of American citizens based on their race, would you do it?**
(Note that the Supreme Court has explained that "[t]he forcible relocation of U.S. citizens to concentration camps, solely and explicitly on the basis of race, is objectively unlawful and outside the scope of Presidential authority." *Hawaii*, 585 U.S. at 710. Thus, an order to that effect from any president would be illegal. Any answer by you that does not include a statement that you would refuse such an order will be construed as an admission that you would follow an illegal order.)

RESPONSE: As I stated at my confirmation hearing, the President would not direct me to follow an illegal order. And, of course, I would resign rather than violate the Constitution.

d. **If your answer to part c of this question is anything other than "Yes" or "No," please explain your view of how Attorney General Francis Biddle should have responded when President Roosevelt asked him for his legal opinion on interning Japanese Americans.**

RESPONSE: See the above answer to Question 75(c).

Nomination of Todd Wallace Blanche
To be Attorney General of the United States
Questions for the Record
Submitted July 17, 2026

QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR CORY A. BOOKER

1. You are currently the Acting Attorney General of the United States. Identify the authority pursuant to which you were named in this role and provide the date on which that authority expires.

   RESPONSE: I am serving as Acting Attorney General pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 508, under which the Deputy Attorney General exercises the duties of the Attorney General during a vacancy in that office, and consistent with the Federal Vacancies Reform Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 3345–3349d. The authority under Section 508 is tied to the existence of the vacancy and is not subject to a fixed statutory expiration date; to the extent the Vacancies Reform Act's time limitations apply, those limitations run as computed under that statute.

2. Describe the circumstances of Pam Bondi's departure from the Department of Justice.

   RESPONSE: The President has the constitutional authority to appoint and remove the Attorney General. Attorney General Bondi departed the Department in April 2026. It would not be appropriate for me to characterize the President's personnel decisions, and my communications with the President are confidential.

   a. Who, if anyone, did you speak with about the possibility of her departure, including President Trump, any official at the White House or otherwise associated with the Administration?

      RESPONSE: It is not appropriate to detail internal deliberations or my confidential communications with the President concerning a personnel decision that rests with the President.

   b. Were you aware of her termination before she was told?

      RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 2(a).

   c. Were you informed before her departure that you would be named Acting Attorney General?

      RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 2(a).

   d. Did you support Attorney General Bondi's termination?

      RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 2(a). I loved working with General Bondi. The decision to remove the Attorney General rests with the

President, and I do not think it appropriate to comment on the President's personnel decisions.

3. Describe how you learned you would be nominated to serve as Attorney General, including the date and name of person(s) who informed you.

   RESPONSE: President Trump publicly announced his intention to nominate me to serve as Attorney General in June 2026. To the extent I learned of the President's intention through communications with him, those communications are confidential, and I do not think it appropriate to detail them.

   a. Did you ever discuss the prospect of becoming Attorney General with President Trump before January 20, 2025?

      RESPONSE: My communications with the President are confidential, and I do not think it appropriate to detail them.

   b. Did you ever discuss the prospect of becoming Attorney General with anyone associated with President Trump before January 20, 2025?

      RESPONSE: My communications with the President are confidential, and I do not think it appropriate to detail them.

   c. Did you ever discuss the prospect of becoming Attorney General with President Trump while you were Deputy Attorney General?

      RESPONSE: My communications with the President are confidential, and I do not think it appropriate to detail them.

   d. Did you ever discuss the prospect of becoming Attorney General with anyone associated with President Trump while you were Deputy Attorney General?

      RESPONSE: The nomination and vetting process involves confidential communications that I do not think it appropriate to detail.

4. According to former Attorney General Bondi, you oversaw the release and redaction of the relevant documents under the Epstein Files Transparency Act. The law requires DOJ to protect survivors of Epstein's criminal conduct by withholding or redacting records that "contain personally identifiable information (PII) of victims or victims' personal and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy."[1]

   A review of the files released found that the DOJ failed to redact the names and personal information of close to 100 survivors, violating the requirements in the Epstein Files

[1] Epstein Files Transparency Act, Pub. L. 119-38 (Nov. 19, 2025), https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-119publ38/pdf/PLAW-119publ38.pdf.

Transparency Act and exposing survivors names to the general public.[2]

a. When were you aware that the DOJ would be in violation of the law's requirement to release the files no later than 30 days after enactment?

RESPONSE: I disagree with the premise of the question. The Epstein Files Transparency Act permits the withholding or redaction of certain records but does not specify a time within which such determinations must be made. The Department took steps to accelerate review and ensure compliance, including allocation of additional personnel.

i. Why not?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 4(a).

ii. Did you take any steps to ensure compliance? If so, describe them.

RESPONSE: Yes, the Department undertook an unprecedented, resource-intensive review to comply with EFTA's 30-day requirement following its enactment on November 19, 2025. These steps included immediate mobilization of teams across DOJ components to identify, collect, and process millions of pages, videos, and images for public release in a searchable format.

iii. Did you notify any member or committee of Congress?

RESPONSE: Yes, I notified Congress in my December 19, 2025 letter to Congress.

b. When were you aware that victims' personally identifiable information (PII) had been left unredacted?

RESPONSE: I was informed of unredacted PII shortly after public reporting alerted the Department. DOJ immediately initiated corrective actions, removed affected documents from public access, and assigned attorneys, including privacy specialists, to remediate.

i. What measures did you take, if any, to address the failure to redact victims' PII? Please describe each measure, the date, and any person(s) involved.

RESPONSE: As stated in my January 30, 2026 letter to Congress: "The Department remains committed to protecting the privacy of victims and

[2] Khadeeja Safdar and Brian Whitton, *Epstein Files Release Exposes Names of at Least 43 Victims*, WSJ Review Finds, WSJ, (Feb. 1, 2026), https://www.wsj.com/us-news/law/epstein-files-release-exposes-names-of-at-least-43-victims-wsj-review-finds-ba4ff95e.

welcome continued engagement from victims and their counsel. In that regard, the Department has established an email inbox for victims to reach us directly to correct redaction concerns when appropriate."

c. What impact do you think the release of PII has on victims personally or professionally? Please be specific.

RESPONSE: Every individual is unique and may react differently to the disclosure of PII. Victims' wellbeing is paramount, and DOJ regrets any harm caused by the inadvertent disclosure of PII.

i. What impact do you think it might have on their wellbeing? Please be specific.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 4(c).

d. What training, if any, did DOJ provide for staff who were reviewing the files?

RESPONSE: The Department provided training on privacy, redaction protocols, and victim-identifying information. The Attorney Review Protocol for Epstein Files is publicly available on the Epstein Library on the DOJ's website.

i. Who developed the training?

RESPONSE: The Attorney Review Protocol for the Epstein Files and other training materials were developed by and in consultation with experienced DOJ and FBI personnel, many of whom are privacy specialists.

ii. Was the training administered in person, via video, or through written materials?

RESPONSE: Training and guidance were administered in person, virtually, and through written materials.

iii. Did training include specialized training related to identifying statutorily-protected information regarding child victims and child witnesses? Please describe the training and provide all materials, including any videos, to the Committee.

RESPONSE: Yes. The training and guidance provided included training related to victim-identifying information and child witnesses. The details are included in the Attorney Review Protocol for the Epstein Files and in my letters to Congress available on the DOJ website. Additional requests for materials should be made to the Department's Office of Legislative Affairs.

iv. Did you personally review the training? Did you personally approve it? If not, who did?

RESPONSE: I reviewed and approved the Attorney Review Protocol for the Epstein Files. I did not participate in the training for reviewers.

v. What sections of the DOJ did the reviewers work in? Please list each one.

RESPONSE: The Department utilized more than 500 employees to conduct the review and apply redactions. The sections from which the reviewers worked included the Criminal Division, the Civil Division, the National Security Division, the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties, the Office of Information Policy, the FBI, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of Florida, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Northern District of New York, the Office of the Associate Attorney General, the Office of the Deputy Attorney General, and the Office of the Attorney General.

vi. Did staff reviewing the files have to have prior experience in document review and/or redacting documents?

RESPONSE: Given the volume of documents to collect, review, redact, and release as well as the 30-day statutory deadline under the Act, the Department utilized more than 500 members of the DOJ to conduct the review and apply redactions, many of whom are privacy specialists. Most DOJ attorneys, especially those in litigating components, have redaction experience when reviewing and producing discovery in their cases.

e. How many DOJ employees were involved in reviewing the Epstein documents?

RESPONSE: As stated in my January 30, 2026 letter to Congress, more than 500 members of the DOJ were involved in reviewing documents.

f. Did the training include instructions to redact President Donald Trump's name from the Epstein Files? If so, why? Did you direct staff to include those instructions?

RESPONSE: No.

5. As you are aware and testified to during the hearing, Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell are the only two people who have been prosecuted for actions related to the Epstein sex-trafficking ring.

a. There were more than 1,200 victims of this sex-trafficking ring.[3]

   i. How many other people in total are named as potential co-conspirators are in the file?

   RESPONSE: The files released under EFTA contain references to various individuals associated with investigations into Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell, including those identified in court filings or other materials as potential co-conspirators or unindicted co-conspirators from prior proceedings.

   ii. How many investigations in total has DOJ initiated since January 20, 2025?

   RESPONSE: Consistent with longstanding Department policy, I cannot comment on the status of investigations.

   iii. Were you aware of President Trump's campaign promise that he would release the entirety of the files? Did you agree with his position at the time?

   RESPONSE: I am aware of President Trump's public statements regarding the release of the Epstein files. The Department has worked tirelessly to ensure compliance with the EFTA.

   iv. When did you first have concerns about the information contained in the file?

   RESPONSE: I was always committed to fully complying with the law regarding the contents of the Epstein files. The Department has worked tirelessly to ensure compliance with the EFTA.

b. Are you currently investigating any other child predators related to the Epstein sex-trafficking ring?

   RESPONSE: Consistent with longstanding Department policy, I cannot comment on the status of investigations.

c. Please describe additional investigative efforts DOJ has pursued to find other people who committed crimes related to the Epstein sex-trafficking ring.

   RESPONSE: Consistent with longstanding Department policy, I cannot comment on the status of investigations.

[3] Josh Mayer, *Epstein Files Raise Questions About Evidence and Possible Accomplices,* USA Today, (Dec. 20, 2025), https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2025/12/20/new-epstein-files-raise-questions-accomplices/87862323007/.

6. On July 24 and 25, 2025, you personally interviewed Ghislaine Maxwell in FCI Tallahassee to ask her about matters related to Epstein, including what she knew about President Trump.[4]

    a. Describe any communication you or other DOJ employees had with Ms. Maxwell or her lawyers between the time she began her sentence at FCI Tallahassee and before you met with her for the interview in July 2025.

    RESPONSE: Every word spoken between myself and Ms. Maxwell was recorded and transcribed and is now available to the public.

    b. Did you request the interview with Ms. Maxwell? Did anyone at DOJ initiate the interview? If so, who did?

    RESPONSE: I interviewed Ghislaine Maxwell after learning that she had not previously spoken directly with DOJ and to explore any possible investigative leads involving Jeffrey Epstein and possible co-conspirators. Discussions with defense counsel to coordinate a witness proffer is routine.

    c. Describe your pre-existing relationship with Ms. Maxwell's attorney David Markus.

    RESPONSE: David Markus and I have a pre-existing professional acquaintance as colleagues.

    d. What was your goal for the interview?

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 6(b).

    e. During your time as Acting Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General, have you ever visited any other person incarcerated in a federal Bureau of Prisons facility?

    RESPONSE: During my time as Acting Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General, I have not visited any inmate in a BOP facility.

        i. If yes, identify the individual(s) visited, date(s), and reason for visiting.

        RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 6(e).

    f. Describe the preparation you conducted prior to interviewing Ms. Maxwell in July 2025, including:

[4] *See* Aaron Katersky, James Hill, Brandon Baur & Katherine Faulders, *DOJ Meeting with Longtime Jeffrey Epstein Associate Ghislaine Maxwell*, ABC NEWS (Jul. 24, 2025), https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/doj-meeting-ghislaine-maxwell-set-thursday-sources/story?id=124021785.

i. Did you read Ms. Maxwell's prior testimony?

RESPONSE: Preparation details, including prior testimony review, and internal consultations are attorney work product and deliberative information; thus, are privileged.

ii. Did you review Maxwell's prior testimony from her trial?

RESPONSE: Preparation details, including prior testimony review, and internal consultations are attorney work product and deliberative information; thus, are privileged.

iii. Did you read Virginia Guiffre's deposition?

RESPONSE: Preparation details, including prior testimony review, and internal consultations are attorney work product and deliberative information; thus, are privileged.

iv. Did you speak with Maureen Comey, the prosecutor who prosecuted Maxwell?

RESPONSE: Preparation details, including prior testimony review, and internal consultations are attorney work product and deliberative information; thus, are privileged.

v. Did you speak with any members of the trial team? If so, who?

RESPONSE: Preparation details, including prior testimony review, and internal consultations are attorney work product and deliberative information; thus, are privileged.

vi. Did you speak with agents who worked on the case at the FBI?

RESPONSE: Preparation details, including prior testimony review, and internal consultations are attorney work product and deliberative information; thus, are privileged.

vii. Did you speak with the prosecutors in the Southern District of Florida who first brought the case against Epstein?

RESPONSE: Preparation details, including prior testimony review, and internal consultations are attorney work product and deliberative information; thus, are privileged.

viii. Did you review the case file?

RESPONSE: Preparation details, including prior testimony review, and internal consultations are attorney work product and deliberative information; thus, are privileged.

ix. Did you review Maxwell's prior testimony from the trial? Did you have a written outline in advance of questions for Ms. Maxwell?

RESPONSE: Preparation details, including prior testimony review, and internal consultations are attorney work product and deliberative information; thus, are privileged.

g. As a result of your interview with Ms. Maxwell, did DOJ initiate any new prosecutions?

RESPONSE: Consistent with longstanding Department policy, I cannot comment on the status of investigations.

h. Have you or any DOJ employee ever discussed a Presidential pardon with Ms. Maxwell or her lawyers?

RESPONSE: I have no personal recollection of discussing a pardon with Ms. Maxwell or her counsel in any official capacity.

i. Have you or any DOJ employee ever discussed any clemency with Ms. Maxwell?

RESPONSE: I do not recall discussing a pardon with Ms. Maxwell or her counsel.

7. As you know, Ms. Maxwell was transferred from FCI Tallahassee and to FPC Bryan, a minimum security prison camp, which BOP policy prohibits housing individuals with a sex offense PSF. In December 2025, you explained that Ms. Maxwell was moved because of "threats" and that while BOP made the decision, "every decision that they make lands on my desk to the extent it needs to."[5]

a. Please disclose all threats made to Ms. Maxwell prior to her transfer to FPC Bryan.

RESPONSE: Threat information involving inmates is law-enforcement sensitive and invokes security and privacy concerns and cannot be discussed publicly.

i. When did you learn of those threats and from who?

[5] Jacob Wendler, *Deputy AG Todd Blanche defends moving Ghislaine to minimum-security prison*, POLITICO (Dec. 21, 2025), https://www.politico.com/news/2025/12/21/todd-blanche-defends-moving-ghislaine-maxwell-00702240.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 7(a).

b. Did you speak with the BOP Director about Ms. Maxwell's transfer?

RESPONSE: Ms. Maxwell's designation and transfer were made independently by BOP.

i. On what date?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 7(b).

ii. Did the BOP Director contact you?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 7(b).

c. Describe your role in the transfer, including when you were made aware of any "threats."

RESPONSE: I do not have personal knowledge of the facts and circumstances that led to the transfer of Ms. Maxwell.

8. On May 19, 2026, the Department of Justice issue, in connection with its settlement in *Trump v. Internal Revenue Service*, No. 1:26-cv-20609 (S.D. Fla.), issued an unprecedented document, signed by yourself as Acting Attorney General which effectively provides the president, his family, and associates a sweeping tax amnesty.

a. Confirm the full scope and applicability of the immunity directive, including whether it extends to conduct not yet known, investigated, or charged, and whether it includes immunity from both criminal and civil liability.

RESPONSE: The document speaks for itself. By the terms of the document it applies only to tax returns filed prior to May 19, 2026.

b. Did you rely on any legal authority to permanently and prospectively bind the U.S. government from pursuing law enforcement actions, including actions arising from conduct not yet known or investigated. If so, identify the legal authority. If you relied on legal opinions or memoranda, produce them in full.

RESPONSE: The premise of this question is flawed. The government is not prohibited from taking law-enforcement action for future conduct.

c. The Plaintiffs in *Trump v. Internal Revenue Service*, No. 1:26-cv-20609 (S.D. Fla.), are the President, Donald Trump Jr., Eric Trump, and the Trump Organization. The immunity directive, however, extends immunity beyond these named plaintiffs to all "related or affiliated individuals," including "trusts, parent, sister, or related companies, affiliates, and subsidiaries."

i. Did you rely on any legal authority to confer immunity to non-parties who were neither before the court nor subject to its jurisdiction in the settlement? If so, identify the legal authority. If you relied on legal opinions or memoranda, produce them in full.

RESPONSE: The premise of this question is flawed. The document speaks for itself.

ii. Identify all individuals and entities who are intended or potential beneficiaries of the directive.

RESPONSE: The document speaks for itself.

iii. Did you, in your role as Deputy Attorney General or Acting Attorney General, evaluate the merits of the President's $10 billion lawsuit against the IRS? If so, describe your involvement. If you relied on legal opinions or memoranda, produce them in full.

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on litigation strategy in any case. It has long been the position of the Office of Legal Counsel that the Attorney General has the authority to settle and/or compromise claims against the United States.

iv. Did you participate in or approve DOJ's decision not to seek dismissal of the President's $10 billion lawsuit against the IRS? If so, describe your involvement and identify the individuals involved.

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on litigation strategy in any case. It has long been the position of the Office of Legal Counsel that the Attorney General has the authority to settle and/or compromise claims against the United States.

b. Did you directly or indirectly negotiate, approve, or direct any aspect of the immunity directive? If so, describe your involvement, either directly or indirectly, and identify all individuals who participated in its development, drafting, or approval.

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on litigation strategy in any case. It has long been the position of the Office of Legal Counsel that the Attorney General has the authority to settle and/or compromise claims against the United States.

c. Did you, at any point, consult with DOJ ethics officials or the Office of Professional Responsibility regarding your recusal obligations with respect to this

matter? If yes, identify the dates on which such consultation(s) occurred and the outcome of that consultation.

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on litigation strategy in any case. It has long been the position of the Office of Legal Counsel that the Attorney General has the authority to settle and/or compromise claims against the United States.

d. Did you ever discuss with the President, any member of his family, or any Administration official acting on his behalf that the Department of Justice grant him and his family immunity as a condition of the settlement? If so, identify the individual, the date, the form of the communication, and describe the content of that discussion.

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, I did not speak with the President about this matter prior to the execution of the Settlement and/or the issuance of the related Attorney General memoranda.

e. Do you think that your conduct in this matter comports with your ethical and legal obligations under the law?

RESPONSE: Yes.

9. On January 20, 2025, President Trump granted blanket pardons to nearly 1,600 individuals convicted of or awaiting trial for the January 6, 2021 insurrection. At least 97 of those pardoned have been arrested for, charged with, or convicted of other crimes since their pardon.[6]

a. Do you think it was appropriate for President Trump to issue these pardons?

RESPONSE: The Constitution gives the President the power to pardon or commute the sentence of anyone convicted of a Federal crime.

b. Please describe the impact on public safety those pardons have had, especially considering the additional offenses committed by people who received clemency.

RESPONSE: Violations of the law generally have a negative impact on public safety. To the extent any individual previously pardoned commits a new federal crime, that individual should be investigated, arrested, and prosecuted.

10. On July 10, 2026, U.S. District Court Judge Timothy J. Kelly, appointed during President Trump's first term, granted the DOJ's motion to dismiss the convictions of several members of the Proud Boys who attacked law enforcement during the January 6

[6] Katherine Pompilio, *The Jan. 6 Pardons: How Many Clemency Recipients Have Faced Other Charges?*, Lawfare, (Jun. 4, 2026), https://www.lawfaremedia.org/article/the-jan-6-pardons--how-many-clemency-recipients-have-faced-other-charges.

insurrection. Judge Kelly wrote, "Because the decisions to issue the Executive Order and to abandon this prosecution — even after the Government secured convictions for serious crimes relating to the attack on the Capitol on January 6 — are solely the Executive's, no one should mistake the Court's granting of the Government's motion for its agreement with those decisions."[7] Did you approve the DOJ's decision to dismiss these convictions? If so, why?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may to have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

11. Have you ever spoken or corresponded with any of the following individuals? If yes, provide the dates, mode, and content of those discussions and communications.
    a. Enrique Tarrio
    b. Stewart Rhodes
    c. Kelly Meggs
    d. Kenneth Harrelson
    e. Thomas Caldwell
    f. Jessica Watkins
    g. Roberto Minuta
    h. Edward Vallejo
    i. David Moerschel
    j. Joseph Hackett
    k. Ethan Nordean
    l. Joseph Biggs
    m. Zachary Rehl
    n. Dominic Pezzola
    o. Jeremy Bertino
    p. Julian Khater

    RESPONSE: I am not aware of having spoken or corresponded with any of the individuals listed in subparts (a) through (p). In representing President Trump in *United States v. Trump* (D.D.C.), I did not represent any of these individuals.

12. Have you ever spoken or corresponded with any individuals convicted and later pardoned of offenses related to the January 6, 2021 attack on the U.S. Capitol? If yes, identify the individual(s) and provide the dates, mode, and content of those discussions and communications.

    RESPONSE: I am not aware of having spoken or corresponded with any individual concerning that person's conduct on January 6, 2021, their prosecution, or any related pardon or clemency. Given the number of individuals who received clemency, I cannot exhaustively account for every incidental or social contact, but I am aware of no communications of the kind this question appears to seek.

[7] *United States v. Nordean*, No. 1:21-cr-00175 (D.D.C. Jul. 10, 2026) (order granting motion to dismiss).

13. Since the beginning of President Trump's second term, the Department of Justice has initiated a number of prosecutions or criminal investigations that appear to be targeting the President's perceived enemies. For each of the following individuals, organizations, and categories of people, please detail your involvement in each prosecution:
    a. Gavin Newsom
    b. Southern Poverty Law Center
    c. Minnesota Governor Tim Walz
    d. Minneapolis Mayor Jacob Frey
    e. St. Paul Mayor Kaohly Her
    f. Minnesota Attorney General Keith Ellison
    g. Hennepin County Attorney Mary Moriarty
    h. Congressman Jason Crow
    i. Congresswoman Maggie Goodlander
    j. Congresswoman Chrissy Houlahan
    k. Congressman Chris Deluzio
    l. Senator Elissa Slotkin
    m. Senator Mark Kelly
    n. Chair of the Federal Reserve Jerome Powell
    o. Federal Reserve Governor Lisa Cook
    p. Former National Security Advisor John Bolton
    q. Senator Adam Schiff
    r. New York attorney general Letitia James
    s. Former FBI Director James Comey
    t. Former CIA Director John O. Brennan
    u. SEIU California President David Huerta
    v. Newark Mayor Ras Baraka
    w. Congresswoman LaMonica McIver
    x. Special Counsel Jack Smith
    y. Miles Taylor, DHS Chief of Staff
    z. ActBlue
    aa. Cassidy Hutchinson

    RESPONSE: The Office of the Deputy Attorney General is responsible for overseeing the law enforcement components of the Department of Justice and the United States Attorneys' Offices. I cannot confirm or deny the existence of ongoing investigations. I cannot comment on any ongoing criminal prosecutions beyond what is stated in public DOJ filings and hereby incorporate the positions of the United States stated in these public DOJ filings.

14. On March 7, 2025, Elizabeth Oyer was fired by the Department of Justice from her role as Pardon Attorney, after having served in that position for nearly four years.[8] Ms. Oyer

[8] Statement to Members of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, Elizabeth G. Oyer, *Hearing on Restoring Accountability and Attacks on the Rule of Law*, at 1 (Apr. 7, 2025), https://www.schiff.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/20250407-Liz-Oyer-Hearing-Statement-4.7.25.pdf.

was fired by the Trump Administration after refusing to recommend that actor Mel Gibson have his gun rights restored.[9] Mel Gibson, a prominent Trump supporter, had pled no contest in 2011 to a charge of misdemeanor battery in a case of domestic violence involving his girlfriend.[10] When Ms. Oyer agreed to testify to Congress about the circumstances of her firing, U.S. Marshals were sent to her home–what can only be assumed as an implicit threat to silence her.[11]

a. When did you make the decision to fire Ms. Oyer?

RESPONSE: March 7, 2025.

b. What materials did you review or use to determine that Ms. Oyer should be fired?

RESPONSE: This request seeks internal deliberative and personnel information that would not be appropriate to provide.

c. Did you speak with anyone at the Department of Justice about your decision to fire Ms. Oyer? If so, who, and on what dates? What did you discuss?

RESPONSE: See prior response.

d. Was it your decision to send the U.S. Marshals to Ms. Oyer's home? If not, whose was it?

RESPONSE: The Department did not send U.S. Marshals to Ms. Oyer's home. Instead, the Department's Justice Management Division (JMD) utilized an Inspector to attempt to deliver a letter to Ms. Oyer. Once JMD confirmed that Ms. Oyer received the letter by email, JMD called back the Inspector before he arrived at Ms. Oyer's home. In addition, this request seeks internal deliberative information that would not be appropriate to provide.

e. Did you consult with anyone at the DOJ about the appropriateness of sending U.S. Marshals to Ms. Oyer's home?

RESPONSE: See prior response.

---

[9] Devlin Barrett, *Justice Dept. Official Says She Was Fired After Opposing Restoring Mel Gibson's Gun Rights*, N.Y. TIMES (Mar. 10, 2025), https://www.nytimes.com/2025/03/10/us/politics/justice-department-mel-gibson.html.

[10] Li Shan, *Mel Gibson pleads no contest in domestic abuse*, L.A. Times (Mar. 12, 2011), https://www.latimes.com/local/la-xpm-2011-mar-12-la-me-mel-gibson-20110312-story.html.

[11] Rebecca Beitsch, *DOJ planned to send US marshals to ex-employee's home over Mel Gibson discussion*, Hill (Apr. 7, 2025), https://thehill.com/homenews/administration/5236378-justice-department-intimidation-actor-gibson/.

f. Please describe all instances in which the Department of Justice has dispatched United States Marshals to personally serve an individual that the DOJ learned planned to testify about communications related to their work at DOJ.

RESPONSE: I am not aware of this ever occurring.

15. In January 2024, HPE announced it had acquired Juniper for $14 billion.[12] The proposed merger of the second and third largest firms offering enterprise-grade wireless local area networks (WLAN) to businesses, schools, hospitals, and other networks in the United States[13] would result in the entities controlling over 70% of the United States' enterprise-grade WLAN market, raising antitrust concerns.[14]

The Department of Justice's antitrust division filed a lawsuit to block the acquisition.[15] However, less than two weeks before the trial was scheduled to start, DOJ abruptly reversed course and approved a settlement.[16] According to reports, DOJ antitrust division head, Assistant Attorney General Gail Slater, opposed the decision to settle, but her recommendation was overridden by senior political appointees at DOJ.[17] Reports also indicate that HPE hired lobbyists Mike Davis and Arthur Schwartz, close allies to the White House, to convince Administration officials outside of the DOJ antitrust division to derail the case.[18]

a. Did you or then Attorney General Bondi receive instructions from the White House to direct the DOJ to pursue settlement negotiations with HPE or Juniper?

RESPONSE: I won't comment on purported reporting of anonymous sources nor would it be appropriate for me to speak for former Attorney General Bondi. As the Deputy Attorney General at the time, I supported the decision of the Antitrust Division to resolve this litigation and did not receive direction from the White House regarding this settlement.

b. Did then Assistant Attorney General Slater object to the settlement?

RESPONSE: Former Assistant Attorney General Slater signed the settlement.

---

[12] News Release, HPE, *HPE to Acquire Juniper Networks to Accelerate AI-Driven Innovation* (Jan. 9, 2024), https://investors.hpe.com/~/media/Files/H/HP-Enterprise-IR/documents/hpe-to-acquire-juniper-press-release.pdf.

[13] *United States v. U.S. v. Hewlett Packard Enterprise Co. and Juniper Networks, Inc.*, Complaint, No. 3:25-cv-00951, ¶ 1 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2025).

[14] *Id.*

[15] *Id.*

[16] Bryan Koenig, *DOJ OKs $14B HPE-Juniper Deal With Small-Biz WiFi Unit Sale*, Law360 (Jun. 28, 2025), https://www.law360.com/competition/articles/2358863.

[17] *HPE/Juniper: As Fight Between DOJ Leadership and Antitrust Division Broils, Tunney Act Proceeding Looms*, Capitol Forum (Jul. 24, 2025), https://thecapitolforum.com/hpe-juniper-as-fight-between-doj-leadership-and-antitrust-division-broils/.

[18] *Id.*

c. Did you or Bondi consult with Slater, her deputies Roger Alford and William Rinner, or career antitrust attorney about settling before negotiations took place?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to speak for former Attorney General Bondi. As this settlement is the subject of ongoing litigation it would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations within the Department.

d. Who negotiated the settlement negotiations with HPE?

RESPONSE: As this settlement is the subject of ongoing litigation it would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations within the Department.

e. Explain why the HPE-Juniper merger is not a violation of antitrust law, will not lead to market concentration in the movie and cable TV businesses, and has sufficient procompetitive justifications that will credibly lead to tangible benefits for the American public?

RESPONSE: The Department's assessment of the proposed final judgment is set forth in the competitive impact statement filed with the court under the Tunney Act. *See https://www.justice.gov/atr/media/1406601/dl.*

16. Deputy Associate Attorneys General Roger Alford and Bill Rinner were reportedly fired for insubordination.[19] Roger Alford, in particular, has publicly accused senior Trump Administration officials of corruption in connection with HPE and Juniper's proposed merger.[20] For what reason were they removed?

RESPONSE: It would not be appropriate for me to discuss the specifics of individual personnel matters.

17. On May 23, 2024, the Department of Justice formally announced its antitrust lawsuit against Live Nation Entertainment, accusing the company of illegally monopolizing the live event market.[21] The DOJ was joined in filing the lawsuit by 38 state attorneys general and the attorney general for the District of Columbia.[22]

---

[19] Hannah Rabinowitz & David Goldman, *Justice Department fires two senior antitrust attorneys, alleging insubordination*, CNN (Jul. 29, 2025), https://www.cnn.com/2025/07/29/politics/justice-department-fires-two-senior-antitrust-attorneys.

[20] Josh Sisco & Neal Nylen, *DOJ 'Perverted Justice' in HPE Deal, Dismissed Official Says (1)*, Bloomberg Law (Aug. 18, 2025), https://news.bloomberglaw.com/antitrust/doj-perverted-justice-in-hpe-deal-dismissed-official-says.

[21] Dave Michael & Anne Steele, *Justice Department Sues to Break Up Live Nation-Ticketmaster*, Wall St. J. (May 23, 2024), https://www.wsj.com/business/media/ticketmaster-live-nation-sued-justice-department-monopoly-d9442a75.

[22] *See United States, et al. v. Live Nation Entertainment, Inc. and Ticketmaster Entertainment, LLC*, Complaint, No. 1:24-cv-03973 (S.D.N.Y. May 23, 2024), https://www.justice.gov/atr/media/1353101/dl; Press

Yet, on March 5, 2026, the Department of Justice and Live Nation reached a tentative settlement while the trial was already underway;[23] Live Nation would only have to pay a fine of up to $280 million, divest itself of at least 13 amphitheaters across the country, and open up its ticketing processes to competitors–a settlement amounting to little more than a slap on the wrist.[24] Despite reaching an agreement on March 5, 2026, the settlement was only announced on March 9, 2026.[25] District Judge Arun Subramanian was only informed on the evening of March 8, 2026, which he called "entirely unacceptable."[26] Lawyers for the states and District of Columbia were never informed and given just one day to decide whether to participate in the settlement.[27]

Most states and the District of Columbia rejected the settlement and continued with the trial, ultimately prevailing when a federal jury found that Live Nation held a monopoly and violated federal and state antitrust laws.[28]

a. Did you or then Attorney General Bondi receive instructions from the White House to pursue settlement negotiations with Live Nation?

RESPONSE: The decision to resolve the federal claims was the Department's. I do not speak for others, and I will not describe internal Executive Branch communications.

b. Given how widely publicized it is that Live Nation donated $500,000 to Trump's inauguration and Trump spoke to Live Nation's CEO before the settlement's announcement, do you deny this is strong proof of pay-to-play?[29]

Release, Dep't of Justice, *Ten Additional States Join Justice Department's Suit Against Live Nation-Ticketmaster for Monopolizing Markets Across the Live Concert Industry* (Aug. 19, 2024), https://www.justice.gov/archives/opa/pr/ten-additional-states-join-justice-departments-suit-against-live-nation-ticketmaster.

[23] Ben Sisario et al., *Justice Department and Live Nation Reach Settlement Terms in Antitrust Case*, N.Y. TIMES (Mar. 9, 2026), https://www.nytimes.com/2026/03/09/arts/music/live-nation-ticketmaster-antitrust-suit-settled.html.

[24] *Id.*

[25] Kara Scannell, *Judge scolds Live Nation and Justice Department for secret settlement talks*, CNN (Mar. 10, 2026), https://edition.cnn.com/2026/03/10/politics/live-nation-ticketmaster-justice-department-settlement-controversy

[26] *Id.*

[27] *Id.*

[28] Isabella Gomez Sarmiento, *Jury finds that Live Nation acted as a monopoly and overcharged ticket buy*, NPR (Apr. 15, 2026), https://www.npr.org/2026/04/15/nx-s1-5786715/live-nation-ticketmaster-antitrust-verdict-monopoly.

[29] Ben Kamisar, *Major corporate interests and megadonors gave $239 million to fund Trump's inauguration*, NBC News (Apr. 21, 2025), https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/trump-administration/major-corporate-interests-megadonors-gave-239-million-fund-trumps-inau-rcna202074; Kara Scannell, *Trump spoke with Live Nation CEO shortly before surprise Justice Department settlement, court filing reveals*, CNN (Jun. 24, 2026), https://www.cnn.com/2026/06/24/politics/trump-live-nation-ceo-settlement.

RESPONSE: Yes. Political status is not evidence, and it is not a basis for the Department's decisions. Each matter is resolved on its own facts and the law.

c. Did you or AG Bondi consult with Assistant Attorney General Gail Slater or any other official in the DOJ antitrust division, about settling with Live Nation, before negotiations took place?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may to have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

d. Did you or Bondi negotiate the settlement? If not, who?

RESPONSE: The United States' counsel of record are identified on the public filings.

e. Why did the DOJ not disclose to the attorneys general of the states and District of Columbia about the negotiations until trial was midway through and only after reaching the settlement–not before you entered into settlement talks?

RESPONSE: The United States' settlement resolved the federal claims; the states were free to proceed on their own claims and did so.

f. On February 12, 2026, Gail Slater resigned after less than a year as Associate Attorney General, one month before the settlement was reached with Live Nation.[30] This came a few months after the dismissal of Deputy Associate Attorneys General Roger Alford and William Rinner. Many reports indicate that Slater's resignation came from being sidelined by Bondi amidst the HPE-Juniper and Live Nation-Ticketmaster settlements.[31] What was your involvement in her firing?

RESPONSE: Gail Slater was the Assistant Attorney General for the Antitrust Division; Roger Alford and William Rinner both held the title Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Antitrust Division. It would otherwise be inappropriate for me to comment on personnel matters within the Department of Justice.

18. On February 27, 2026, Paramount Skydance ("Paramount") announced a definitive agreement with Warner Bros. Discovery ("Warner Bros.") to acquire the company for $110.9 billion.[32] Paramount's proposed takeover of Warner Bros. will further concentrate

[30] Jennifer Jacobs & Sarah N. Lynch, *Trump officials oust Abigail Slater as DOJ's antitrust chief, sources say*, CBS News (Feb. 12, 2026), https://www.cbsnews.com/news/abigail-slater-out-as-dojs-anti-trust-chief/.

[31] Rabinowitz & Goldman, *supra* note [ ].

[32] Press Release, Paramount Skydance, *PARAMOUNT TO ACQUIRE WARNER BROS. DISCOVERY TO FORM NEXT-GENERATION GLOBAL MEDIA AND ENTERTAINMENT COMPANY* (Feb. 27, 2026),

the movie and TV industry resulting in higher streaming costs, fewer movies and TV shows being produced, weakened stability for theater, and likely job losses. Moreover, there are significant security concerns with the substantial foreign investment in the deal.[33] Twelve states have sued to block the deal.[34] The Writers Guild of America have filed to prevent the merger. And the United Kingdom and European Union are currently investigating the transaction.[35] Despite action from multiple regulatory bodies and an American union, your Department of Justice closed its investigation into the merger choosing not to pursue further action.

a. Did you receive instructions from the White House to close the investigation into Paramount's acquisition of Warner Bros.?

RESPONSE: The decision to close the investigation was the Department's, and as I testified, I was part of it. I will not describe internal Executive Branch communications.

b. During your nomination hearing, you testified that you were "part of the decision" to close the investigation into Paramount's takeover of Warner Bros. Did you direct the DOJ antitrust division to close their investigations? If not, then who did?

RESPONSE: As I testified, I was part of the decision, which was made by Department leadership and was based on the recommendation of the Antitrust Division.

c. You testified that you did not consult Antitrust Division officials or career attorneys for their input on whether to close their investigation into Paramount's takeover of Warner Bros.

i. Why did you not consult with anyone from the DOJ antitrust division?

RESPONSE: That is an inaccurate characterization of my testimony. Senator Booker asked if "the career attorneys … who investigated that

---

https://ir.paramount.com/news-releases/news-release-details/paramount-acquire-warner-bros-discovery-form-next-generation/.

[33] *See* Andrew deWaard et al., The Costs of Consolidation: Arguments and Evidence for Blocking the Paramount-Warner Bros. Merger (2026), https://macrolab.ucsd.edu/files/2026/07/The-Costs-of-Consolidation-MACRO-Lab-Version-6.pdf.

[34] Lillian Rizzo, *Paramount, WBD hit with lawsuit from 12 states, including California, to block merger*, CNBC (Jul. 13, 2026), https://www.cnbc.com/2026/07/13/paramount-wbd-merger-lawsuit.html?msockid=0bea04af1b4c6ea607a513d41ab96fa1.

[35] Ivana Kottasová & Brian Stelter, *UK government says it's likely to challenge $110 billion Paramount-Warner Bros. merger*, CNN (Jun. 30, 2026); Scott Roxborough, *Europe Won't Kill the Paramount-Warner Bros. Deal — but It Could Make David Ellison Wait*, Hollywood Reporter (Mar. 2, 2026), https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/business/business-news/eu-antitrust-review-may-delay-paramount-warner-merger-1236518201/.

deal recommend[ed] closing that investigation." As I testified, I did not speak with career attorneys in the Antitrust Division about their recommendation. However, I did speak with Department leadership—including Antitrust Division leadership—about this matter.

ii. Is it acceptable to make a dispositive decision over a case without input from the attorneys that worked on it?

RESPONSE: See above.

d. Explain why the Paramount-Warner Bros. merger is not a violation of antitrust law, will not lead to market concentration in the movie and cable TV businesses, and has sufficient procompetitive justifications that will credibly lead to tangible benefits for consumer welfare.

RESPONSE: See the Statement of the Department of Justice Antitrust Division on the Closing of Its Investigation of the Merger of Paramount Skydance and Warner Bros., June 12, 2026, available at https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/statement-department-justice-antitrust-division-closing-its-investigation-merger-paramount.

19. During your Department's investigation of Paramount's proposed acquisition of Warner Bros., you attended David Ellison's dinner honoring the president, the same day Paramount shareholders voted to approve the merger.[36]

a. At your confirmation hearing you testified that, "[e]very appearance or dinner or speech that I give are cleared by ethics officials." Provide the ethics documentation clearing your attendance to David Ellison's dinner on April 23, 2026.

RESPONSE: My attendance at outside events is reviewed through the Department's ethics process, as I testified. The Department will respond to the Committee's request for records through its ordinary process.

b. Have you spoken or corresponded with either David Ellison or Larry Ellison since the Department of Justice opened its investigation into the proper merger of the former's company? If yes, provide the dates, mode, and content of those discussions and communications.

RESPONSE: As I testified, I did not speak with Mr. Ellison at that dinner and did not discuss the Department's investigation with anyone there. I do not recall any communications with either individual.

[36] Michael M. Grynbaum, *Paramount Throws Party for Trump as It Awaits Approval of Warner Bros. Deal*, N.Y. TIMES (Apr. 24, 2026), https://www.nytimes.com/2026/04/24/business/media/david-ellison-trump-cbs-news.html.

20. Since taking office in January 2025, President Trump has issued clemency to more than 1,700 people. In addition to his blanket pardons of people convicted of crimes related to their participation in the January 6, 2021 insurrection, President Trump has also focused clemency on wealthy individuals convicted of white-collar crimes, many of whom owe restitution to investors, taxpayers, and crime victims. A recent report estimated that Trump's pardons during his second term have wiped out between $1.3 billion and $2 billion in restitution owed to crime victims.[37] For the following clemency recipients, please detail: Any contact you or anyone at the Department of Justice had with these individuals or their legal representation prior to or after they received clemency, how much restitution they owed victims prior to receiving clemency, and whether they have been convicted of any crimes since they received clemency.
    a. Changpeng Zhao (Binance)
    b. Trevor Milton (Nikola)
    c. George Santos
    d. Imaad Shah Zuberi
    e. Julie and Todd Chrisley
    f. Paul Walczak
    g. Ross Ulbricht
    h. Wanda Vázquez
    i. Arthur Hayes
    j. HDR Global Trading Ltd.
    k. Lawrence S. Duran
    l. Jason Galanis
    m. Adriana Isabel Camberos
    a. Andres Enrique Camberos
    b. Devon Archer
    c. Carlos R. Watson
    d. Marian I. Morgan
    e. David Gentile
    f. Joseph Lewis
    g. Joseph Schwartz
    h. Michele Fiore
    i. Timothy J. Leiweke

    RESPONSE: To the best of my recollection, I have had no contact with the individuals identified. Before clemency was granted, Department officials had limited communications with or received materials from some of the individuals. Some individuals may also have submitted clemency applications in previous administrations. After clemency was granted, Department officials communicated with recipients as necessary to implement the grants.

    I am not aware of whether there is outstanding restitution owed by the identified clemency recipients prior to their receipt of clemency.

[37] https://www.gov.ca.gov/2026/03/05/trumpcriminals3/.

I am not aware of whether any of the identified individuals have been convicted of a crime since their receipt of clemency during President Trump's second term in office.

21. On March 24, 2025, President Trump appointed his former personal lawyer and later White House counselor Alina Habba to be interim U.S. Attorney for the District of New Jersey.[38] Alina Habba had no prosecutorial background and her only legal experience is running a small civil litigation firm, yet she oversaw the 150 federal prosecutors of the U.S. Attorney's Office and the important work they do.[39]

a. Describe your involvement in AG Bondi's decision to "appoint" Alina Habba as Interim U.S. Attorney of New Jersey.

RESPONSE: The President of the United States may appoint or terminate the employment of any U.S. Attorney for any reason. Any discussions within the Department, or between the Department and the White House, concerning the appointment procedures for U.S. Attorneys would necessarily be covered by various privileges.

22. Immediately after her appointment, in conversation with the conservative Real America's Voice outlet, Habba stated: "We could turn New Jersey red. And I think New Jersey is absolutely close to getting there. So hopefully while I'm there, I can help that cause.[40] The Hatch Act forbids federal employees from using official authority to assist a political campaign or to influence an election.[41] Similarly, the Office of Government Ethics ("OGE") ethics rules prohibit the use of official position for private gain or to endorse a nongovernmental enterprise, including a political campaign.[42] Violations of the Hatch Act and of OGE ethics rules are not permissible under any circumstances. This was echoed by a formal letter sent on July 18, 2025 to the Office of the Special Counsel and Office of Government Ethics by a bipartisan group of former counsels to Presidents Obama, Bush, and Clinton, requesting an investigation into Habba's comments as potential violations of the Hatch Act and OGE ethics rules.[43]

---

[38] Jonah E. Bromwich, *Trump Chooses His Former Lawyer as Interim U.S. Attorney for New Jersey*, N.Y. TIMES (Mar. 24, 2025), https://www.nytimes.com/2025/03/24/nyregion/trump-alina-habba-new-jersey-us-attorney.html.

[39] *Id.*

[40] Nandika Chatterjee, *Trump's Favorite Attorney Alina Habba Tried to Turn Down His Job Offer*, Daily Beast (Mar. 27, 2025), https://www.yahoo.com/news/trump-favorite-attorney-alina-habba-213604085.html.

[41] *See* 5 U.S.C. § 7323 (providing that "(a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), an employee may take an active part in political management or in political campaigns, except an employee may not … use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the result of an election.").

[42] *See* 5 C.F.R. § 2635.702 (providing that "An employee shall not use his public office for his own private gain, for the endorsement of any product, service or enterprise…").

[43] Letter from Norm Eisen, Former Special Couns. to President Barack Obama, Virginia Canter, Former Assoc. Couns. to Presidents Barack Obama and Bill Clinton, and Richard W. Painter, Former Assoc. Couns. to President George W. Bush; to Jamieson Greer, Acting Special Counsel, Off. Special Couns., Acting Dir., Off. Gov't Ethics (Jul. 18, 2025), https://fb1cd5ab-5a51-475c-87d1-10904a61146d.usrfiles.com/ugd/fb1cd5_1398b37fd05c43bcac20d57828dafcfa.pdf.

a. Did her statement violate the Hatch Act and/or OGE ethics rules? Please provide your understanding of the Hatch Act and OGE ethics rules.

RESPONSE: All Department of Justice employees are subject to the Hatch Act, 5 U.S.C. 7323(a) and 7324(a), which generally prohibits Department employees from engaging in partisan political activity while on duty, in a federal facility or using federal property.

b. Did the Office of Government Ethics, the DOJ Office of the Special Counsel and/or Office of Professional Responsibility investigate Habba's comments? If not, will you instruct either the Office of Government Ethics, the DOJ Office of the Special Counsel and/or Office of Professional Responsibility to investigate the comments?

RESPONSE: I cannot confirm or deny the existence of any investigation at the Department of Justice. Any such internal DOJ discussions regarding such matters would necessarily be privileged.

c. Is that an appropriate comment for a U.S. Attorney to make?

RESPONSE: U.S. Attorneys are the chief federal law enforcement officers for each federal district, subject to the appointment and/or removal by the President of the United States. All prosecution and litigation decisions by U.S. Attorneys are made without regard to the political affiliation of the subject or partisan interest in the case.

23. Not only lacking in serious qualifications, Habba pursued a nakedly partisan agenda and made many outrageous missteps that have politicized the office and damaged its credibility. Within days of her appointment as interim U.S. Attorney, Habba announced criminal investigations into Phil Murphy, New Jersey's governor, and Matt Platkin, the state's attorney general, over the state's directive to local law enforcement not to cooperate with federal agents conducting immigration enforcement.[44] Notably, Habba announced the investigation during an appearance on conservative commentator Sean Hannity's Fox television show, stating: "I want it to be a warning for everybody. I have instructed my office to open an investigation into Governor Murphy, to open an investigation into Attorney General Platkin . . ." Ms. Habba later posted the segment to her Twitter account.[45]

a. What is the legal basis for Habba's authorization for the criminal investigations into New Jersey Governor Phil Murphy and Attorney General Matt Platkin?

[44] Greg Hahn, *Alina Habba Says She's Investigating New Jersey Governor, AG Over Immigration Enforcement*, Politico (Apr. 11, 2025), https://www.politico.com/news/2025/04/11/alina-habba-new-jersey-immigration-enforcement-00286158.

[45] *See* Alina Habba (@AlinaHabba), Twitter, https://x.com/AlinaHabba/status/1910514829674131833.

RESPONSE: In April 2025, then-U.S. Attorney Habba announced federal investigations into New Jersey Governor Murphy and Attorney General Platkin for generally harboring and concealing illegal aliens, which is a federal violation of law pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1324, and for generally obstructing federal immigration enforcement officers, which is a federal violation of law pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1505.

b. Were you involved in Habba's decision to investigate both the governor and attorney general?

RESPONSE: Any such internal DOJ discussions regarding a pending investigation would necessarily be privileged.

c. Did you or Habba consult with each other before she announced her decision to investigate the governor and attorney general?

RESPONSE: Any such internal DOJ discussions regarding a pending investigation would necessarily be privileged.

24. Alina Habba and the Department of Justice charged New Jersey Congresswoman LaMonica McIver and Newark mayor Ras Baraka after they sought access to the Delaney Hall detention center to conduct oversight and inspect the facility on May 9, 2025. Mayor Baraka–who was on public property after having been told to leave–was dragged back onto the detention site and wrongly arrested by Immigration Customs and Enforcement (ICE) and Homeland Security Investigation (HSI) officers.[46]

a. When did you learn that Mayor Ras Baraka and Representative McIver, along with other elected officials, were seeking access to Delaney Hall for federal oversight purposes? Specify whether you learned this before or after they were arrested.

RESPONSE: *United States v. McIver* is an ongoing criminal prosecution pending in United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. A federal grand jury in New Jersey returned an indictment against Representative McIver for forcibly impeding and interfering with federal officers. I cannot comment on an ongoing criminal prosecution at the Department of Justice beyond what is available in public DOJ filings and hereby incorporate the positions of the United States from said filings in this response.

b. Bodycamera footage of the scene outside of Delaney Hall depicts a federal law enforcement agent ending a phone call and telling other officers on the scene to turn off

[46] Jake Offenhartz & Claudia Lauer, *Mayor Baraka of Newark, New Jersey, arrested at immigration detention center he has been protesting*, AP News (May 9, 2025), https://apnews.com/article/immigration-protest-ice-newark-mayor-arrested-5a2b3fefd7da563c48d2f85831cf2194.

their bodycams, stating that he would place Mayor Baraka "in handcuffs" and under arrest, "as per the Deputy Attorney General of the United States."[47]

i. At that time, you were the Deputy Attorney General of the United States. Did you speak on the phone with Special Agent in Charge (SAC) Ricky Patel on May 9, 2025 as events unfolded at Delaney Hall detention facility in Newark, New Jersey?

RESPONSE: As I said in my Nomination Hearing, I authorized federal agents to make an arrest in this case. Prosecutors and attorneys within the criminal supervisory chain at the Department of Justice, from an Assistant United States Attorney all the way to the Deputy Attorney General or Attorney General, may authorize federal agents to arrest criminal offenders where there exists probable cause that the person has committed a violation of federal law. *United States v. McIver* is an ongoing criminal prosecution pending in United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. A federal grand jury in New Jersey returned an indictment against Representative McIver for forcibly impeding and interfering with federal officers. I cannot comment on an ongoing criminal prosecution at the Department of Justice beyond what is available in public DOJ filings and hereby incorporate the positions of the United States from said filings in this response.

ii. Who decided to deploy over a dozen armed HSI/ICE agents to Delaney Hall as a highly provocative armed response to a congressional oversight visit?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice does not oversee agents and officers employed by Immigration and Customs Enforcement; those agents and officers are employed and supervised by the Department of Homeland Security.

iii. Did you consult with Habba or any other person during the events of Delaney Hall before Mayor Baraka was arrested?

RESPONSE: *United States v. McIver* is an ongoing criminal prosecution pending in United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. A federal grand jury in New Jersey returned an indictment against Representative McIver for forcibly impeding and interfering with federal officers. I cannot comment on an ongoing criminal prosecution at the Department of Justice beyond what is available in public DOJ filings and hereby incorporate the positions of the United States from said filings in this response.

[47] Colleen Murphy, *New bodycam footage reveals who really ordered the arrest of Newark's mayor*, NJ.COM (Sept. 30, 2025), https://www.nj.com/essex/2025/09/new-bodycam-footage-reveals-who-really-ordered-the-arrest-of-newarks-mayor.html.

iv. How did you, or anyone not physically present at the scene at Delaney Hall, assess whether probable cause existed and whether Mayor Baraka should be arrested?

RESPONSE: *United States v. McIver* is an ongoing criminal prosecution pending in United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. A federal grand jury in New Jersey returned an indictment against Representative McIver for forcibly impeding and interfering with federal officers. I cannot comment on an ongoing criminal prosecution at the Department of Justice beyond what is available in public DOJ filings and hereby incorporate the positions of the United States from said filings in this response.

c. You testified in the hearing that you authorized the arrest of Mayor Baraka, on May 9, 2025. But did you direct or order SAC Patel or anyone else at Delaney Hall to arrest Mayor Baraka?

RESPONSE: As I said in my Nomination Hearing, I authorized federal agents to make an arrest in this case. Prosecutors and attorneys within the criminal supervisory chain at the Department of Justice, from an Assistant United States Attorney all the way to the Deputy Attorney General or Attorney General, may authorize federal agents to arrest criminal offenders where there exists probable cause that the person has committed a violation of federal law. *United States McIver* is an ongoing criminal prosecution pending in United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. A federal grand jury in New Jersey returned an indictment against Representative McIver for forcibly impeding and interfering with federal officers. I cannot comment on an ongoing criminal prosecution at the Department of Justice beyond what is available in public DOJ filings and hereby incorporate the positions of the United States from said filings in this response.

d. Were you involved in Habba's decision to charge Representative McIver? If yes, describe your involvement.

RESPONSE: As I said in my Nomination Hearing, I authorized federal agents to make an arrest in this case. Prosecutors and attorneys within the criminal supervisory chain at the Department of Justice, from an Assistant United States Attorney all the way to the Deputy Attorney General or Attorney General, may authorize federal agents to arrest criminal offenders where there exists probable cause that the person has committed a violation of federal law. *United States v. McIver* is an ongoing criminal prosecution pending in United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. A federal grand jury in New Jersey returned an indictment against Representative McIver for forcibly impeding and interfering with federal officers. I cannot comment on an ongoing criminal prosecution at the Department of Justice beyond what is available in public DOJ filings and hereby incorporate the positions of the United States from said filings in this response.

e. In this matter, Habba rushed to conclusions without the necessary facts, charging both Representative McIver and Mayor Baraka; in Mayor Baraka's case, Habba was forced to drop the criminal trespass charge. Additionally, it is troubling that Habba would threaten Mayor Baraka with resisting arrest if he did not agree to forgo his right to sue over the false arrest. Is that acceptable or typical behavior for a U.S. Attorney to make?

RESPONSE: Federal prosecutors must necessarily make charging decisions during criminal investigations as facts warrant. Prosecutors must always follow the facts and the law, which may require alternative or specifically tailored resolutions to pending criminal charges in line with ethical obligations. Any internal DOJ discussions regarding charging and pleading decisions are necessarily privileged. *United States v. McIver* is an ongoing criminal prosecution pending in United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. A federal grand jury in New Jersey returned an indictment against Representative McIver for forcibly impeding and interfering with federal officers. I cannot comment on an ongoing criminal prosecution at the Department of Justice beyond what is available in public DOJ filings and hereby incorporate the positions of the United States from said filings in this response.

f. On June 25, 2025, the Campaign for Accountability (CfA) asked the New Jersey Office of Attorney Ethics (OAE) to investigate Alina Habba, then interim U.S. Attorney for the District of New Jersey, for potential violations of the New Jersey Rules of Professional Conduct in relation to her ordering the arrest of Newark Mayor Ras Baraka, the subsequent prosecution of Congresswoman LaMonica McIver, and for the previous announcement of a criminal investigation into New Jersey Governor Phil Murphy and Attorney General Matt Platkin.[48]

   i. If required, would you cooperate with the New Jersey OAE's investigation into Habba's conduct?

   RESPONSE: The Department of Justice follows applicable law, consistent with the Constitution, regarding state bar investigations into Department attorneys.

   ii. Did either the Office of Government Ethics, the DOJ Office of the Special Counsel and/or Office of Professional Responsibility investigate Habba's conduct in this matter? If not, would you instruct the Office of Government Ethics, the DOJ Office of the Special Counsel and/or Office of Professional Responsibility to investigate Habba's conduct?

[48] Letter from Michelle Kuppersmith, Exec. Dir. of Campaign for Accountability, to N.J. Office of Attorney Ethics (Jun. 24, 2025), https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/25983507-cfa-nj-office-of-attorney-ethics-alina-habba-62425/.

RESPONSE: I cannot confirm or deny the existence of an investigation at the Department of Justice.

iii. Have you spoken to (or disciplined/reprimanded) Habba about her conduct during this affair?

RESPONSE: Any internal DOJ discussions would necessarily be privileged.

25. On July 22, 2025, a panel of judges on the District Court for the District of New Jersey declined to retain Habba until a nominee is named, appointing Desiree Leigh Grace, a widely respected prosecutor whom Habba appointed as her top deputy, instead.[49] Bondi fired Desiree Leigh Grace a few hours later and made Habba first assistant to fill the vacancy she left behind.[50] Then, on July 24, 2025, President Trump withdrew the nomination of Alina Habba to clear the way for her to serve as Acting U.S. Attorney.[51] This caused court activity in New Jersey involving the U.S. Attorney to abruptly stop amid motions that contested Habba's continued tenure–a needless delay of justice.[52] A district judge ruled on August 21, 2025, that Habba's appointment was unlawful and void as of July 1, 2025;[53] this position was affirmed by the Third Circuit on December 1, 2025,[54] with Habba resigning on December 8 thereafter.[55]

a. Describe your involvement in AG Bondi's decision to "remove" Desiree Grace from her role as Interim U.S. Attorney of New Jersey.

RESPONSE: Any President of the United States may appoint and terminate the employment of any U.S. Attorney for any reason. Any U.S. Attorney may resign from their position for any reason. Any internal DOJ discussions related to administering the President's appointments and terminations at the Department of Justice would be privileged.

b. Describe your involvement in AG Bondi's decision to "appoint" Alina Habba "Acting" U.S. Attorney of New Jersey.

---

[49] Tracey Tully & Jonah E. Bromwich, *Showdown in New Jersey Over Top Federal Prosecutor*, N.Y. TIMES (Jul. 22, 2025), https://www.nytimes.com/2025/07/22/nyregion/alina-habba-nj-us-attorney.html.

[50] *See* Pam Bondi (@AGPamBondi), Twitter, https://x.com/AGPamBondi/status/1947768353025556950 .

[51] Melissa Quinn et al., *Trump yanks Alina Habba's nomination for U.S. attorney, enabling her to serve in acting capacity*, CBS News (Jul. 25, 2025), https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/25983507-cfa-nj-office-of-attorney-ethics-alina-habba-62425/.

[52] Tracey Tully, *N.J. Criminal Cases Screech to a Halt as Habba's Authority Is Challenged*, N.Y. TIMES (Jul. 28, 2025), https://www.nytimes.com/2025/07/28/nyregion/alina-habba-new-jersey-us-attorney-battle.html.

[53] *See United States v. Julien Giraud, Jr.*, No. 1:24-cr-00768, (D.N.J. Aug. 21, 2025).

[54] *See United States v. Julien Giraud, Jr.*, No. 25-2635, (3rd Cir. Dec. 1, 2025).

[55] Alexander Mallin & Peter Charalambous, *Alina Habba resigns as New Jersey US attorney after appeals court defeat*, ABC News (Dec. 8, 2025), https://abcnews.com/US/alina-habba-resigns-new-jersey-us-attorney-ending/story?id=128216127.

RESPONSE: Any President of the United States may appoint and terminate the employment of any U.S. Attorney for any reason. Any U.S. Attorney may resign from their position for any reason. Any internal DOJ discussions related to administering the President's appointments and terminations at the Department of Justice would be privileged.

c. Did you, AG Bondi, or anyone at the White House consult with the DOJ's Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) or any one in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of New Jersey about the lawfulness of appointing Habba as Acting U.S. Attorney?

RESPONSE: Any President of the United States may appoint and terminate the employment of any U.S. Attorney for any reason. Any U.S. Attorney may resign from their position for any reason. Any internal DOJ discussions related to administering the President's appointments and terminations at the Department of Justice would be privileged.

d. Throughout the period of Habba's role as Acting U.S. Attorney, how many times did you have to co-sign filings that otherwise would have carried Habba's name alone due to the uncertainty of her authority?[56]

RESPONSE: During the time of pending litigation concerning the appointments matter in the District of New Jersey, from about August 4, 2025, to March 23, 2026, the U.S. Attorney's Office had approximately 477 criminal filings which opened a docket—318 criminal dockets in 2025 and about 159 criminal dockets in 2026—that included my signature. During that time there were approximately 5,000 civil filings that included my signature.

e. Why did the DOJ challenge the district court's ruling about the unlawfulness of Habba's appointment while maintaining her in that role all the while, despite the harm it was causing to the U.S. Attorney's Office and their ability to prosecute criminal cases?

RESPONSE: The position of the Department of Justice is stated in the Department's public filings concerning the litigation over then-U.S. Attorney Alina Habba's appointment.

26. Despite the controversy around Habba's appointment and tenure, AG Bondi responded with two extremely unorthodox decisions: (1) Bondi appointed Habba as Senior Advisor to the Attorney General for United States Attorneys,[57] and (2) you announced the appointment

[56] *Judge Rules Alina Habba's Appointment Void; Raises Questions on Attorney Stability*, Juris Rev. (Aug. 22, 2025), https://jurisreview.com/judge-rules-alina-habbas-appointment-void-raises-questions-on-attorney-stability/

[57] Press Release, Dep't of Justice, *Department of Justice Leadership Announces New Personnel Appointments and Authorizations in the District of New Jersey* (Dec. 8, 2025), https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/department-justice-leadership-announces-new-personnel-appointments-and-authorizations.

of three persons to run the U.S. Attorney's Office.[58] This "triumvirate" leadership arrangement was struck down by a district court on March 9, 2026; Matthew W. Brann, the chief district judge, was highly critical of this arrangement, writing: "Why does the fate of thousands of criminal prosecutions in this District potentially rest on the legitimacy of an unprecedented and byzantine leadership structure? ... the President doesn't like that he cannot simply appoint whomever he wants,"[59]

a. Describe your involvement in AG Bondi's decision to "appoint" Alina Habba as Senior Advisor to the Attorney General for United States Attorneys.

RESPONSE: On December 8, 2025, then-Attorney General Pam Bondi announced Alina Habba would serve as Senior Advisor to the Attorney General for United States Attorneys. Any such internal DOJ discussions or deliberations concerning this matter would necessarily be privileged. I rest on the positions stated by the United States in the Department's public filings concerning the litigation over then-U.S. Attorney Alina Habba's appointment and then-Attorney General Bondi's decision to appoint three individuals to run the U.S. Attorney's Office in New Jersey.

b. What are Alina Habba's roles and responsibilities as "Senior Advisor to the Attorney General for United States Attorneys"? Would she maintain this role if you are confirmed to be Attorney General?

RESPONSE: On December 8, 2025, then-Attorney General Pam Bondi announced Alina Habba would serve as Senior Advisor to the Attorney General for United States Attorneys. Any such internal DOJ discussions or deliberations concerning this matter would necessarily be privileged. I rest on the positions stated by the United States in the Department's public filings concerning the litigation over then-U.S. Attorney Alina Habba's appointment and then-Attorney General Bondi's decision to appoint three individuals to run the U.S. Attorney's Office in New Jersey.

c. Describe your involvement in AG Bondi's decision to "appoint" Philip Lamparello as Senior Counsel and authorize him to supervise or conduct the work of the district's Criminal Division and Special Prosecutions Division.

RESPONSE: On December 8, 2025, following Alina Habba's resignation as United States Attorney, then-Attorney General Bondi appointed three Department attorneys, Philip Lamparello, Jordan Fox, and Ari Fontecchio, to serve as the office leadership for the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of New Jersey. Any such internal DOJ discussions or deliberations concerning this matter would necessarily be privileged. I rest on the positions stated by the United States in the Department's public filings concerning the litigation over then-U.S. Attorney

[58] *Id.*

[59] *United States v. Naviwala*, No. 2:24-cr-00099, at 9 (D.N.J. Mar. 9. 2026).

Alina Habba's appointment and then-Attorney General Bondi's decision to appoint three individuals to run the U.S. Attorney's Office in New Jersey.

d. Describe your involvement in AG Bondi's decision to "appoint" Jordan Fox as Special Attorney and authorize her to supervise or conduct the work of the district's Civil Division and Appellate Division.

RESPONSE: On December 8, 2025, following Alina Habba's resignation as United States Attorney, then-Attorney General Bondi appointed three Department attorneys, Philip Lamparello, Jordan Fox, and Ari Fontecchio, to serve as the office leadership for the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of New Jersey. Any such internal DOJ discussions or deliberations concerning this matter would necessarily be privileged. I rest on the positions stated by the United States in the Department's public filings concerning the litigation over then-U.S. Attorney Alina Habba's appointment and then-Attorney General Bondi's decision to appoint three individuals to run the U.S. Attorney's Office in New Jersey.

e. Describe your involvement in AG Bondi's decision to "appoint" Ari Fontecchio as Executive Assistant United States Attorney and authorize him to supervise or conduct the work of the district's Administrative Division.

RESPONSE: On December 8, 2025, following Alina Habba's resignation as United States Attorney, then-Attorney General Bondi appointed three Department attorneys, Philip Lamparello, Jordan Fox, and Ari Fontecchio, to serve as the office leadership for the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of New Jersey. Any such internal DOJ discussions or deliberations concerning this matter would necessarily be privileged. I rest on the positions stated by the United States in the Department's public filings concerning the litigation over then-U.S. Attorney Alina Habba's appointment and then-Attorney General Bondi's decision to appoint three individuals to run the U.S. Attorney's Office in New Jersey.

f. Whose idea was it to appoint the "triumvirate" to oversee the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of New Jersey?

RESPONSE: On December 8, 2025, following Alina Habba's resignation as United States Attorney, then-Attorney General Bondi appointed three Department attorneys, Philip Lamparello, Jordan Fox, and Ari Fontecchio, to serve as the office leadership for the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of New Jersey. Any such internal DOJ discussions or deliberations concerning this matter would necessarily be privileged. I rest on the positions stated by the United States in the Department's public filings concerning the litigation over then-U.S. Attorney Alina Habba's appointment and then-Attorney General Bondi's decision to appoint three individuals to run the U.S. Attorney's Office in New Jersey.

g. Did you, AG Bondi, or anyone at the White House consult with the DOJ's Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) or any one in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of New Jersey about the lawfulness of the "triumvirate" leadership structure?

RESPONSE: On December 8, 2025, following Alina Habba's resignation as United States Attorney, then-Attorney General Bondi appointed three Department attorneys, Philip Lamparello, Jordan Fox, and Ari Fontecchio, to serve as the office leadership for the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of New Jersey. Any such internal DOJ discussions or deliberations concerning this matter would necessarily be privileged. I rest on the positions stated by the United States in the Department's public filings concerning the litigation over then-U.S. Attorney Alina Habba's appointment and then-Attorney General Bondi's decision to appoint three individuals to run the U.S. Attorney's Office in New Jersey.

h. How many criminal cases were impacted or delayed from proceeding during the period when the "triumvirate" oversaw the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of New Jersey?

RESPONSE: The U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of New Jersey has consistently promoted public safety through criminal prosecution and has not slowed down in its mission despite delays from courts.

i. In his opinion, District Chief Judge Brann remarked about your "combative (and legally incomplete) [Twitter] posts" hinting that the DOJ would not permit anyone to hold any United States Attorney's office if that person was not handpicked by the President.[60]

RESPONSE: There is no question to respond to.

j. Is it your official legal position that no person can hold any United States Attorney's office unless they were chosen by the President? Please provide your reasoning with proper cite to authorities?

RESPONSE: 28 U.S.C. § 541 reads as follows:

(a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a United States Attorney for each judicial district.
(b) Each United States attorney shall be appointed for a term of four years. On the expiration of his term, a United States attorney shall continue to perform the duties of his office until his successor is appointed and qualifies.

[60] *Id.* at 11; 11 n.45 (*citing* Todd Blanche (@DAGToddBlanche), Twitter, https://x.com/DAGToddBlanche/status/2021777972215062787; ("Judges don't pick U.S. Attorneys, @POTUS does. See Article II of our Constitution. You are fired, Donald Kinsella."); Todd Blanche (@DAGToddBlanche), Twitter, https://x.com/DAGToddBlanche/status/2024993246175261137 ("Here we go again. EDVA judges do not pick our US Attorney. POTUS does. James Hundley, you're fired!").

(c) Each United States attorney is subject to removal by the President.

k. District Judge Zahid Quraishi ejected a federal prosecutor from his courtroom after he interjected–despite having filed no notice of appearance and being warned not to speak–during his questions to the line prosecutor about whether Habba had any involvement with the U.S. Attorney's Office.[61]

1. Was Habba still involved with the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of New Jersey after she resigned on December 8?

RESPONSE: No.

2. Does Habba still have any involvement with the U.S. Attorney's Office currently?

RESPONSE: No.

27. Last April, the Department of Justice (DOJ) cancelled hundreds of grants worth more than $800 million. Organizations in New Jersey and around the country had to lay off workers, restrict their services, and abandon their public safety work. DOJ outlined a vague process by which organizations could appeal those grant terminations.

a. If confirmed, do you commit to publicly releasing the list of grants terminated, grants appealed, and the status or result of each appeal?

RESPONSE: The Department will continue to handle grant terminations and appeals, consistent with 2 C.F.R. § 200.342.

28. The Department of Justice's budget for Fiscal Year 2027 proposes the consolidation of the Office of Justice Programs, Office of Violence Against Women (OVW), and the Community-Oriented Policing Services Office into a new office called the Bureau of Justice Grants, despite the fact that existing law prohibits OVW from being consolidated into other offices.[62]

a. What is the status of efforts to consolidate these offices?

RESPONSE: The Department is nearing the end of the consolidation process and anticipates it being effectuated this year.

b. What is the legal basis for consolidating OVW into other offices?

RESPONSE: The Office of Legal Counsel evaluated the relevant statutes and authorities and determined that this important government efficiency initiative

[61] Ellie Quinlan Houghtaling, J*udge Kicks Out Prosecutor Until He Gets Answers on Alina Habba*, New Republic (Mar. 17, 2026), https://newrepublic.com/post/207886/judge-kicks-out-prosecutor-alina-habba.

[62] 34 U.S.C § 10442 (b).

complies with existing law. OVW will remain a distinct office within the new grants component.

c. In addition to the statutory bar on combining OVW with other offices, Congress has repeatedly directed DOJ not to move forward with this consolidation.[63] Will you follow Congress's clear direction that these offices not be consolidated?

RESPONSE: The Office of Legal Counsel evaluated the relevant statutes and authorities and determined that this important government efficiency initiative complies with existing law. The Department disagrees that there is a statutory bar to consolidation. OVW will remain a distinct office within the new grants component.

d. Are you aware that the National Organization of Police Organizations (NAPO) opposes the consolidation, in part based on the organization's opinion that it "will have a negative impact on the COPS Office"? Please describe the outreach DOJ has conducted to stakeholder organizations that would be impacted by the consolidation.

RESPONSE: The Associate Attorney General recently hosted two webinars with the grants community regarding the Departments consolidation efforts. The Department continues to make outreaches to constituent groups.

29. The consolidation plans described in the FY27 budget request would eliminate the following OJP grant programs. Please describe how the elimination of each of these programs will improve public safety?

a. Byrne Discretionary Community Project Grants

b. Community Based Violence Intervention and Prevention Initiative

c. Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Grants Program

d. Khalid Jabara and Heather Heyer NO HATE Act Program

e. Body Worn Camera Partnership Program

f. Training to Improve Police-Based Responses to the People with Mental Illness

g. Multidisciplinary Partnership Improvements for Protective Orders,

h. Community-Based Approaches to Prevent and Address Hate Crime

RESPONSE: The Department is committed to implementing any organizational changes in a deliberate and orderly manner to ensure continuity of operations and uninterrupted support for grantees, stakeholders, and law enforcement partners. As

[63] https://docs.house.gov/billsthisweek/20260105/Division%20A%20Commerce%20Justice%20Science.pdf.

reflected in the FY 2026 Budget, the proposed consolidation is intended to streamline administrative functions, reduce duplication, and improve operational efficiency while preserving the distinct statutory missions and programmatic responsibilities of the Office on Violence Against Women, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, and the Office of Justice Programs. Subject to congressional action and applicable legal requirements, the Department anticipates a phased implementation that prioritizes continuity of grant administration, technical assistance, program oversight, and performance evaluation. Throughout the transition, DOJ will work to retain mission expertise, maintain strong stakeholder engagement, and ensure that program quality and customer service remain consistent while achieving greater administrative efficiency.

The FY 2027 President's Budget invests in OJP programs that directly support law enforcement operations, combat violent crime, protect American children, provide services to American crime victims, and address public safety issues including trafficking, sexual assault, and the opioid crisis.

30. On January 7, 2026, a masked ICE agent shot and killed Renee Good, a 37-year old mother of three, while she was in her car. Rather than immediately investigating this killing, the Trump Administration deployed a public smear campaign against Ms. Good. Vice President Vance called Ms. Good's actions, "classic terrorism."[64] According to the New York Times, FBI Director Patel and senior DOJ officials blocked a use-of-force investigation by FBI agents and the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Minnesota because the Trump-appointed officials worried that a civil rights investigation would contradict President Donald Trump's false claims that Ms. Good "violently, willfully, and viciously ran over the ICE officer" who fired at her.[65] Instead of investigating the officers involved in Ms. Good's killing, DOJ launched an investigation to examine ties between Ms. Good and her wife with several groups monitoring and protesting the conduct of immigration agents. Six federal prosecutors resigned rather than conduct this baseless and offensive investigation.[66]

a. Do you believe that Ms. Good was a domestic terrorist?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice has not characterized Ms. Good as a domestic terrorist. The Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General is investigating the death of Ms. Good, and the Department of Justice is providing support and legal process as necessary. It would be inappropriate for me to discuss any further details of an ongoing investigation.

---

[64] Richard Luscombe, Trump Administration Unleashes Torrent of Untruths After Woman Shot Dead by ICE, THE GUARDIAN, (Jan. 9, 2026), https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2026/jan/09/white-house-minneapolis-ice-killing.

[65] Ernesto Londono, *Prosecutors Began Investigating Renee Good's Killing. Washington Told Them to Stop,* N.Y. TIMES, (Feb. 7, 2026), https://www.nytimes.com/2026/02/07/us/renee-good-investigation-minnesota-trump.html.

[66] Ernesto Lodono, *Six Prosecutors Quit Over Push to Investigate ICE Shooting Victim's Widow*, N.Y. TIMES, (Jan.13, 2026), https://www.nytimes.com/2026/01/13/us/prosecutors-doj-resignation-ice-shooting.html.

b. Were you involved in the decision not to open a civil rights investigation into Ms. Good's death?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 30(a)

i. If so, please detail your involvement.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 30(a).

c. Why did the DOJ decide not to open a civil rights investigation into Ms. Good's death?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 30(a).

d. Were you involved in the decision to investigate Ms. Good's widow? If so, please detail your involvement.

RESPONSE: No.

e. What is the status of the reported investigation of Ms. Good's widow?

RESPONSE: To my knowledge, there is not an active investigation into Ms. Good's widow, though if there were, it would be inappropriate to discuss any details of that investigation.

f. On July 13, 2026, the DOJ turned over evidence related to Ms. Good's killing, including hard drives containing statements, policy body camera video, and other materials to the Hennepin County Attorney's office. Why did it take the DOJ more than seven months to turn over this evidence?

RESPONSE: As with any investigation, federal law enforcement will work with State and locals as appropriate. DHS OIG, FBI, and the U.S. Attorney's office have and will run these investigations professionally and in appropriate coordination with State and local partners.

31. On January 24, 2026, a Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Agent shot and killed Alex Pretti. Soon after the killing, then-Secretary of Homeland Security Kristi Noem called Mr. Pretti a "domestic terrorist."[67] You announced that the DOJ Civil Rights Division was investigating the killing.

a. Do you believe Mr. Pretti was a domestic terrorist?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice has not characterized Mr. Pretti as a domestic terrorist.

[67] Benjamin Weiss, *Noem Refuses to Backpedal on Calling Alex Pretti a Domestic Terrorist*, Courthouse News Service, (March 3, 2026), https://courthousenews.com/noem-refuses-to-backpedal-on-calling-alex-pretti-a-domestic-terrorist/.

b. Please provide an update into the civil rights investigation.

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to discuss the details of any ongoing investigation.

c. On July 13, 2026, DOJ turned over evidence related to Mr. Pretti's killing, including hard drives containing statements, policy body camera video, and other materials to the Hennepin County Attorney's office. Why did it take the DOJ more than seven months to turn over this evidence?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 30(f).

32. In September and October 2025, the military conducted numerous lethal military strikes on civilians in boats suspected of smuggling drugs in the Caribbean Sea and eastern Pacific Ocean, killing dozens of people. OLC prepared a classified memo that purportedly provides a legal justification for the strikes.

a. Who was responsible for preparing the OLC memo?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice provided unprecedented access to the head of OLC to discuss the legal basis behind these strikes in an appropriate classified setting, including allowing every member of Congress who wished to do so the ability to review the memorandum. Consistent with principles of executive privilege, the confidential nature of the attorney-client relationship, and the classified information discussed in the document, it would be inappropriate to comment further on legal advice that the Department may or may not have given to the President or other Executive Branch officials.

b. Did you author, contribute to, or advise the classified OLC memo authorizing military strikes on boats in the Caribbean and Pacific since September 2025?

RESPONSE: See the above answer to Question 32(a).

c. Please summarize the legal justification for these strikes, as discussed in the memo.

RESPONSE: See the above answer to Question 32(a).

d. Does the OLC memo offer a justification the following military actions:

i. Strikes against civilian targets?

RESPONSE: See the above answer to Question 32(a).

ii. "Double-tapping", in other words re-engaging a disabled boat with the intention of inflicting more casualties?

RESPONSE: See the above answer to Question 32(a).

iii. Conducting military operations within other country's borders without that country's consent?

RESPONSE: See the above answer to Question 32(a).

iv. Conducting military operations in international waters?

RESPONSE: See the above answer to Question 32(a).

v. Conducting offensive military actions without the consent of Congress?

RESPONSE: See the above answer to Question 32(a).

e. Prior to using lethal force, what is the legal standard of proof required to show that a boat is trafficking drugs or otherwise affiliated with cartels and not a civilian craft?

RESPONSE: See the above answer to Question 32(a).

i. Who bears the burden of proof for making such a showing?

RESPONSE: See the above answer to Question 32(a).

ii. Has the government offered any evidence to meet this burden of proof?

RESPONSE: See the above answer to Question 32(a).

f. According to the OLC memo, what is the legal burden of proof required to show that a boat is a valid military target?

RESPONSE: See the above answer to Question 32(a).

33. As you are aware, as of June 2026, the FISA 702 collection authority lapsed.[68]

a. How many FISA querying violations has the FBI committed since you were appointed acting Attorney General?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice, including the FBI, takes its FISA compliance obligations seriously. These responsibilities include the release of public statistics of DOJ's compliance review on an annual basis. These figures will be included in that report. In 2025, the FBI's compliance rate for U.S. person queries in 2025 was greater than 98 percent.

[68] Eric McDaniel, *A Key U.S. Spy Tool Has Lapsed — Now What?*, NPR, (Jun. 13, 2026), https://www.npr.org/2026/06/12/nx-s1-5856291/fisa-702-surveillance-expiration-bill-pulte.

b. Yes or no, is a warrant required for law enforcement to conduct surveillance on U.S. citizens?

RESPONSE: Although whether a warrant is required for either criminal or intelligence surveillance on an individual in any particular circumstance will depend on particular facts, some authorities for conducting such surveillance do require a warrant.

c. Does the DOJ use data that has been collected in Section 702 queries to prosecute US persons in US courts?

RESPONSE: The Government can only use FISA information in a criminal proceeding with Attorney General approval. Since the advent of Section 702 in 2008, in only eight criminal cases, nine U.S. persons (the definition of which includes citizens and lawful permanent residents) have received notice of the Government's intent to use or disclose information obtained or derived from Section 702 acquisitions. These notices were filed on the public docket.

d. When the annual FISC certification for Section 702 expires in March of 2027, which specific DOJ collection capabilities will be affected and how?

RESPONSE: The government will lose the ability to collect foreign intelligence information from non-United States persons outside of the United States with the assistance of an electronic communications service provider unless the government is otherwise able to collect the information through other legal means.

e. Would you ever authorize electronic surveillance or FISA queries of a sitting member of Congress? If so, under what circumstances? What kind of information would be collected?

RESPONSE: Querying FISA information for U.S. persons is protected under a strict compliance regime under FISA, and the Department adheres to that regime in all circumstances.

34. Last year, the *Washington Post* reported that nearly one-quarter of Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) agents spend 50 percent or more of their day-to-day activities conducting low-level immigration enforcement.[69] Reassignments of federal law enforcement away from their primary responsibilities to focus on immigration enforcement is not unique to the FBI. The CATO Institute reported that the Department of Justice reassigned 1,778 agents at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF) to immigration enforcement, 1,181 agents

[69] Perry Stein, *A Quarter of FBI Agents are Assigned to Immigration Enforcement, Per FBI Data*, WASHINGTON POST, (Oct. 8, 2025), https://www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/2025/10/08/fbi-agents-reassigned-immigration.

from the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), and 650 agents from the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS).[70]

a. How many FBI agents spend more than 50 percent of their time working on immigration enforcement activities?

RESPONSE: To my knowledge, none.

b. How many FBI employees spend more than 50 percent of their time working on immigration enforcement activities?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 34(a).

c. How many ATF employees spend more than 50 percent of their time working on immigration enforcement activities?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 34(a).

d. How many DEA agents spend more than 50 percent of their time working on immigration enforcement activities?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 34(a).

e. How many DEA employees spend more than 50 percent of their time working on immigration enforcement activities?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 34(a).

f. How many USMS employees spend more than 50 percent of their time working on immigration enforcement activities?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 34(a).

g. Have these reassignments impacted the DOJ's operational capabilities? Why or why not?

RESPONSE: No. Our agents work tirelessly every day to enforce the law, investigate crimes, and prioritize public safety and national security. Our Title 8 coordination with ERO is done to benefit ongoing investigations into criminal and national security matters. Given the well-documented connection between illegal immigration and drug trafficking and other crimes, coordination with immigration officials advances important the Department of Justice's objectives.

[70] David Bier, *ICE Has Diverted Over 25,000 Officers from Their Jobs*, CATO INSTITUTE (Sept. 3, 2025), https://www.cato.org/blog/ice-has-diverted-over-25000-officers-their-jobs.

35. Have the FBI, ATF, DEA, and USMS hired additional personnel to compensate for the personnel reassigned to conduct low-level immigration enforcement? Please state yes or no for each agency, and the number of additional personnel hired for each.

RESPONSE: All law enforcement components are rapidly hiring new federal agents. Personnel that work in coordination with Title 8 enforcement do so in support of broader operational and public safety objectives. For specific numbers of new hires by each agency, please reach out to the Office of Legislative Affairs and they will respond.

36. What training have DOJ employees reassigned to immigration enforcement operations received related to immigration enforcement? Specify the training they received, including the duration of each module or program.

RESPONSE: Federal agents conducting Title 8 operations receive training, including legal training online and in person training at academies. For specific durations and contents, please reach out to the Office of Legislative Affairs and they will respond. This training supplements agents' exhaustive training in criminal law, use of force, first aid, and other relevant subjects.

37. For each of the following topics, (i) confirm whether DOJ employees assigned or reassigned to immigration enforcement receive training related to that topic; (ii) provide the number of hours of required training; and (iii) identify the platform on which these trainings will be delivered (e.g., classroom, scenario-based, virtual):

a. Immigration law
b. Criminal law
c. Investigations
d. Witness interviews
e. Interactions with youth
f. Report writing
g. First aid and safety training
h. Crisis intervention
i. Firearms
j. Use of force
k. Deescalation
l. First amendment protected activity
m. Stops, searches, and arrests
n. Misconduct reporting

RESPONSE: All federal agents receive comprehensive training on legal and operational components of their jobs. And I understand that any agent working on Title 8 enforcement received additional legal training for such operations. For specific details on the length and content of that training, please reach out to the Office of Legislative Affairs and they will respond.

38. On September 29, 2025 a *Reuters* analysis revealed that federal drug prosecutions fell 10 percent between 2024 and 2025, the lowest rate since the late 1990s.[71]

a. What accounts for the decrease in prosecutions?

RESPONSE: Raw prosecution numbers do not, by themselves, capture the effectiveness of the Department's counternarcotics efforts. The Department has increasingly concentrated its resources on dismantling the command-and-control structures of Transnational Criminal Organizations and cartels responsible for trafficking fentanyl and other deadly substances into our communities. Just this year, DEA has seized over 16.6 million fentanyl pills and over 2,500 kilos of fentanyl powder. And since the start of the Trump Administration, DEA has taken 500 million lethal doses of fentanyl, cocaine, heroin, and meth off the streets.

b. Has this shift in focus to low-level immigration enforcement affected the agency's capacity to pursue drug-related prosecutions?

RESPONSE: No. The Department's immigration enforcement efforts and its counternarcotics strategy are complementary. The same TCOs and cartels that traffic fentanyl and other drugs to the United States are frequently responsible for human smuggling and exploiting our borders. Enforcement directed at those networks advances both objectives.

39. On January 21, 2025, then-Acting Deputy Attorney General Emil Bove issued a memorandum to all DOJ employees regarding interim immigration enforcement policy changes. That memo instructed the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force (OCDETF) and the Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) program to establish and provide at the federal, state, and local level, resources to immigration-related prosecution.[72]

a. How many OCDETF personnel are now working either full time or part time on immigration enforcement? Please provide the number of personnel and the average percentage of time spent on immigration enforcement.

RESPONSE: I do not have specific personnel figures responsive to this question available to me, nor do I have available a reliable average allocation of time for these personnel.

b. How many PSN personnel are now working either full time or part time on immigration enforcement? Please provide the number of personnel and the average percentage of time spent on immigration enforcement.

---

[71] Brad Heath, *Exclusive: Federal Drug Prosecutions Fall to Lowest Level in Decades as Trump Shifts Focus to Deportations*, REUTERS (Sept. 30, 2025), https://www.reuters.com/legal/government/federal-drug-prosecutions-fall-lowest-level-decades-trump-shifts-focus-2025-09-29/.

[72] Mem. from Emil Bove, Acting Deputy Attorney General, to all Dep't Employees, "Interim Policy Change Regarding Charging, Sentencing, And Immigration Enforcement" (Jan. 21, 2025).

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 39(a).

40. On September 29, 2025, the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) announced it would terminate the contract between BOP and the Council of Prison Locals, the union representing most BOP employees. The Council has consistently worked to bridge partisan divides in Congress to help BOP secure additional funding and safety measures for corrections professionals.

a. Why did BOP terminate the contract?

RESPONSE: There is ongoing litigation involving the termination of BOP's collective bargaining agreement with the Council of Prison Locals. As a result, I cannot comment.

b. Were you involved in the decision to terminate the contract?

RESPONSE: There is ongoing litigation involving the termination of BOP's collective bargaining agreement with the Council of Prison Locals. As a result, I cannot comment.

c. Who made the final decision to terminate the contract?

RESPONSE: There is ongoing litigation involving the termination of BOP's collective bargaining agreement with the Council of Prison Locals. As a result, I cannot comment.

d. Have you engaged in any discussions within DOJ about transferring BOP operations to private prison companies, such as GEO Group?

RESPONSE: There is ongoing litigation involving the termination of BOP's collective bargaining agreement with the Council of Prison Locals. As a result, I cannot comment.

e. Do you support transferring operations from BOP to private prison companies?

RESPONSE: There is ongoing litigation involving the termination of BOP's collective bargaining agreement with the Council of Prison Locals. As a result, I cannot comment.

41. On July 1, 2026, BOP announced it planned to close six BOP facilities: Beaumont FCI Low, Big Spring FCI and Satellite Camp, La Tuna FCI, FSL (Federal Satellite Low) and Satellite Camp, Lexington FMC Satellite Camp, Petersburg FCI Low, and Taft FCI. Director Marshal justified the closures as necessary considering the "decades of deferred maintenance and extreme staffing challenges" BOP continues to experience.[73]

a. How much of the $5 billion Congress appropriated BOP in the One Big Beautiful Bill Act has been obligated? How much has been spent?

RESPONSE: BOP continues to work to expeditiously obligate all One Big Beautiful Bill Act funding in a fiscally responsible manner.

[73] Bureau of Prisons, Federal Bureau of Prisons Announces Facility Closures and Operational Changes, (Jul. 1, 2026) https://www.bop.gov/news/pdfs/20260701_pr_facility_closures.pdf.

b. Why did BOP make the decision to close these institutions now, given the significant investment Congress made to improve BOP deferred maintenance and staffing?

RESPONSE: BOP regularly assesses its existing institutions and considers various factors, including needs and costs. These particular facilities are beyond repair and even if repairs were possible, staffing these facilities would remain a challenge. BOP is using OBBBA funding to address its most critical infrastructure updates, including upgrades to severely deteriorated structural and security systems.

This requires BOP to make strategic choices to ensure that the resources we have go toward addressing our most critical staffing and infrastructure challenges. The goal of these efforts is to significantly reduce BOP's deferred maintenance and repair backlog and to ensure that the Federal Prison System is safe and secure for both BOP staff, inmates, and communities nationwide.

42. In September 2024, New York Mayor Eric Adams was indicted by the United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York for numerous crimes, including wire fraud; soliciting campaign contributions from foreign nationals; and soliciting and accepting a bribe.[74] Despite the seriousness of the allegations and the strength of the evidence, the Trump Department of Justice ordered Acting U.S. Attorney Danielle Sassoon to drop the charges against Mayor Adams because it could interfere with Mayor Adams's support for Trump's immigration agenda.[75] Acting U.S. Attorney Sassoon resigned along with several acting heads and prosecutors rather than act on what is clearly blatant political interference into the justice system.[76] During your nomination hearing for the role of Deputy Attorney General, when Sen. Welch asked you whether "the dismissal of the Adams charge, that was directed by D.C., correct?," you replied "I have the same information you have … I don't know beyond what I've [seen] publicly reported;" you gave a similar answer to Sen. Coons's question.[77] But we now know that then Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General Emil Bove told Acting U.S. Attorney Sassoon–regarding the dismissal of Mayor Adams's charges–that both you and Bove were "on the same page."[78]

---

[74] Aaron Katersky & Ivan Pereira, *New York City Mayor Eric Adams charged with fraud, accepting $10 million in improper campaign contributions*, ABC News (Sep. 26, 2024), https://abcnews.com/Politics/new-york-city-mayor-eric-adams-charged-accepting/story?id=114182253.

[75] Jeff Coltin et al., *Trump's Justice Department moves to drop charges against Eric Adams*, Politico (Feb. 10, 2025), https://www.politico.com/news/2025/02/10/trumps-justice-department-moves-to-drop-charges-against-eric-adams-00203483.

[76] Scott MacFarlane et al., *Top DOJ officials, Manhattan federal prosecutor resign after receiving orders to drop Eric Adams case*, CBS News (Feb. 14, 2025), https://www.cbsnews.com/news/u-s-attorney-manhattan-danielle-sassoon-quits-justice-dept-drops-eric-adams-case/.

[77] Alexander Mallin & Aaron Katersky, *Trump's lawyer may have known more about Eric Adams' criminal case*, ABC News (Mar. 25, 2025), https://abcnews.com/US/trumps-lawyer-eric-adams-criminal-case/story?id=120152531.

[78] *Id.*

a. Were you aware of the DOJ's intention to drop charges against Eric Adams prior to February 10, 2025?

RESPONSE: I was not involved in the Department's decision-making prior to my confirmation as Deputy Attorney General.

b. Did you discuss the Eric Adams case with Bove or anybody at the DOJ prior to February 10, 2025? If so, who did you speak to and what did you discuss?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 42(a).

c. Was the timing of your nomination to Deputy Attorney General a consideration in the DOJ's decision to drop charges against Eric Adams?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 42(a).

d. Have you ever had direct communication with Eric Adams? When, how, and what was the subject of these communications?

RESPONSE: I have never had direct communication with Eric Adams.

43. Have you ever discussed with President Trump, or any person associated with him or his Administration, a potential nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court? Describe the nature of the discussion, the name of the individual(s) involved, and the date of the discussion.

RESPONSE: I have not sought a nomination to the Supreme Court, and I am not aware of any discussion. To the extent the question concerns my communications with the President, those communications are confidential and I do not think it appropriate to detail them.

44. Have you spoken or corresponded with Emil Bove since he joined the Third Circuit in September 2025? If yes, provide the dates, mode, and content of those discussions and communications, including whether those discussions related to matters at the Department of Justice.

a. Affirm that, since September 2025, you have not spoken with Emil Bove about any matters relating to the Department of Justice. If you cannot so affirm, describe with specificity what matters relating to the Department of Justice you discussed with Emil Bove and provide dates and mode of those discussions.

RESPONSE: Since Judge Bove's appointment to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, I can affirm that I have not spoken with Judge Bove about any matters relating to the Department of Justice. To the extent Judge Bove and I have had any incidental or social contact, it has not concerned Department business.

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

RESPONSE: I do not recall any communication with Mr. Musk concerning any matter before the Department of Justice. To the extent any incidental contact occurred, it did not involve any Department matter.

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

RESPONSE: I do not recall any communication with Mr. Zuckerberg concerning any matter before the Department of Justice. To the extent any incidental contact occurred, it did not involve any Department matter.

47. In your Senate Judiciary Questionnaire, you state that you served as Acting Librarian of Congress from May 2025 to December 2025.

a. Describe the circumstances of your appointment as Acting Librarian of Congress.

RESPONSE: On May 8, 2025, the President removed Carla Hayden from her position as Librarian of Congress. The next day, the President designated me as acting Librarian of Congress and directed me to perform the duties of that office. As explained in my Senate Judiciary Questionnaire, the appointment was the subject of litigation, and the term expired in December 2025.

b. Describe your duties as Acting Librarian of Congress.

RESPONSE: The appointment was subject to litigation so I never assumed the duties of the office.

a. Estimate the amount of time you dedicated to your duties as Acting Librarian of Congress from May 2025 to December 2025.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 47(b).

48. Do you believe that President Biden won the 2020 election? Note that this question is not asking who was certified as president in the 2020 election. A response that references only certification will be treated as a refusal to answer.

a. Did Biden win a majority of the electoral vote in the 2020 election?

RESPONSE: On January 7, 2021, Congress certified that Joseph Biden won the majority of electoral votes.

b. Do you believe that the results of the 2020 election, meaning the vote count, were accurate? If not, explain why not and examples.

RESPONSE: As I have previously stated, there are several outstanding investigations into the accuracy and trustworthiness of the results of the 2020 election. Consistent with longstanding rules and guidelines of the Department, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on these outstanding investigations.

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

a. Do you acknowledge that this is the law of the land?

RESPONSE: Yes.

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

RESPONSE: On January 6, 2017, Congress certified that Donald Trump received 304 electoral votes while Hilary Clinton received 227 electoral votes.

c. Did Trump win a majority of the electoral vote in the 2016 election?

RESPONSE: On January 6, 2017, Congress certified that President Trump received 304 electoral votes. This was a majority of electoral votes.

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

RESPONSE: On January 6, 2025, Congress certified that Donald Trump received 312 electoral votes while Kamala Harris received 226 electoral votes.

e. Did Trump win a majority of the electoral vote in the 2024 election?

RESPONSE: On January 6, 2025, Congress certified that President Trump received 312 electoral votes. This was a majority of electoral votes cast.

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

RESPONSE: The 22nd Amendment states in relevant part that "no person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice." As I stated during my hearing, I do not believe so under that text.

50. In your Senate Judiciary Questionnaire, you stated you are affiliated with these organizations:

- Ocean Reef Club (2006–Present)
- Manhasset Soccer Club (2006–2010)
- Huntington Country Club, Member (2019–2023)

- Downtown Association (2016–2019)
- Metropolitan Club, Summer Guest Privileges (2025)
- Executive Branch (2026–Present)

For each organization:

a. Describe what the organization is and its membership.
b. Identify the cost of membership, whether monthly or annual.
c. Did you pay this cost of membership yourself, or did someone else on your behalf?
d. When was the last date that you visited this organization and with whom?
e. With whom did you speak with during that visit and what was the nature of the conversation?

RESPONSE: The organizations listed are social, recreational, athletic, or professional membership organizations. I have satisfied my membership obligations personally. Beyond what appears in that report, I do not think it appropriate to reconstruct the dates of, companions at, or the substance of private social visits, none of which involved the conduct of Department business.

51. Explain, with particularity, the process whereby you answered these written questions, including whether you personally drafted initial responses and whether anyone helped draft, review, or edit the answers.

RESPONSE: My answers to each question are my own. Consistent with the practice of past nominees, I drafted answers to these questions with the assistance of attorneys from the Department of Justice, and Executive Office of the President personnel. Where relevant, I consulted prior Department practice and legal guidance, including the Justice Manual and publicly available legal materials.

a. Affirm that you personally drafted initial responses to each question. If you cannot so affirm, identify which questions you personally drafted responses to.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 51.

52. For each of the following scenarios, please state whether possession of a firearm by a prohibited person under 18 U.S.C. § 922(g) be lawful or unlawful: if the prohibited person obtained the firearm from a straw purchaser; if the prohibited person purchased the firearm from an unlicensed dealer; if the prohibited person bought the firearm from a licensed dealer.

RESPONSE: The possession of a firearm by a prohibited person listed in 18 U.S.C. § 922(g) is unlawful regardless of who he purchased the firearm from.

On August 11, 2025, President Trump issued an Executive Order on crime in Washington, D.C. Executive Order.[79] For the next two months, then-Attorney General Pam Bondi posted regular updates of the number of illegal guns that had been seized in Washington, D.C., on X. In the first 10 days that followed the President's Executive order, that number was 86 illegal guns.[80] By the end of August, that number had almost doubled.[81] Nearly one month later, Attorney General Bondi posted that 225 illegal guns had been seized in D.C.[82] More than two months later, on October 14, Attorney General Bondi posted that a total of 413 illegal guns had been seized.[83] At your nomination hearing to be Attorney General, you also mentioned these efforts by the Department in D.C. as well as in Memphis, Tennessee, citing thousands of illegal gun seizures under the Trump Administration.

a. Separate and apart from seizing illegal guns, do you support efforts to stop illegal guns from reaching our cities in the first place by preventing them from getting into the hands of unlawful possessors and other dangerous individuals to begin with?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice under President Trump's leadership has prioritized prosecution of violent offenders and those who arm offenders with illegal firearms. Across all federal districts, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF) and U.S. Attorneys' Offices (USAOs) work together aggressively and strategically to identify and prosecute those who violate federal firearms laws.

53. At his nomination hearing to be ATF Director, now-Director Robert Cekada said, "ATF's core mission is public safety," and then stated that ATF "disrupt[s] firearms trafficking networks that arm gangs and cartels."

a. Do firearms trafficking networks *only* arm gangs and cartels? If not, what other categories of individuals can become armed by firearms trafficking networks?

RESPONSE: Firearm trafficking networks arm gangs, cartels, and otherwise prohibited persons. The Department of Justice under President Trump's leadership is committed to identifying and dismantling firearm trafficking networks, as evidenced by the data in the previous answer.

b. Who or what are common sources of the firearms that are trafficked through these networks?

---

[79] The White House, Executive Order 14333: Declaring a Crime Emergency in the District of Columbia (Aug. 11, 2025) https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/08/declaring-a-crime-emergency-in-the-district-of-columbia/.

[80] Pam Bondi (@AGPamBondi), Twitter, https://x.com/AGPamBondi/status/1958488447863398750?s=20

[81] Pam Bondi (@AGPamBondi), Twitter, https://x.com/AGPamBondi/status/1962141445395042573?s=20

[82] Pam Bondi (@AGPamBondi), Twitter, https://x.com/AGPamBondi/status/1965752674076266947?s=20

[83] Pam Bondi (@AGPamBondi), Twitter, https://x.com/AGPamBondi/status/1978165803804471632?s=20

RESPONSE: Common sources of trafficked firearms includes those stolen from lawful owners, those purchased with criminal intent by straw purchasers, and other crime guns used and distributed by criminal networks.

i. Do you agree with the following statement: firearms trafficking networks can be intrastate (i.e., within one state), interstate (i.e., across state lines), or international (i.e., across international borders), or any combination thereof?

RESPONSE: Yes.

ii. What specific efforts will the Department take under your leadership, if confirmed, to combat *intrastate* firearms trafficking?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice under President Trump's leadership is committed to identifying and dismantling firearm trafficking networks, as evidenced by the information in the above answer. The Department continually strengthens our partnership with state and local law enforcement agencies to identify violent offenders and those who arm them. Through rigorous investigation and prosecution, we will continue to hold such offenders accountable to the fullest extent of the law, in line with the Department's policies.

iii. What specific efforts will the Department take under your leadership, if confirmed, to combat *interstate* firearms trafficking?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice under President Trump's leadership is committed to identifying and dismantling firearm trafficking networks, as evidenced by the information in the above answer. The Department continually strengthens our partnership with state and local law enforcement agencies to identify violent offenders and those who arm them. Through rigorous investigation and prosecution, we will continue to hold such offenders accountable to the fullest extent of the law, in line with the Department's policies.

iv. What specific efforts will the Department take under your leadership, if confirmed, to combat *international* firearms trafficking?

RESPONSE: The Department is actively involved in the administration of President Trump's Homeland Security Task Forces, which are focused on combatting criminal activity by transnational criminal organizations, including those that traffic and smuggle firearms internationally to or through the United States.

v. How do the Department of Justice, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosive, "disrupt" such networks?

RESPONSE: Through partnerships with international, federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies, and with increased focus on federal prosecution by USAOs, DOJ, including ATF, will use all investigative tools available to advance criminal investigations that identify and prosecute perpetrators. These tools include, but are not limited to, forensic analysis, firearms tracing, confidential sources, undercover agents and officers, search warrants, subpoenas and other legal process, and physical and electronic surveillance in compliance with requisite statutes and court orders.

1. Do you believe law enforcement agencies should be required to comprehensively trace all crime guns?

   RESPONSE: Where feasible and appropriate, the Department of Justice and ATF will assist state and local law enforcement partners to acquire technology and programs that can assist in firearms tracing and forensic analysis, including ballistics tools.

2. Do you believe law enforcement agencies should be required to submit ballistics to the National Integrated Ballistic Information Network (NIBIN)?

   RESPONSE: Please see the response to the previous question.

vi. ATF data indicates that the two most common trafficking channels involve unlicensed dealers and straw purchasers.

1. Do unlicensed dealers typically acquire or otherwise obtain their firearms from licensed dealers? If not, please describe where unlicensed dealers acquire or otherwise obtain their supplies of firearms.

   RESPONSE: Common sources of trafficked firearms include those stolen from lawful owners, those purchased with criminal intent by straw purchasers, and other crime guns used and distributed by criminal networks.

2. Do straw purchasers typically acquire or otherwise obtain their firearms from licensed dealers? If not, please describe where straw purchasers acquire or otherwise obtain their supplies of firearms.

   RESPONSE: Please see previous answer.

vii. Do gun traffickers typically acquire or otherwise obtain their firearms from licensed dealers? If not, please describe where gun traffickers acquire or otherwise obtain their supplies of firearms.

RESPONSE: Common sources of trafficked firearms include those stolen from lawful owners, those purchased with criminal intent by straw purchasers, and other crime guns used and distributed by criminal networks.

viii. Do you believe the commercial firearms market, including licensed manufacturers, importers, and dealers, has a responsibility to ensure that guns do not end up trafficked by unlicensed dealers, straw purchasers, and gun traffickers?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice and ATF are committed to protecting our communities from violent crime and the proliferation of illegal firearms, while ensuring that Americans' Second Amendment rights are protected.

1. If so, please describe the steps the legal commercial firearms market should take to prevent firearms trafficking.

   RESPONSE: The Department of Justice and ATF are committed to protecting our communities from violent crime and the proliferation of illegal firearms, while ensuring that Americans' Second Amendment rights are protected. ATF is prepared to work with lawful firearms dealers to combat illicit firearms trafficking.

2. If confirmed, what will be the Department's (including ATF's) role in ensuring that the legal commercial firearms market is meeting this responsibility? If not, why not?

   RESPONSE: Please see the previous answer.

55. For each question (1-54) and related subquestion, provide the name and title of the person who drafted the original draft of the response, and the name(s) and title(s) of any person(s) who reviewed and edited the original draft of the response.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 51.

Questions for the Record from Senator Alex Padilla
Senate Judiciary Committee
"Nomination of the Acting Attorney General Todd Wallace Blanche to serve as Attorney General of the United States"

July 20, 2026

1. You have confirmed that DOJ is moving forward with plans to consolidate OVW, OJP, and COPS—despite concerns expressed by various Members of Congress.

    a. **What efforts are being made to ensure that the experts within each component can continue working on the issues they have specialized experience in?**

    RESPONSE: Each component will remain separate and distinct within the new grants entity.

    b. **Which, if any, grant programs within each component will be eliminated as a result of the consolidation?**

    RESPONSE: None.

    c. **Which, if any, grant programs will receive fewer resources because of the consolidation?**

    RESPONSE: None.

    d. **Will you commit to providing this Committee a list of every grant program that will be eliminated, merged, or reduced under the planned consolidation?**

    RESPONSE: Please see subparts (b) and (c).

    e. **Has DOJ produced any research, memoranda, or analyses assessing how consolidation will impact domestic violence organizations, sexual assault prevention organizations, or those they serve? If any exist, will you commit to providing those resources to the Committee?**

    RESPONSE: Leadership of each component have worked regularly to ensure the Department is finding and maximizing administrative efficiencies as part of the consolidation process. OVW will remain a separate and distinct entity within the new consolidated component.

    f. **How many full-time employees currently work at OVW, OJP, and COPS respectively? Has the Department analyzed how many full-time positions will continue to exist following consolidation? If so, please provide those estimates.**

RESPONSE: There are currently 92 employees at OVW, 654 at OJP, and 58 at COPS. The Department has not analyzed how FTEs will change after the consolidation.

g. Have any grant program specialists received RIF notices, reassignment directives, or other equivalent notices in relation to the planned consolidation?

RESPONSE: Not to my knowledge.

2. As discussed during your confirmation hearing, OVW has been substantially delayed in issuing FY25 grant awards and releasing funding applications for FY26 grants. OVW representatives have informed my office that grants are undergoing additional review to ensure compliance with President Trump's Executive Order 14332.

a. What criteria is DOJ using to assess compliance with the Executive Order?

RESPONSE: The Department is reviewing consistent with Section 4 of the Executive Order.

b. Who at DOJ is determining compliance with the Executive Order? Are they career DOJ employees or political appointees?

RESPONSE: Both political appointees and career employees are complying with the Executive Order.

c. Are organizations that provide services to groups or causes disfavored by the President at increased risk of having their applications denied?

RESPONSE: See the response to Question 2(a).

d. Are there any OVW grant programs for which DOJ does not plan to release FY26 notices of funding opportunities? If so, please list the programs and explain the factual and legal justification for not posting notices of funding opportunities.

RESPONSE: No.

e. Given the ongoing delay in releasing FY26 notices of funding opportunities, what steps is OVW taking to ensure that awards will be issued by October 1, 2026?

RESPONSE: OVW is working diligently every day and hopes to have them posted by October 1, 2026.

f. If by FY27 you have consolidated OVW, OJP, and COPS, how (if at all) will consolidation impact the timeline for notices of funding opportunities and the distribution of grant money?

RESPONSE: The Department does not anticipate a meaningful impact on the distribution of funds resulting from the consolidation.

g. What steps is DOJ taking to avoid similar delays in the future?

RESPONSE: Department and component leadership are working judiciously every day to work through the backlog. We continue to evaluate where efficiencies can be gained.

h. Will you commit to working with my office to resolve funding delays to OVW grantees in California that have resulted in a reduction in staff and services?

RESPONSE: I am not aware of delays to specific grantees who have already been awarded funds. If there are specific grantees who have been awarded money, but who are not receiving the money consistent with an award, I am happy to look into it.

3. Gun violence remains a critical issue in the United States, with gun deaths increasing by 15% from 2015 to 2024. Firearms also remain the leading cause of death for children. As you know, DOJ plays a key role in enforcing federal gun laws and reducing firearm-related violence.

a. What specific action would you take as Attorney General to address the epidemic of gun violence in the United States, including illegal gun trafficking?

RESPONSE: As Attorney General, I would commit to enforcing the law against illegal gun traffickers. Indeed, since the beginning of this administration, ATF has seized more than 44,000 illegal firearms.

b. **Do you support federal funding for community-based violence intervention programs, and how would you measure their effectiveness?**

RESPONSE: I have not had occasion to consider this issue and welcome further engagement through the Office of Legislative Affairs if confirmed.

c. Many of ATF's proposed rules have been framed as initiatives to manage regulatory burden. Does this come at the expense of public safety?

RESPONSE: No. ATF's proposed rules are grounded in clear statutory authority and focused on reducing burden while protecting American communities from violent crime driven by explosives, arson, and the illegal use of firearms.

d. Do you agree that safe storage reduces the likelihood that a weapon will be used to cause harm?

RESPONSE: Yes, safe storage can prevent harm.

e. Should Federal Firearms Licensees (FFLs) be required to provide safe storage resources to prospective firearm buyers and transferees?

RESPONSE: I defer to Congress on whether FFLs should be statutorily required to provide additional resources to prospective customers.

f. Do you believe FFLs that have a documented history of selling weapons that are frequently used to commit violent crimes should be barred from obtaining government contracts?

RESPONSE: I defer to Congress on whether and at what point FFLs should be barred from obtaining government contracts.

g. Do you support ATF's Demand 2 program?

RESPONSE: I support ATF administering its various reporting programs consistent with its statutory authority.

h. If confirmed, will you commit to publishing data collected from the Demand 2 program?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 3(g).

4. Last year, the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department established a special Second Amendment Section (SAS)—representing a shift in civil rights enforcement priorities within the Administration.

a. How many attorneys have been reassigned into SAS, and from which sections?

RESPONSE: Zero.

b. Has the establishment of SAS diverted resources away from civil rights investigations involving minority communities?

RESPONSE: No.

c. Of all the civil rights cases DOJ has taken up during your tenure, how many have been SAS cases?

RESPONSE: Eight.

d. **Has DOJ abruptly closed any pending cases to accommodate the influx of SAS cases?**

RESPONSE: No.

5. Harmeet Dhillon has described the Civil Rights Division as the President's "shock troops" and stated that her goal was to move it in the "opposite direction" from its historic mission of enforcing civil rights protections.

a. Do you agree that the Civil Rights Division functions, or should function, as DOJ's or President Trump's "shock troops?

RESPONSE: The mandate of the Civil Rights Division is to protect the civil and constitutional rights of all Americans. To accomplish this mandate, the talented attorneys in the Civil Rights Division vigorously enforce federal anti-discrimination laws and civil rights laws. Whether I serve as Deputy Attorney General or Attorney General, the Department will enforce the civil rights laws in accordance with the relevant facts and law to protect the civil rights of all Americans. As with all matters, any decisions regarding whether to pursue a case under any applicable laws will be based on a thorough analysis of the facts and the governing law.

b. Will you commit that the Division will enforce Title VI, Title VII, the Voting Rights Act, the ADA, the Fair Housing Act, and any other pertinent federal civil rights law on behalf of all protected groups, and that it will not deprioritize any protected class on the basis of the current administration's political preferences?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 5(a).

c. During your tenure as Deputy and Acting Attorney General, how many times has the Civil Rights Division challenged a program or policy on the grounds that it unlawfully discriminates against, burdens, or harms a racial, ethnic, or religious minority under a federal civil rights statute? When possible, identify the target of such investigations or litigation, the violation in question, and the date the matter was opened.

RESPONSE: The Civil Rights Division is committed to enforcing federal anti-discrimination laws and civil rights laws for all Americans. The past few weeks have been reflective of the Division's practice while I have served as Deputy Attorney General and Acting Attorney General. For example, on July 16, the Division oversaw the sentencing of a man to nine years' imprisonment for a racially motivated shooting and charged another with an arson attack against a Philadelphia-based Islamic Center. For more specific data, I would refer you to the Department's Office of Legislative Affairs.

d. During your tenure as Deputy and Acting Attorney General, how many times has the Civil Rights Division challenged a program or policy that was adopted to remedy or prevent discrimination against a racial, ethnic, or religious minority under a federal civil rights statute? Similarly, when possible, identify the target of such investigations or litigation, the violation in question, and the date the matter was opened.

RESPONSE: Consistent with longstanding Department policy, I cannot comment on ongoing investigations or prosecutions, including the internal deliberation related to these matters. As with all matters, any decisions regarding whether to charge cases under any applicable laws will be based on a thorough analysis of the facts and the governing law.

e. Please state, by section and per fiscal quarter, the number of career attorneys in the Civil Rights Division who resigned, retired, were reassigned, were placed on administrative leave, or were terminated during your tenure as Deputy and Acting Attorney General.

RESPONSE: It would not be appropriate for me to discuss individual personnel decisions or the deliberations surrounding them, which would necessarily be revealed in this granular data request. At a high level, I can say that 317 attorneys have left the Civil Rights Division since March 2025.

f. How many reassignments or other force reductions in the Civil Rights Division did you personally approve or review?

RESPONSE: As Deputy Attorney General, I routinely approved and reviewed recommendations regarding staffing within the Civil Rights Division. I am not aware of the exact number of personnel decisions I made since being sworn in as Deputy Attorney General, but every personnel decision made within the Civil Rights Division was approved by me.

6. Last month, President Trump announced that he directed Bill Essayli, the First Assistant U.S. Attorney for the Central District of California, to probe California's primary election results because he feared that Republican gubernatorial candidate Steve Hilton was not advancing to the general election. The President then told a rally of supporters, without any evidence, that Mr. Hilton did advance to the runoff only because he called Mr. Essayli and said "Do me a favor. Take a look."

   On the Department's website, there is a section on the history of the Office of the Attorney General, which details that in June of 1870, Congress enacted a law entitled "An Act to Establish the Department of Justice." That law placed the Attorney General as head of the new executive department, the United States Department of Justice, and gave the Attorney General direction and control of U.S. Attorneys and all other counsel employed on behalf of the United States.

a. Given that Congress explicitly gave the Attorney General direction and control of U.S. Attorneys and all other counsel employed on behalf of the United States, like Mr. Essayli—is it appropriate for the President to direct the actions of U.S. Attorneys and Department counsel?

RESPONSE: At the Department of Justice, all decisions regarding investigations and prosecutions must be made based on the facts and the law. Article II of the Constitution gives the President the Executive power, making him the head of the Executive Branch. The Department of Justice is part of the Executive Branch.

b. If confirmed, will you commit to protecting the independence of the U.S. Attorneys' Offices from the political whims of the President?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 6(a).

7. In addition to the Department's continued unlawful attempts to compel sensitive voter roll data, last month, while under your tenure as Acting Attorney General, the Department confirmed that it has also welcomed Kurt Olsen—who has repeatedly advanced unsubstantiated claims of election fraud and has sought to access election systems in Fulton County, Georgia, and in Puerto Rico. His role at the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of Florida has now positioned him to further his conspiracy theories, while working alongside Joe DiGenova, a former associate of Rudy Guiliani who worked to overturn the 2020 election.

   The actions taken to further the President's Big Lie by attempting to install loyalists like Bill Essayli and Lindsey Halligan as U.S. Attorneys are corrosive to our democracy and ignore the checks and balances established in the Appointments Clause and 28 U.S.C. Section 546, specifically the constitutional role of Congress in the appointments process.

   a. How do you view the Department's responsibility to respect Congress's constitutional role in the nominations and confirmation process?

   RESPONSE: Department personnel swear an oath to support and defend the Constitution. That includes the Appointments Clause in Article II, Section 2, Clause 2.

   b. Specifically, what steps will you take to ensure that individuals who are unable to receive Senate confirmation are not placed into alternative senior roles within the Department that bypass that process?

   RESPONSE: In keeping with the Constitutional framework of the Appointments Clause, if Congress wishes to expand the universe of inferior officer positions in the Department that require the Senate confirmation, it is free to pursue legislation toward that end.

8. The *Freedom of Access to Clinics Entrances (FACE) Act* is a critical law that protects safe access to clinics for patients seeking reproductive health services. In recent years, clinics

have experienced a significant increase in violence and threats, driven largely by targeted harassment, including a 113% increase in death threats and a 111% increase in stalking.

a. Do you agree that everyone should feel safe when visiting a reproductive health services facility?

RESPONSE: The safety of all Americans is a top priority of the Department.

b. Do you agree that reproductive healthcare workers deserve to feel safe at their place of work?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 8(a).

c. In light of the ongoing violence targeting abortion providers, what criteria will your office use to determine which incidents are investigated and prosecuted under the FACE Act?

RESPONSE: If confirmed, I will enforce the civil rights laws in accordance with the relevant facts and law to protect the civil rights of all Americans. As with all matters, any decisions regarding whether to charge cases under any applicable laws will be based on a thorough analysis of the facts and the governing law.

d. How many FACE Act prosecutions or civil actions has DOJ initiated in FY25 and FY26?

RESPONSE: The Civil Rights Division has initiated two matters under the FACE Act in those years: *United States v. Armstrong*, Case No. 0:26-cr-00025-LMP-DLM (D. Minn.), and *United States v. Party for Socialism and Liberation New Jersey, et al.*, Case No. 25-civ-16049 (D.N.J.).

e. If confirmed, will you fully enforce the FACE Act to address the rise in violence and threats that is currently happening at reproductive health services facilities?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 8(c).

9. Attacks on federal judges undermine public trust in our courts and the rule of law, while also putting the safety of our judges and their families at serious risk. The U.S. Marshals Service, which is responsible for overseeing judicial security, tracked 564 threats against lower-court judges last fiscal year, an increase from the 509 threats tracked during the previous year. Meanwhile, Justices Kagan and Barrett recently testified to Congress on the increasing threats facing justices and the need for more security funding.

a. Do you agree that protecting the physical safety and wellbeing of the federal judiciary and their families is a critical responsibility of DOJ?

RESPONSE: Yes.

b. Do you believe it is prudent for the nation's chief law enforcement officer to publicly claim DOJ is at "war" with "rogue activist judges" in light of rising threats to the federal judiciary?

RESPONSE: Federal judges, like other federal officials, are often subject to criticism for their decisions. The Department of Justice, including the United States Marshals Service, takes its obligation to protect federal judges very seriously.

c. How do you plan to ensure the physical security of all federal judges?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice has been focused on empowering federal prosecutors and law enforcement officers to investigate violent crime, including threats against federal judges. By prioritizing public safety, the Department directly supports the United States Marshals Service in protecting federal judges. If confirmed, I plan to ensure the Department takes appropriate action to protect federal judges.

d. Do you support the full funding of, and adherence to, the *Daniel Anderl Judicial Security and Privacy Act*?

RESPONSE: It is important that law enforcement agencies and other government entities have the resources to effectively prevent and address violent crime, and it is also important that statutes are followed as appropriate and in accordance with the relevant facts and law.

10. In February 2026, your Associate Deputy Attorney General, Aakash Singh, reportedly asked the leaders of all 93 U.S. Attorneys' Offices to provide "fodder" that could be used to pursue the impeachment of federal judges.

a. Did you authorize, approve, or have advance knowledge of that request or any equivalent requests?

RESPONSE: Your question refers to public reporting citing anonymous sources. The Department of Justice is committed to enforcing federal law and ensuring public safety for all Americans regardless of the actions of other branches of government. The Department of Justice will always comply with federal law and court orders.

b. Are you aware of any materials collected by U.S. Attorneys in response to that request?

RESPONSE: Your question refers to public reporting citing anonymous sources. The Department of Justice is committed to enforcing federal law and ensuring public safety for all Americans regardless of the actions of other branches of

government. The Department of Justice will always comply with federal law and court orders.

c. Will you commit to preserving any materials related to this effort?

RESPONSE: Your question refers to public reporting citing anonymous sources. The Department of Justice is committed to enforcing federal law and ensuring public safety for all Americans regardless of the actions of other branches of government. The Department of Justice will always comply with federal law and court orders.

d. Do you believe that it is appropriate to ask DOJ attorneys to investigate federal judges that have made rulings the President disagrees with?

RESPONSE: Your question refers to public reporting citing anonymous sources. The Department of Justice is committed to enforcing federal law and ensuring public safety for all Americans regardless of the actions of other branches of government. The Department of Justice will always comply with federal law and court orders.

11. Multiple ethics complaints have been filed against you in New York, including by more than 100 former federal and state judges over your actions concerning President Trump's "settlement agreement" with the IRS, prosecutions of the President's perceived enemies—such as former FBI Director James Comey—and DOJ's flawed response to the Epstein Files Transparency Act.

a. If confirmed, will you refrain from interfering in any investigation into your own ethical activity conducted by the New York State Bar or any other state bar?

RESPONSE: Yes. I would have no role in, and would not interfere with, any bar proceeding concerning me, and I would recuse from any Department matter involving such a proceeding.

b. Will you abide by any disciplinary decisions made following a state bar investigation?

RESPONSE: I will respect the lawful processes of the bar, including any determinations they reach and the rights available to me within those processes.

12. As Judge Williams explained in her July 13, 2026, ruling in *Trump v. IRS*, "[f]idelity to the rule of law can be achieved only when the DOJ is free to assess the facts and governing law of each case it reviews without the stain of political interference." Due to your history as the President's personal lawyer, there is significant concern that President Trump has had—and would continue to have—inappropriate influence on the nature of the decisions made by DOJ.

a. Do you believe that President Trump has the right to direct DOJ to prosecute specific individuals?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 6(a).

b. If President Trump asked DOJ to prosecute a specific person, but career attorneys believed there was insufficient evidence to do so, would you still pursue the case?

RESPONSE: I respectfully reject the premise of this question. If confirmed, I will always uphold my oath to support and defend the Constitution and I would follow the law.

c. **Did President Trump write, direct, or in any way influence the April 27th motion you submitted in *National Trust for Historic Preservation v. National Park Service* requesting that the injunction preventing the construction of the White House Ballroom be dissolved?**

RESPONSE: It would not be appropriate for me to comment on this pending litigation.

d. Have you recused yourself from every matter in which ethics officials have recommended recusal?

RESPONSE: Yes.

e. Have you ever declined an ethics recommendation?

RESPONSE: It is my practice to consult the Department's ethics officials and to act consistent with governing regulations and their guidance.

f. Should President Trump direct you not to recuse yourself from a case despite the appearance of a conflict of interest, what would you do?

RESPONSE: I respectfully reject the premise. I would consult the Department's ethics officials and act consistent with 18 U.S.C. § 208, 5 C.F.R. § 2635.502, and my oath to the Constitution, regardless of any such direction.

13. In February 2026, your Associate Deputy Attorney General, Aakash Singh, reportedly communicated to the leaders of all 93 U.S. Attorneys' Offices that President Trump is their "chief client." He then suggested to the attorneys that those unwilling to advance the President's directives should resign.

a. Is it your position that President Trump is the "chief client" of U.S. Attorneys and the Department of Justice?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice seeks to do justice every day on behalf of the American people. In addition, Article II of the Constitution gives the President the Executive power, making him the head of the Executive Branch. The Department of Justice is part of the Executive Branch.

b. Do you believe that U.S. Attorneys should be selected based on their loyalty to the President?

RESPONSE: All Executive Branch officials should be selected based on merit and fitness for the particular job to which they are applying.

14. As Congress considers reauthorization of Section 702, the Department of Justice is appealing portions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court's March 2026 opinion limiting the government's use of certain filtering tools. That opinion, including its discussion of compliance problems, remains classified and unavailable to the public.

a. If confirmed, will you commit to encouraging swift review of the opinion for declassification and public release to the maximum extent consistent with protecting legitimate national security interests and before Congress considers reauthorization?

RESPONSE: Yes.

15. The mission of the Antitrust Division is to vigorously enforce our nation's antitrust laws and encourage economic competition in a fair and consistent manner. The Division is currently facing serious questions concerning whether it is properly following its own procedures and making decisions free from inappropriate political influence.

a. Do you think it is appropriate for President Trump or members of the White House to publicly comment on matters pending review by the Division?

RESPONSE: Public commentary does not decide cases. DOJ approaches all antitrust matters with the goal of enforcing the law and achieving a favorable outcome for the American people that protects competition, promotes consumer choice, and contributes to economic growth. All enforcement decisions are made based on the facts, the law, and the interests of the American people.

b. If confirmed, will you commit to ensuring the Antitrust Division is able to engage in independent and robust apolitical review of mergers and acquisitions to facilitate competition, protect consumers, and promote the wellbeing of workers?

RESPONSE: Yes.

16. It has been reported that you were a passenger in one of NASA Administrator Jared Isaacman's private jets during a July 4th flyover event. You participated despite safety

objections from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) that these flyovers may endanger the public.

a. Were you informed before the event of the FAA's safety findings regarding the flyover?

RESPONSE: I was honored to be asked to participate along with NASA in a flyover on July 4, 2026 to honor our nation's 250th Anniversary. NASA and the various federal agencies were extraordinarily careful in their planning and coordination to make sure the events on July 4, 2026 were safe.

b. Did you or your office communicate with NASA, the FAA, or the White House about clearing the aircraft to participate in the flyover?

RESPONSE: I was asked to participate in the flyover to celebrate American and I readily agreed to do so. I had communications with the NASA Administrator in the days leading up to the flyover and I had no concerns about my participation in the event.

c. Do you believe DOJ officials should participate in events that a federal safety regulator has advised against?

RESPONSE: I believe that my participation in the flyover on July 4, 2026 to help our nation celebrate our 250th Anniversary was safe and I was honored to be asked to join NASA on that day.

17. DOJ oversight mechanisms have faced scrutiny for failing to address abuses effectively. For example, the PREA audit at FCI Dublin failed to detect widespread sexual abuse.

a. Has DOJ conducted any review of why the PREA audit at FCI Dublin failed to detect widespread sexual abuse?

RESPONSE: The Department and BOP take PREA compliance extremely seriously and routinely audits incidents and systemic issues at facilities. Internal reviews and oversight have been conducted to identify failures and implement corrective actions following reports of abuse to prevent future incidents. Ongoing efforts focus on accountability, improved training, and stronger prevention measures across the BOP system.

b. What changes would you make to improve DOJ's monitoring protocols and prevent abuse in facilities under DOJ's oversight?

RESPONSE: I will ensure that BOP prioritizes PREA compliance through frequent and independent audits, enhanced training for staff, and increased use of technology for monitoring high-risk facilities.

c. How will you hold auditors accountable for failing to identify abuses?

Response: Auditors and BOP personnel who fail to identify or report abuses may face appropriate disciplinary action, up to and including termination.

18. The Bureau of Prisons (BOP) Director recently issued a notice of change giving the Attorney General power to determine where federal prisoners serve their sentence—a determination typically made by the BOP Director.

    a. Under what statutory authority was designation authority moved from the BOP Director to the Attorney General?

    RESPONSE: The BOP's Change Notice issued May 6, 2026, includes citation to the statutory authority for doing so.

    b. Why did your BOP Director issue this change?

    RESPONSE: I do not have direct knowledge on why the BOP Director issued this change.

    c. Did you instruct your BOP Director to issue this change?

    RESPONSE: I did not personally request any change notice to BOP Program Statement 5100.08. Any policy or classification updates are handled through standard BOP processes by career professionals based on operational needs.

    d. What criteria will be used to determine whether an inmate should be transferred?

    RESPONSE: The BOP's Change Notice speaks for itself.

    e. Since the change, how many inmates have had their designations made or altered at the Attorney General level? Please indicate each of the facilities involved, and the stated rationale for each Attorney General-level designation change.

    RESPONSE: As Acting Attorney General, I have not personally exercised authority to designate or redesignate the place of imprisonment for any specific prisoner.

    f. Did the August 2025 transfer of convicted child sex trafficker and Epstein associate Ghislaine Maxwell to a minimum-security prison influence or inform this decision?

    RESPONSE: Not to my knowledge.

    g. Can you commit to not using this rule to place President Trump's perceived political enemies in maximum-security prisons regardless of their crimes

while placing political allies in minimum-security prisons or on house arrest?

RESPONSE: I did not personally request any change notice to BOP Program Statement 5100.08. Any policy or classification updates are handled through standard BOP processes by career professionals based on operational needs.

19. Congress should not unilaterally determine how a drug is scheduled without recommendations from the appropriate expert agencies, including the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA). Congress needs accurate, current, and evidence-based information before considering legislation to schedule fentanyl-related substances or xylazine under the Controlled Substances Act.

    a. **Will you provide Congress with timely updates on the DEA's review and consideration of recommendations from the Department of Health and Human Services regarding the scheduling of xylazine?**

    RESPONSE: The fentanyl crisis has had a devastating impact on American lives. I understand that xylazine has exacerbated the problem, since xylazine is routinely cut with fentanyl before distribution to stretch the supply of fentanyl. More troubling, I understand that the presence of xylazine in the body has rendered some emergency treatments to overdose ineffective. I am laser-focused on addressing this issue, and I look forward to working with Congress on this critically important task.

    b. **What steps will you take to ensure a science-based approach to the scheduling of controlled substances, particularly with respect to emerging synthetic drugs like fentanyl analogues?**

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 19(a).

20. On April 23, 2026, DOJ issued an order immediately reclassifying FDA-approved cannabis products and state-licensed medical marijuana from Schedule I to Schedule III under the Controlled Substances Act (CSA).

    a. **DOJ has forgone the traditional notice-and-comment period and an administrative hearing required by the CSA for rescheduling. Why was this decision made?**

    RESPONSE: The Department of Justice delivered on President Trump's promise to expand Americans' access to medical treatment options. This rescheduling action allows for research on the safety and efficacy of this substance, ultimately providing patients with better care and doctors with more reliable information.

    b. **Do you support rescheduling marijuana for adult use? Do you support reducing current penalties for possessing and selling marijuana?**

RESPONSE: If confirmed, I will give the matter careful consideration after conferring with all relevant stakeholders, including DEA personnel.

c. **The order states that Section 280e of the Internal Revenue Code will no longer apply to state medical marijuana licensees. Does that policy change apply to businesses that hold both medical and adult-use licenses?**

RESPONSE: Section 280e of the Internal Revenue Code applies to businesses engaged in trafficking in controlled substances in schedule I or II.

d. **Do you support DOJ September 2025 guidance that directed U.S. Attorneys' offices to start enforcing simple cannabis possession crimes in places like national parks? If so, please explain.**

RESPONSE: As a general matter, I think it is important to empower our U.S. Attorneys to enforce all laws as appropriate and in accordance with relevant facts and law to keep the American public safe.

21. Top intelligence experts identify domestic extremism—particularly attacks motivated by racial, ethnic, and religious hatred—as one of the most pressing threats facing the United States. The recent attack at the San Diego Islamic Center is a tragic example. Three people were killed, including two community elders and a security guard. Shortly after the attack, law enforcement recovered a manifesto calling for "an all-out race war," and attacking Muslims, Jews, and LGBTQ+ individuals.

    a. **How will you address the growing threat of domestic extremism, including attacks by white nationalists and other racially or ethnically motivated extremists, to protect the American people?**

    RESPONSE: I vehemently condemn domestic extremism and violence of all types, to include racially or ethnically motivated violence. I can commit to investigating and prosecuting violations of law, like these, that result in grievous harm to the American people.

22. In June, you stated at a news conference that you have directed every U.S. attorney's office across the country to pursue "all viable charges" related to unaccompanied children or their sponsors. Given the broad nature of this directive, we are facing the potential for a second iteration of family separation of children from their parents and other vetted sponsors. American Academy of Pediatrics considers the harms caused by family separation to be "consistent with torture." Under the first Trump Administration, the "Zero Tolerance" family separation policy led to the separation of thousands of children, including infants – many of whom remain separated from their families to this day.

    a. **Are these charges based solely on the fact that these children were previously identified as unaccompanied minors at entry?**

RESPONSE: These cases are based solely on the evidence of sponsors making false statements to immigration authorities to obtain custody of unaccompanied minors with whom they have no familial or actual relationship. The charges in these cases include conspiracy to defraud the United States, making false statements, aggravated identity theft, and encouraging and inducing (and conspiracy to do the same) the concealing, harboring, or shielding from detection aliens that have come to, entered, or remain in the United States.

b. What evidence are such charges based on? What guidance have U.S. Attorneys' offices received regarding coordination with other law enforcement agencies in these investigations and prosecutions?

RESPONSES: Investigators and prosecutors, including in the Human Rights and Special Prosecutions Section in the Criminal Division and the United States Attorney's Offices, have been instructed to follow the Principals of Federal Prosecution in the Justice Manual when evaluating admissible evidence that would support these charges.

c. What arrangements are made for children whose adult caregivers are arrested or detained?

RESPONSE: This question assumes that undocumented alien children are properly with adult caregivers when charges are levied and arrests are made. The point of these cases is that the children are not properly with these individuals. In some cases, this fraud and harboring has led to sexual assault and exploitation of children. When arrests are made, the Office of Refugee and Resettlement (ORR) and immigration authorities take all appropriate steps to ensure the safety and security of these undocumented alien children.

d. How many arrests of sponsors have taken place since you issued this directive?

RESPONSE: Since June, there have been at least eight cases filed against ten sponsors.

e. How many children have been impacted? How many have been returned to the custody of the Office of Refugee and Resettlement (ORR) at the Department of Health and Human Services?

RESPONSE: The Office of Refugee Resettlement tracks sponsors and ORR custody for undocumented alien children as part of its efforts to ensure their safety and security. Accordingly, the Department of Justice does not track these cases.

23. Following litigation by the ACLU, in which a judge enjoined the previous Trump Administration's "Zero Tolerance" policy and ordered families to be reunited, the Biden Administration entered into a settlement agreement with a class of separated families. The settlement prohibits certain future separations and provides support for separated

families. President Trump has actively challenged the agreement and revoked legal support programs designed to protect these families.

a. Have the terms of this settlement agreement been honored? If not, why not?

RESPONSE: Yes, the terms of this settlement agreement have been honored.

b. If confirmed as Attorney General, will you pledge to continue to support the reunification efforts for families that remain separated?

RESPONSE: If confirmed as Attorney General, I will continue to support processes that comply with United States immigration law.

24. As part of his mass deportation efforts, President Trump has rescinded the policy that prevented immigration enforcement in sensitive locations like churches, schools, or hospitals. Since then, we have seen increased enforcement at these locations, including churches and other religious places of worship. As you may know, churches and other religious places of worship have had a rich history in this country of providing sanctuary to anyone who needed it. Churches and other religious dwellings have practiced the principle of providing shelter and safety to those persecuted for thousands of years, a practice we have always viewed as a cornerstone of religion. In June, a coalition of over 7,000 congregations and major faith coalitions joined a lawsuit against DHS over immigration raids and the fear it has caused in their religious communities.

a. Will the Department of Justice pursue prosecutions of church members, or members of other religious dwellings, if they permit a noncitizen to seek sanctuary within their religious dwelling?

RESPONSE: As your question points out, these topics are the subject of ongoing litigation on which I cannot comment.

b. Do you believe that this policy overrides the First Amendment rights of churches and other religious institutions' belief in providing sanctuary to noncitizens?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 24(a).

25. Since taking office, President Trump has pledged to eliminate birthright citizenship by executive order. Your predecessor helped file multiple legal briefs defending the executive order against nationwide injunctions. But as you know, the Supreme Court ruled against the Administration's effort to undermine it, reaffirming that the President cannot overturn the 14th Amendment by executive order. As a response to this ruling, in your capacity as Acting Attorney General, you directed your Department to bring fraud charges in alleged cases of birth tourism, despite the fact that falsely obtaining a nonimmigrant visa solely for the purposes of giving birth in the United States is already illegal.

a. **Do you believe the Supreme Court ruling on Birthright Citizenship was correct?**

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice will adhere to the Supreme Court's decision.

b. **According to data from the Center on Immigration Studies, which as you know is not a left-wing, pro-immigration organization, there are between 20,000 to 26,000 births by women on tourist visas annually, representing less than 1% of all babies born in the United States each year. Do you believe directing DOJ prosecutorial resources to investigating less than 1% of births in the United States is a judicious use of limited resources at the Department?**

RESPONSE: Criminal fraud undermines the integrity of the United States immigration system and corrodes the value of United States citizenship. The Department of Justice will zealously protect the sanctity of United States citizenship by investigating and prosecuting those who fraudulently exploit our immigration system.

26. If confirmed, you will continue to oversee the Executive Office of Immigration Review (EOIR) which includes immigration courts and judges. There has been an unprecedent politicization of immigration courts under the second Trump administration, including the firing of at least 100 immigration judges (IJs) and policies that diminish or remove access to due process for noncitizens in immigration proceedings.

a. **Do you believe that immigration courts are most efficient when judges are able to manage their own dockets and prioritize cases that should be continued or heard more expeditiously?**

RESPONSE: I believe immigration courts are most efficient when immigration judges impartially follow the law and adjudicate cases fairly and expeditiously in accordance with the law.

27. We have received reports from former IJs of the undue influence the administration is exerting on IJs to decide cases in line with its policies.

a. **Do you believe this is appropriate, given IJs are supposed to decide cases impartially?**

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice does not exert undue influence on immigration judges. The reversal of policies of the prior Administration, which did pressure immigration judges to decide cases in certain ways, is appropriate and fully consistent with the law and EOIR's role as an impartial adjudicatory component.

b. Do you believe that immigration judges should be subject to ideologically based policies or base their decisions on fairly and impartially applying the law to the individual facts of each case?

RESPONSE: I believe immigration judges should adjudicate cases impartially and expeditiously based on the facts of each case and the applicable law.

c. Are IJs being pressured to align with the President's policies?

RESPONSE: No. Immigration judges adjudicate cases impartially and expeditiously based on the facts of each case and the applicable law.

28. On August 27, 2025, the DOD approved a DOJ request to send up 600 military lawyers (JAGs) to serve as temporary IJs. They reportedly received less training than previously required for IJs and were not required to have any prior experience with immigration law.

a. Do you think it's appropriate for military lawyers who have received little training to adjudicate complex immigration cases?

RESPONSE: The premise of the question is false. Temporary immigration judges receive the same robust training as permanent immigration judges.

b. What are the grant and denial rates for JAGs serving as temporary IJs across the country? Please provide a breakdown by immigration court, including the number of JAGs serving as temporary IJs at each court.

RESPONSE: Grant and denial rates for temporary immigration judges are commensurate and in line with the grant and denial rates of all newly-hired permanent immigration judges. It would not be appropriate to provide a specific breakdown in this context, as the release of certain information could implicate protections under the Privacy Act and confidentiality regulations for asylum applications.

29. On December 2, 2025, one of the JAGs serving as an IJ was reportedly fired less than a month into the job after seemingly granting asylum at a rate too high under this administration's standards. The Trump administration has fired almost 100 judges viewed as too liberal and eased rules allowing any attorney, regardless of their legal background, to apply to become what recent recruitment ads refer to as a "Deportation Judge".

a. Do you believe that someone applying to become a "deportation judge" can impartially decide immigration cases where someone is seeking an immigration benefit? Please explain.

RESPONSE: Yes. The individual adjudicating cases in immigration court is defined by statute, 8 U.S.C. 1101(b)(4), as an immigration judge. Regardless of whether the adjudicator is called an immigration judge or a deportation judge, the

adjudicator resolves cases impartially and expeditiously based on the facts of each case and the applicable law.

b. Are IJs and temporary IJs being told to deny more cases? Are IJs and temporary IJs reprimanded or fired because they are granting relief in too many cases?

RESPONSE: No, immigration judges and temporary immigration judges are not being told to deny more cases. The Department of Justice continually evaluates all immigration judges on factors such as conduct, impartiality/bias, adherence to the law, productivity/performance, and professionalism. The failure to meet such standards necessarily undermines the fair and orderly processing of immigration matters, and judges who fail to meet those standards, especially those who demonstrate partiality or bias, may face disciplinary action, including removal.

c. What led to the firing of the JAG in the news reporting referenced above?

RESPONSE: It would not be appropriate for me to comment on personnel matters, especially those regarding an individual who was not an employee of the Department of Justice.

d. If you are confirmed, how would you handle the hiring and firing of IJs to preserve the integrity of EOIR, reaffirm a noncitizen's right to due process, and address the erosion of public trust in the Department?

RESPONSE: EOIR has taken great steps in the past 18 months to restore its integrity, and I will ensure those efforts continue by hiring well-qualified individuals to adjudicate cases in an impartial and expeditious manner. I will also continue to review all adjudicators on factors such as conduct, impartiality/bias, adherence to the law, productivity/performance, and professionalism and will continue to take appropriate action against those who fail to meet those obligations.

30. Across the United States, 53 percent of people facing deportation in immigration court lack legal counsel. For people in immigration detention facing deportation, securing legal representation can be even more challenging. Of the more than 580,000 people who were ordered removed in immigration court from April 2025 to April 2026, 67 percent lacked legal representation. In that same timeframe, more than 840,000 children were facing deportation and over 61% of them did not have an attorney. Attorneys have a significant impact on every stage of removal proceedings, such that represented individuals are more likely to show up for their court cases and are significantly more likely to be successful in obtaining relief in immigration court.

a. As a former prosecutor and private counsel representing clients, including the President, can you please explain why it is important for individuals to have competent legal representation when appearing in court?

RESPONSE: By statute all aliens in removal proceedings have a right to counsel at no expense to the Government. Aliens who believe they have received ineffective assistance of counsel may seek remedial action in immigration proceedings on that basis subject to longstanding procedures and requirements.

b. Do you believe that noncitizens in complex immigration proceedings should be given an opportunity to seek legal representation?

RESPONSE: By statute all aliens in removal proceedings have a right to counsel at no expense to the Government. Further, by statute, all aliens in removal proceedings are entitled to at least 10 days after the service of the charging document to seek representation, and many aliens receive additional time, either through a motion for a continuance or due to the normal process for scheduling hearings.

c. If confirmed as Attorney General, will you commit to reversing your predecessor's actions of terminating the Legal Orientation and Immigration Court Help Desk Programs?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice, through EOIR, has determined through multiple analyses that the Legal Orientation Program (LOP) as previously constituted was a wasteful program that actually increased both an alien's time in detention and the overall length of immigration proceedings. Although EOIR uses the funds currently appropriated for the LOP for FY 2026, the Department and the President's budget request do not seek any funding for it in FY 2027.

31. In May, DOJ drastically sped up immigration court proceedings in what are known as "mega masters" where 100 or more people are being scheduled for master calendar hearings. Historically, master calendar hearings comprise two or three dozen people at a time. Typically, these individuals are seeing an IJ for the first time and most lack legal counsel.

a. Do you believe that master calendar hearings of more than 100 people at a time, especially without legal counsel, provide noncitizens with a meaningful opportunity to seek relief? As a former prosecutor, do you believe these conditions promote due process?

RESPONSE: Historically, the size of master calendar dockets has varied considerably, and large dockets were not uncommon. All master calendar hearings are conducted fully in accordance with the applicable law, and for aliens with specific questions or concerns, immigration judges will hear those cases individually as appropriate. All aliens who wish to seek relief and are eligible to do so are provided an opportunity to seek such relief.

b. What efforts are made by DOJ and EOIR to ensure that people receive timely notice for such hearings? How many in absentia orders of removal have been issued since the start of these "mega master" hearings?

RESPONSE: Hearing notices are served in accordance with well-established law and procedures. EOIR's statistics regarding in absentia removal orders are available at https://www.justice.gov/eoir/media/1344881/dl?inline.

32. It was recently reported that the administration plans to intensify its push to denaturalize citizens, aiming for 250 cases by the end of the fiscal year.

    a. **What are the factors that are considered by DOJ to initiate denaturalization proceedings? If you are confirmed, how will you ensure these are properly investigated in such a short period of time?**

    RESPONSE: The criteria of relevant civil and criminal denaturalization statutes will be considered in initiating denaturalization proceedings. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1451, the U.S. government may seek to revoke citizenship if it was illegally procured, obtained through concealment of a material fact, or by willful misrepresentation. The statute also provides for revocation if a naturalized citizen becomes affiliated with certain organizations within five years of naturalization, which would have precluded citizenship at the time of naturalization. Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1425, it is a federal crime to knowingly procure naturalization in violation of law. The Department will pursue denaturalization proceedings in all cases permitted by law and supported by the evidence. The Department will ensure proper investigation and initiation of proceedings working closely with the Department of Homeland Security and the U.S. Attorneys' Offices.

    b. **What due process procedures are in place (or will you commit to) to ensure that people have an opportunity to respond?**

    RESPONSE: Individuals facing a criminal denaturalization charge or civil denaturalization proceeding are afforded the same constitutional protections as any other individual in criminal or civil proceedings. Additionally, in civil denaturalization cases, individuals are provided notice prior to filing of the complaint. In advance of filing a complaint, and absent extenuating circumstances, the Department attempts to engage in pre-filing settlement discussions with the putative defendant and/or his or her attorney. Accordingly, in advance of filing the complaint, a Civil Justice Reform (CJR) letter provides notice and outreach to the putative defendant. The Department commits to pursue denaturalization proceedings in the manner permitted by law.

33. As you know, DOJ has long possessed the authority to pursue denaturalization in cases involving fraud or other serious legal violations. Historically, however, that authority has been exercised very rarely and reserved for extreme circumstances because revoking citizenship is one of the most consequential actions the federal government can take. Since the start of the second Trump Administration, the Department has shown an interest in the expansion of denaturalization efforts, raising concerns among civil rights advocates about whether this authority could be used more broadly than Congress intended.

a. Do you believe denaturalization should remain limited to cases involving clear evidence of fraud or other legally recognized grounds under existing law?

RESPONSE: The Department will continue to prioritize and maximally pursue denaturalization proceedings in all cases permitted by law and supported by the evidence.

b. Will you commit that DOJ will not use denaturalization as a tool to advance broader immigration enforcement objectives?

RESPONSE: I commit to utilize the civil and criminal denaturalization statutes as permitted by law and policy to protect the integrity of American citizenship. The Department of Justice will continue to protect the integrity of the naturalization process and strip citizenship from people who conceal crimes or defraud the American people during the immigration process.

c. What safeguards will you put in place to ensure denaturalization decisions are based solely on the facts and the law, rather than political priorities?

RESPONSE: Denaturalization decisions are made by district court judges. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1451, the U.S. government may seek to revoke citizenship if it was illegally procured, obtained through concealment of a material fact, or by willful misrepresentation. The statute also provides for revocation if a naturalized citizen becomes affiliated with certain organizations within five years of naturalization, which would have precluded citizenship at the time of naturalization. Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1425, it is a federal crime to knowingly procure naturalization in violation of law, and decisions in criminal denaturalization cases are made by a jury unless the defendant pleads guilty or waives his right to a trial (with the consent of the court and the prosecutor). I commit to utilize the civil and criminal denaturalization statutes as permitted by law and policy to protect the integrity of American citizenship.

d. How will you ensure that naturalized U.S. citizens receive the same constitutional protections and due process as every other American citizen?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice will utilize the civil and criminal denaturalization statutes as permitted by law and policy, and consistent with all safeguards available in any affirmative civil case or criminal prosecution.

e. Will you commit to notifying Congress if DOJ adopts new policies that expand denaturalization priorities?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice continues to prioritize and maximally pursue denaturalization proceedings in all cases permitted by law and supported by the evidence. To guide enforcement efforts, the Civil Division has identified certain categories of cases that should be prioritized for civil denaturalization.

The Division's list is not exhaustive, and the Department of Justice retains discretion to pursue denaturalization in other cases where it deems enforcement appropriate.

f. Will you make public any guidance governing how DOJ selects denaturalization cases, ensuring it protects ongoing investigations?

RESPONSE: The Department's guidance regarding civil denaturalization cases is already public at https://www.justice.gov/civil/media/1404046/dl and in section 4-7.200 of the Justice Manual. The Department's guidance for certain criminal denaturalization cases is also already public in sections 4-7.200, 9-142.000, and 9-2.139(2) of the Justice Manual. The Department will prioritize and maximally pursue denaturalization proceedings in all cases permitted by law and supported by the evidence.

34. On April 14, 2025, while discussing CECOT transfers and imprisonment with President Bukele of El Salvador in the Oval Office, President Trump said, "homegrowns are next." President Trump later confirmed that "homegrowns" meant U.S. citizens, adding that U.S. Citizens are not "a special category of person" and that he was "all for it."

a. Do you believe that U.S. citizens can be transferred to other countries outside of existing extradition processes?

RESPONSE: Generally, the extradition process is the most appropriate method of transferring U.S. citizens to other countries. I am unaware of any current efforts to transfer U.S. citizens to other countries by other means.

b. Will you commit that, if confirmed, DOJ will not authorize, direct, fund, facilitate, or provide legal justification for the detention of any U.S. citizen in a foreign facility when the nation in question has not charged the citizen with any offense within its jurisdiction?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 34(a).

c. Will you commit that DOJ, under your leadership, will not issue or endorse any legal opinion concluding that the President may transfer U.S. citizens, convicted or accused solely of U.S. offenses, to a foreign prison outside of existing extradition processes?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 34(a).

35. President Trump indicated he directed the Attorney General to study the legality of transferring Americans to foreign nations and detaining them in foreign prisons. In remarks to journalists, President Trump stated "we're studying the laws right now. Pam [Bondi] is studying. If we can do that, it's good."

a. Has DOJ issued any findings of this study? Is this study still ongoing?

RESPONSE: I am unaware of any study on this subject conducted by former Attorney General Bondi. Any internal deliberative discussions about this subject would be privileged.

b. Has President Trump directed you to identify a mechanism to imprison U.S. citizens abroad?

RESPONSE: It is not appropriate for me to discuss any communications I may or may not have had with President Trump about any subject.

c. If asked by President Trump to identify a mechanism outside of current or established legal processes to imprison U.S. citizens abroad, or create a plan to do so, what will you tell him?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 35(b).

d. Will you commit that DOJ will not invoke, structure, label, or defend any transfer of a U.S. citizen to foreign custody as an "extradition" or "prisoner transfer" where no foreign state has charged that citizen with an offense within its jurisdiction in compliance with requirements set out in 18 U.S.C. §3181 or 18 U.S.C. §§4100-4115, respectively?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice conducts all extraditions and prisoner transfers in accordance with applicable law.

36. Across the country, nonprofit organizations provide legal representation, humanitarian assistance, and social services to noncitizens under authorities established by federal law. The Trump Administration has investigated or threatened organizations engaged in lawful advocacy, prompting concerns that prosecutorial authority could curtail constitutionally protected activity or discourage organizations from providing legal assistance and other services to vulnerable populations.

a. Do you agree that organizations providing legal services and humanitarian assistance should not face investigation solely because they represent or assist noncitizens?

RESPONSE: Facts, evidence, and applicable law determine whether the Department of Justice investigates anyone, and the Department of Justice does not investigate anyone based solely on lawful activity.

b. What current standards does DOJ apply before opening an investigation into a nonprofit engaged in immigration-related advocacy or legal representation?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 36(a).

c. How will you distinguish between legitimate criminal conduct and legal advocacy or humanitarian assistance?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 36(a).

d. Will you commit that DOJ will not initiate investigations based on an organization's political viewpoints or policy positions?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice does not initiate an investigation into anyone based on their political viewpoint or policy positions.

37. The Department of Justice has an obligation to enforce federal criminal law while safeguarding Americans' constitutional rights to free speech and peaceful assembly. Reporting indicates, however, that this Administration has arrested hundreds of individuals protesting or observing immigration enforcement actions—despite the fact that contemporaneous video footage did not support many of those arrests or substantiate charges.

a. What criteria are law enforcement officials and prosecutors using to distinguish between constitutionally protected protest and observation activity and conduct that legitimately warrants federal criminal prosecution?

RESPONSE: I respectfully disagree with the premise of Question 37, as the Department vigorously defends the lawful basis for its enforcement actions.

b. Has DOJ conducted any internal review of protest or observation-related arrests and prosecutions to ensure law enforcement actions are not unlawfully chilling First Amendment activities? If so, what were the main findings of that review process?

RESPONSE: Due to privileges and consistent with longstanding practices, I am unable to share information about internal deliberations. *See The Nomination of Elena Kagan to Be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States,* S. Hrg. 111-1044 (2010), at 257). All Department prosecutions must be sufficiently predicated with specific and articulable facts tending to show that a possible crime has been or will be committed. If confirmed, I will continue to uphold the laws of the United States.

c. Will you commit that arrest and prosecution decisions involving protesters and observers will be based solely on the facts and applicable law?

RESPONSE: All arrest and prosecution decisions at the Department are based on facts and applicable law.

d. Will you provide this Committee a copy of all relevant Department policies concerning criminal enforcement actions involving protestors and observers?

RESPONSE: I would refer you to the Department's Office of Legislative Affairs, which can work with you to provide an answer to this question.

38. As you know, many states and local governments have adopted policies limiting their participation in federal immigration enforcement, citing public safety, community trust, and resource allocation. This is because the federal government maintains primary and sole responsibility for enforcing federal immigration law. The Department of Justice plays a significant role in defining the legal boundaries between federal authority and state and local governments.

    a. Do you believe states and local governments have the constitutional authority to determine how their own law enforcement resources are allocated, consistent with the Tenth Amendment?

    RESPONSE: Based on its enumerated constitutional and sovereign powers, the federal government has an inherent obligation and broad authority to establish immigration laws. State and local governments cannot obstruct or take discriminatory action against the execution of those laws.

    b. What factors would DOJ consider before starting litigation against a state or local government over its immigration-related policies?

    RESPONSE: Among other factors, the Department considers whether a state or local law, policy, or practice discriminates or attempts to regulate the federal government and whether it is preempted by federal law.

    c. If confirmed, will you review ongoing litigation involving so-called sanctuary jurisdictions to ensure DOJ's legal positions are consistent with constitutional principles and Supreme Court precedent?

    RESPONSE: All Department of Justice legal positions are consistent with the Constitution and applicable Supreme Court precedent.

    d. Will you commit to providing Congress with regular updates regarding DOJ's litigation strategy involving state and local immigration enforcement disputes?

    RESPONSE: Subject to the Constitution and applicable law, the Department of Justice cooperates with all reasonable Congressional requests, but its litigation strategies are subject to multiple, longstanding privileges that preclude disclosure.

39. I understand that OJP has sent communications to California state and local entities implying that California state law violates 8 U.S.C. § 1373 that is inconsistent with a judgment that the State of California obtained against DOJ during the first Trump Administration that declared the State's laws comply with Section 1373.

a. Will OJP be rescinding those communications and do you commit to following any and all judgments obtained against DOJ by the State of California on this matter?

Response: T he Department will comply with all court orders.

40. It is concerning that you stood in defense of Emil Bove's statements to ignore court orders in *J.G.G. v. Trump,* the Alien Enemies Act case, where flights took off despite the issuance of an injunction.

a. Will you commit to following court orders that are adverse to the policy priorities of this administration?

RESPONSE: I will always advise a client, including agencies of the Executive Branch, to comply with court orders applicable to them.

b. Will you commit to upholding a recent court decision from the Northern District of California blocking ICE from making arrests at immigration courts nationwide by restoring 2023 guidelines that restrict civil arrests in EOIR courtrooms, "including all spaces where immigration-court business takes place"?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice complies with all federal court orders.

41. As we discussed during your hearing, the January 6, 2021 attack on the U.S. Capitol was a clear assault on democracy, yet President Trump continues to try to rewrite this history, from pardoning the January 6-ers to trying to financially reward them with a $1.8 billion slush fund of taxpayer money.

a. Since January 2025, how many Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) claims have been filed or submitted by individuals who were convicted of crimes related to the January 6 attack on the Capitol, including convictions that were later pardoned by President Trump?

RESPONSE: Under the FTCA, an administrative claim is presented in the first instance to the federal agency alleged to be responsible for the harm, 28 U.S. Code § 2675. Such claims are not public filings; and the Department does not publish an aggregate count of claims presented to it. FTCA complaints filed in district court are matters of public record.

b. Of those FTCA claims identified in subsection (a), how many have been filed or submitted by individuals convicted of assaulting law enforcement officers during the January 6 attack on the Capitol?

RESPONSE: Under the FTCA, an administrative claim is presented in the first instance to the federal agency alleged to be responsible for the harm, 28 U.S. Code § 2675. Such claims are not public filings; and the Department does not publish an

aggregate count of claims presented to it. FTCA complaints filed in district court are matters of public record.

c. Of those FTCA claims identified in subsection (a), how many claims has DOJ denied, how many have been settled, and how many have been withdrawn by the claimant? For those claims that DOJ has settled, how much money did DOJ pay out for each settlement?

RESPONSE: Under the FTCA, an administrative claim is presented in the first instance to the federal agency alleged to be responsible for the harm, 28 U.S. Code § 2675. Such claims are not public filings; and the Department does not publish an aggregate count of claims presented to it. FTCA complaints filed in district court are matters of public record.

d. Of those FTCA claims identified in subsection (a), how many claims have been filed against the United States in federal court? Of those claims in federal court, how many have been denied or dismissed, how many have been approved, settled or paid out, and how many have been withdrawn by the claimant?

RESPONSE: Under the FTCA, an administrative claim is presented in the first instance to the federal agency alleged to be responsible for the harm, 28 U.S. Code § 2675. Such claims are not public filings; and the Department does not publish an aggregate count of claims presented to it. FTCA complaints filed in district court are matters of public record.

e. Of those FTCA claims identified in subsection (a), for how many has the statute of limitations run?

RESPONSE: Under the FTCA, an administrative claim is presented in the first instance to the federal agency alleged to be responsible for the harm, 28 U.S. Code § 2675. Such claims are not public filings; and the Department does not publish an aggregate count of claims presented to it. FTCA complaints filed in district court are matters of public record.

f. As a general matter, for claims or lawsuits filed against the United States by individuals now seeking compensation related to their participation or role in the January 6 attack on the Capitol, do you commit that DOJ will vigorously defend against those claims?

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, the Department always defends the United States vigorously, and it will evaluate any claim on the facts and the law. A claimant's politics will neither advance a claim nor defeat one.

g. Does DOJ take into account whether the President has issued a pardon to a plaintiff when determining how vigorously to defend against the claim?

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, the Department always defends the United States vigorously, and it will evaluate any claim on the facts and the law. A claimant's politics will neither advance a claim nor defeat one.

h. Has anyone within DOJ participated in discussions with individuals seeking compensation related to their participation or role in the January 6 attack on the Capitol? If yes, provide the names of those DOJ officials who have participated in these discussions.

RESPONSE: Several January 6 defendants have filed Federal Tort Claims Act lawsuits against the government. To the extent counsel of record has communicated with individuals regarding potential compensation through a negotiated settlement, the identities of those attorneys is a matter of public record. I am not otherwise aware of any similar discussions.

i. Along with several of my colleagues on this Committee, I sent letters to the Department on May 2, 2025, September 30, 2025, January 15, 2026, and July 1, 2026 seeking additional information about the status of payments to January 6 rioters, and have yet to receive a response. Will you commit to reading and responding to these letters?

RESPONSE: I will read these letters and respond, as appropriate, in accordance with established Department procedures.

42. During your tenure as Deputy and Acting Attorney General, DOJ has increased its efforts to restrict noncitizens' access to higher education, including by targeting state laws that provide noncitizens with in-state tuition rates at institutions of higher education. For example, in Texas, DOJ worked with Ken Paxton to swiftly overturn a Texas law providing noncitizen students with in-state tuition— despite the fact that efforts to repeal the law had repeatedly failed in the state legislature, and even though noncitizens directly impacted by the law were given no opportunity to weigh in (as amicus or intervenor).

a. Members of DOJ have indicated publicly that they coordinated with the Texas State Attorney General in advance of filing a federal lawsuit to challenge the state's higher-education tuition statute. What types of communication and coordination occurred before DOJ filed its lawsuit with the State of Texas regarding the tuition equity law and policies? Did those communications take place over email? In person? By phone? Who initiated them?

RESPONSE: Consistent with longstanding Department policy, I cannot comment on internal deliberation related to these matters. As with all matters, any decisions regarding whether to pursue cases under any applicable laws will be based on a thorough analysis of the facts and the governing law.

b. Please provide a detailed explanation and timeline of DOJ's coordination and communications with the Texas State Attorney General, including (but not

limited to) the initial contact between DOJ and the Texas State Attorney General, the parties' joint motion for entry of consent judgment, and DOJ's press release praising the "swift" resolution of the case.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 42(a).

c. **Did DOJ have any contact with the District Court apart from the publicly available filings?**

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 42(a).

d. How does this lawsuit comply with Article III's case or controversy requirement?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 42(a).

e. **Do you agree that courts should not hear cases where there is no controversy between the parties, or any meaningful ability for affected persons to weigh in?**

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 42(a).

f. Can you point to other cases in which a state worked closely with the federal government in an effort to overturn a state law?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 42(a).

g. With which other states is your department currently coordinating in this way, and on which issues?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 42(a).

h. Can you provide examples of materially analogous cases that were resolved within a matter of a few hours? Over the last four administrations, in how many cases have the parties filed a joint motion for entry of consent judgment the same day as DOJ filed its complaint? During the same time period, in how many cases has a judge declared a law unconstitutional the same day DOJ filed its complaint in a non-emergency posture?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 42(a).

Senator Peter Welch
Senate Judiciary Committee
Written Questions for Todd Blanche
Hearing on "Nominations"
July 15, 2026

1. After you were confirmed as Deputy Attorney General, did you receive an ethics briefing within 15 days of your confirmation?

   RESPONSE: Yes, I received an ethics briefing in connection with entering on duty.

   a. On what date did that ethics briefing take place?

      RESPONSE: Near the start of my service.

   b. Who provided that ethics briefing?

      RESPONSE: The relevant DOJ ethic officials.

   c. Were you provided any documentation during that ethics briefing? If so, what documentation was provided?

      RESPONSE: Yes, I was provided the standard materials.

   d. Were you advised during that ethics briefing to not participate in any matters involving the President in his personal capacity? If not, please describe the ethics information you received regarding matters involving the President in his personal capacity.

      RESPONSE: I received ethics guidance concerning my recusal obligations arising from my prior representation of the President, and I have been recused from the matters in which I represented him—the New York, District of Columbia, and Southern District of Florida cases.

2. Will you provide a copy of any documentation you received during your initial ethics briefing to this Committee prior to a vote on your confirmation?

   RESPONSE: Onboarding ethics materials and any related records are handled by the Department's ethics officials. It would not be appropriate for me to commit to producing those records in this setting.

3. Who currently serves as your primary ethics advisor?

   RESPONSE: I receive ethics guidance from the Department's career ethics officials in the Departmental Ethics Office.

4. 5 CFR § 2635.502(a) provides guidance for when Department of Justice officials should recuse themselves due to personal or business relationships. Have you fully complied with this provision since you were sworn in as Deputy Attorney General?

   RESPONSE: Yes. I have addressed potential conflicts of interest consistent with 5 C.F.R. § 2635.502 and the guidance of the Department's ethics officials.

5. On May 19, 2026, you signed a document related to the settlement agreement in *Trump v. IRS* that purported to provide the President, his family, and his companies and affiliates immunity for any previously filed taxes. At the hearing, I showed you a copy of that document.

   a. Did you receive ethics advice prior to signing that document?

      RESPONSE: The settlement was negotiated by other Department attorneys; I was not involved in the negotiation. My execution of the document was an official act of the kind that statutes commit to the Attorney General or Deputy Attorney General.

   b. On what date did you receive that ethics advice?

      RESPONSE: See my response to Question 5(a).

   c. Who provided that ethics advice?

      RESPONSE: See my response to Question 5(a).

   d. What advice was provided?

      RESPONSE: See my response to Question 5(a).

6. While testifying, you stated the following regarding former Pardon Attorney Liz Oyer's firing: "I know that Ms. Oyer has claimed that that had anything to do with her firing. I didn't even know of that. I know nothing about Mel Gibson or that letter when I fired her. Nothing." You later stated, "It had nothing to do with why she was fired by the way. Nothing."

   a. Did Ms. Oyer's decision to recommend against the restoration of Mel Gibson's gun rights play any role in the decision to terminate her employment with the Department?

      RESPONSE: No.

   b. Do you stand by your statements under oath?

      RESPONSE: Yes.

7. During your hearing, I asked you about your decision to send armed U.S. Marshals to deliver a letter to Ms. Oyer prior to her testimony to members of Congress in April 2025. You stated that this was "not true." What part of this was "not true?"

   RESPONSE: The Department did not "send armed U.S. Marshals" to Ms. Oyer's home. Instead, the Department's Justice Management Division (JMD) utilized an Inspector to attempt to deliver a letter to Ms. Oyer. Once JMD confirmed that Ms. Oyer received the letter by email, JMD called back the Inspector before he arrived at Ms. Oyer's home. I had no involvement in this process.

8. On September 20, 2025, President Trump posted on his Truth Social account, "Pam: I have reviewed over 30 statements and posts saying that, essentially, 'same old story as last time, all talk, no action. Nothing is being done. What about Comey, Adam 'Shifty' Schiff, Leticia??? They're all guilty as hell, but nothing is going to be done.' . . . We can't delay any longer, it's killing our reputation and credibility. They impeached me twice, and indicted me (5 times!), OVER NOTHING. JUSTICE MUST BE SERVED, NOW!!! President DJT[.]"

   a. When asked by an NBC reporter what you would do with a message like that if you were confirmed, you said, "I'd do exactly what we did with the message last time." What did you do with the above statement?

      RESPONSE: We reviewed the statement and continued to manage the operations of the Department of Justice consistent with applicable federal law.

   b. In that same interview, you said that "those types of messages do not faze me. As a matter of fact, I want a president that does that." Please explain what you meant by that statement.

      RESPONSE: Article II of the Constitution gives the President the Executive power, making him the head of the Executive branch. The Department of Justice is part of the Executive branch. I appreciate candid communications from the President.

9. Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) records obtained by American Oversight show that you convened weekly meetings of the Weaponization Working Group in your conference room. Please summarize the work completed to date by the Weaponization Working Group.

   RESPONSE: In a memorandum dated February 5, 2025, titled "Restoring the Integrity and Credibility of the Department of Justice," then Attorney General Pam Bondi established a Weaponization Working Group to identify instances in the prior administration where a department's conduct appeared to have been designed to achieve political objectives or other improper aims rather than pursuing justice or legitimate governmental objectives. The memorandum commissioned a review of events and

matters such as the retaliatory targeting of legitimate whistleblowers, a 2023 memorandum in which the Federal Bureau of Investigation suggested that certain Catholic religious practices were affiliated with violent extremism and criminal activity, and prior DOJ guidance concerning the investigation of parents of school children who expressed sincere, good-faith concerns at local government meetings. The Weaponization Working Group was designed to identify instances of wrongful weaponization, learn from those mistakes, and ensure they are not repeated. The Working Group has assisted with reviewing multiple whistleblower complaint, contributed to the Task Force to Eradicate Anti-Christian Bias, and continues reviewing documents and drafting findings related to the other priority workstreams listed in the Bondi Memo.

a. On June 9, 2025, Neil McCabe, an attorney in the Department's Office of the Pardon Attorney and self-titled "Senior Advisor to the Weaponization Czar," created a chart assigning topics within the Weaponization Working Group to members of the Office of the Deputy Attorney General. Please summarize what work each of the following individuals was assigned and completed for their corresponding topic:

    i. Chris DeLorenz, Special Counsel and POTUS Associates *and* October 7th

    ii. Kendra Wharton, Federal Cooperation with Manhattan DA

    iii. Ed Martin, January 6th *and* Autopen

    iv. Nick Davis, FBI Catholic Memo

    v. Aakash Singh, School Board Parents

    vi. Vance Day, FACE Act

    vii. Jared Wise, Targeting of Whistleblowers

    viii. Paul Perkins, Tina Peters

    ix. Mac Warmer, Elections

    RESPONSE: Members of the Working Group reviewed and continue to review documents and draft findings related to the topics highlighted in the previously referenced Bondi Memo.

b. Are any additional reports from the Weaponization Working Group planned? If so, what are the topics of these reports?

    RESPONSE: Please see response to Question 9(a).

10. On May 18, 2026, DOJ announced that the settlement agreement in *President Donald J. Trump v. Internal Revenue Service* created an Anti-Weaponization Fund. On May 19, you signed an order that directed $1,776,000,000 to the fund from the Federal government's Judgment Fund.

    a. During your nominations hearing to become the Attorney General, you agreed with me that your responsibility under this settlement agreement was to perform due diligence and satisfy yourself that you could sign off the agreement in good faith. In your opinion, did you fulfill this responsibility with regards to the order creating the anti-weaponization fund? Please explain.

       RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

    b. Please explain why you signed that order.

       RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

    c. Your order said that "[t]he corpus of the Anti-Weaponization Fund's funding . . . is based on the projected valuation of future claimants' claims." Please explain how you determined the projected valuation of future claimants' claims and how many claimants you considered would be eligible for the fund.

       RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

    d. Your order argued that the statutory authority for awarding settlements out of the Judgment Fund arose from the payment of "final" judgments rendered against the United States, including "compromise settlements" and "imminent" claims according to 28 U.S.C. § 2414. Please list examples of "compromise settlements" or "imminent" claims that you were aware of at the time you issued your order.

       RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice. The May 18, 2026 settlement agreement speaks for itself.

    e. On June 2, 2026, at an oversight hearing of the House Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, you told Members, "We're not moving forward with the fund, period." You repeated this during your nomination hearing before our committee. If confirmed, do you commit to not

order or authorize the transfer of money from the Judgment Fund regarding this fund?

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed, no funds have been transferred, no claims have been received, and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

f. If confirmed, do you commit not to order or authorize the transfer of money from the Judgment Fund to anyone convicted of assaulting law enforcement during the assault on the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021?

RESPONSE: Every claim submitted pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act is reviewed on the merits and addressed by the Torts Branch of the Civil Division. The compromise and/or settlement of any claim is made only in the best interest of the United States.

g. If confirmed, do you commit not to order or authorize the transfer of money from the Judgment Fund to anyone convicted of seditious conspiracy related to the assault on the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021?

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed, no funds have been transferred, no claims have been received, and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

h. On June 19, 2026, when the Department of Justice submitted its notice of filing in *Floyd v. DOJ*, you, Associate Attorney General Stanley Woodward, Jr., and Treasury Secretary Bessent told the court that it would be "unnecessary" to file a sworn declaration that the Anti-Weaponization Fund will not proceed in any manner. Why is it "unnecessary?"

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice. That said, as I testified at my confirmation hearing, as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed, no funds have been transferred, no claims have been received, and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

i. You have not rescinded your order of May 19, 2026, that created the fund. Why have you not done so?

RESPONSE: The May 19, 2026 Order did not create the fund. That said, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice. That said, as I testified at my confirmation hearing, as the Department

has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed, no funds have been transferred, no claims have been received, and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

i. Will you officially rescind the order prior to the date this Committee votes on your confirmation?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice. That said, as I testified at my confirmation hearing, as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed, no funds have been transferred, no claims have been received, and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

j. During your nominations hearing to become the Attorney General, you told Senator Cornyn that the settlement agreement could be enforceable as a breach of contract. Do you stand by that testimony?

RESPONSE: Only the Attorney General of the United States can implement the Anti-weaponization fund. As I testified at my confirmation hearing, as the Department has repeatedly represented in Court, no commissioners have been appointed, no funds have been transferred, no claims have been received, and no claims have been paid. The Anti-Weaponization Fund is dead.

k. Do you believe there was adverseness between President Trump and the Internal Revenue Service in the settlement agreement? Please explain.

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

l. Your addendum to the settlement agreement in *President Donald J. Trump v. Internal Revenue Service* purported to "release, waive, acquit, and forever discharge" President Trump, his family members, the Trump Organization, and affiliated entities from claims and examinations arising from matters that were pending or could have been pending at the time of the settlement. Please identify any prior instance in which an Attorney General or Acting Attorney General exercised comparable authority involving a President.

RESPONSE: No President in American History has been the victim of government weaponization the way President Donald J. Trump was.

11. On April 14, 2026, U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia Jeanine Pirro asked the D.C. Court of Appeals to vacate the convictions of the Proud Boys and Oath Keepers

leaders who were convicted of seditious conspiracy for attacking the U.S. Capitol. Please explain the extent of your or your office's involvement with the filing of this motion.

RESPONSE: I am the Acting Attorney General and therefore charged with leading the Department of Justice. The United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia, which is within the Department of Justice, filed the subject motion to vacate.

12. After your nomination hearing to become the Deputy Attorney General, you told me in response to written questions for the record, "An employee [at the Department of Justice] should not be dismissed if they simply followed assigned duties in good faith."

    a. On March 26, 2026, you told the 2026 Conservative Political Action Conference that the Department of Justice "cleaned house" of employees who prosecuted individuals who attacked the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021. How do you reconcile this statement with your written response to me?

       RESPONSE: I do not adopt the characterization of my remarks contained in the question. My view remains what I stated to you: an employee should not be dismissed for simply following assigned duties in good faith. Personnel decisions rest with the Attorney General and component leadership; and a number of the actions referenced are the subject of pending litigation, on which it would not be appropriate for me to comment.

    b. To the best of your knowledge, have you authorized, overseen, or solicited the termination of an employee at the Department of Justice who "simply followed assigned duties in good faith?"

       RESPONSE: Consistent with the view expressed above, I do not believe an employee should be dismissed for simply following assigned duties in good faith. I will not characterize specific personnel actions, a number of which are in active litigation, and I am recused from matters connected to my prior representation of the President.

13. How many career employees have been terminated at the Department of Justice since March 5, 2025? Please provide a total number and a number for each office or division.

    RESPONSE: The Department maintains this information in its personnel records. Individualized or component-level disclosure tied to specific personnel actions implicates Privacy Act protections and the confidentiality of matters now in litigation. Approximately 935 individuals out of our nearly 107,000 employees have been terminated. This is less than 1%.

    a. How many career employees are employed at the Department of Justice as of today?

       RESPONSE: Nearly 107,000

14. On February 5, 2025, then-Attorney General Pam Bondi issued a memorandum to Department of Justice employees titled, "General Policy Regarding Zealous Advocacy on Behalf of the United States." The policy outlines that any attorney who declines to sign a brief or appear in court for "personal political views or judgments" could face discipline or termination. If confirmed, do you intend to maintain this policy? If so, please explain why.

    RESPONSE: Department attorneys are expected to zealously advocate on behalf of the United States and to advance the Department's positions in litigation. At the same time, no attorney is required to violate the law or their ethical obligations. I will maintain the expectation of zealous advocacy consistent with those limits.

15. During your nomination hearing to become the Deputy Attorney General, you told Senator Whitehouse, "Political prosecutions should never happen." Then, on April 7, 2026, at a Department of Justice press conference, you told reporters, "We have thousands of ongoing investigations and prosecutions going on in this country right now. And it is true that some of them involve men, women, and entities that the president in the past has had issues with and believe should be investigated. That is his right, and indeed, it is his duty to do that."

    a. How do you reconcile these statements?

        RESPONSE: Article II of the Constitution gives the President the Executive power, making him the head of the Executive branch. The Department of Justice is part of the Executive branch. The statements are consistent and the Department of Justice seeks to bring to justice everyone who violates our laws.

    b. Do you believe politics should play any role in the DOJ's investigative and prosecutorial decisions?

        RESPONSE: No.

    c. Does a President's personal opinion towards an individual or organization on its own provide a legitimate basis to open, reopen, expand, accelerate, or prioritize a criminal investigation?

        RESPONSE: Article II of the Constitution gives the President the Executive power, making him the head of the Executive branch. The Department of Justice is part of the Executive branch. It is the President's constitutional duty to ensure that our laws are faithfully executed. The Department of Justice handles investigations consistent with long-standing practice.

16. On April 24, 2025, President Trump issued a memorandum directing the Attorney General to investigate the potential use of online political fundraising platforms for unlawful foreign or "straw" contributions. Although the memorandum otherwise referred

generally to "online fundraising platforms," it specifically identified ActBlue, the principal fundraising platform used by Democratic candidates and organizations. It did not name a comparable Republican platform. Please describe what role you played, if any, in the development of this memorandum.

RESPONSE: I played no role in the development of this memorandum.

17. On April 21, 2026, you announced that an Alabama grand jury returned an 11-count indictment against the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC). You alleged that the organization was "doing the exact opposite of what it's told its donors it was doing – not dismantling extremism, but funding it."

    a. Please explain the basis for your allegations.

       RESPONSE: Consistent with longstanding Department policy, I cannot comment on ongoing investigations or prosecutions, including the internal deliberation related to these matters. As with all matters, any decisions regarding whether to charge cases under any applicable laws will be based on a thorough analysis of the facts and the governing law.

    b. Were you involved in any of the decision-making to investigate or charge SPLC? Please explain.

       RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 17(a).

    c. Did the President or any White House official communicate with you or your staff about investigating or prosecution SPLC? If so, describe each communication.

       RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 17(a).

    d. Before the indictment was sought, did any career prosecutor raise concerns about the sufficiency of the evidence, the legal theory supporting the charges, or whether the prosecution could reasonably be perceived as politically motivated?

       RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 17(a).

18. There has not been a leader of the Office of Professional Responsibility since Jeffrey Ragsdale was fired in March 2025. The Department's website lists the current leadership as "Counsel." If confirmed, would you appoint an individual to lead this office within 30 days of your confirmation?

    RESPONSE: The Office of Professional Responsibility performs an important function and has continued to operate under its Counsel and career staff. I recognize the importance of the Office having appropriate leadership, and I will ensure that it is appropriately led. I am not in a position to commit to a specific deadline.

19. On March 26, 2026, you sat for an interview with Matt Schlapp, Chairman of the Conservative Political Action Committee (CPAC) and the American Conservative Union, during the 2026 CPAC Convention. He asked you, "Now that justice is gone, how do we bring these big cases to the red areas of the country so normal people can sit in juries and adjudicate them?" You responded that "one of the biggest parts of our strategy going forward is making sure that we're investigating and bringing cases in the right jurisdictions."

    a. What did you mean by bringing cases in the "right jurisdictions?"

    RESPONSE: Congress's venue statutes impose various restrictions on where the Department of Justice and other litigants may file cases. Like all litigants, the Department evaluates these and other considerations in deciding where to file litigation.

    b. You also said, "it's tough because our laws require us to bring cases where the conduct occurred." Please explain why bringing cases where conduct occurs is "tough."

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 19(a).

20. On November 7, 2025, at the Federalist Society's National Lawyers Convention, you joined a "fireside chat" from Gene Hamilton, co-founder of the America First Legal Foundation.

    a. You claimed that judges who have ruled against the Trump Administration are "more political, or certainly as political, as the most liberal governor or D.A." Please explain what you meant by this statement.

    RESPONSE: As the broader context makes clear, I was discussing instances where federal district courts were reversed by the controlling federal circuit court of appeals or the United States Supreme Court and then failed to follow the higher court's decision, which resulted in additional appellate litigation. Federal judges, like other federal officials, are often subject to criticism for their decisions.

    b. You also said that "it's a war, man," against these judges. Please explain what you meant by this statement.

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 20(a).

21. On April 25, 2025, former-Attorney General Pam Bondi issued a memorandum entitled "Updated Policy Regarding Obtaining Information From, And Records Of, Members of the News Media." Among other things, it requires the Attorney General to consider "whether prosecutors have made all reasonable attempts to obtain the information from alternative sources" when authorizing a subpoena.

a. Is this memorandum still in effect?

RESPONSE: Yes.

b. Regarding the subpoenas issued to members of the New York Times on July 10, 2026, did you consider "whether prosecutors have made all reasonable attempts to obtain the information from alternative sources?"

RESPONSE: Pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e)(2)(B), I am prohibited from discussing any matters occurring before a federal grand jury.

c. What alternative efforts were made to obtain the information prior to issuing these subpoenas?

RESPONSE: Pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e)(2)(B), I am prohibited from discussing any matters occurring before a federal grand jury.

22. In January 2025, President Trump commuted the sentences of four Proud Boys leaders convicted by a jury of seditious conspiracy in connection with the January 6, 2021, attack on the United States Capitol. In April 2026, the Department of Justice asked the Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit to vacate the men's convictions and dismiss their original indictments with prejudice, offering only that the Executive Branch considered the dismissal to be "in the interests of justice" as an explanation.

a. Did you authorize or approve the Department's decision to seek vacatur of these convictions?

RESPONSE: Please see my answer to Question 11.

b. If so, why did you find it appropriate to seek vacatur?

RESPONSE: Please see my answer to Question 11. Additionally, I understand that the publicly filed motion outlines the basis for the United States' dismissal request.

c. While the Department sought dismissal for the four Proud Boys convicted at trial, it did not do so for Jeremy Bertino, who also received a commutation. Unlike the other four defendants, Bertino pleaded guilty to seditious conspiracy and cooperated in the prosecution of his fellow Proud Boys. Please explain the differential treatment his case received.

RESPONSE: The case of *United States v. Jeremy Bertino*, 22-cr-00329 (D.D.C.), was dismissed in March 2025.

23. On November 26, 2025, President Trump commuted the seven-year prison sentence of David Gentile, a private equity executive who had served twelve days following his

conviction for participating in a $1.6 billion scheme that defrauded more than 10,000 investors. The commutation also eliminated Gentile's responsibility to pay an estimated $15.5 million in restitution to his victims. Recent reporting indicates that, while incarcerated, Gentile told other inmates he had arranged payments totaling more than $2.5 million to secure his release. One reported recipient was Reverend Frank Mann. Federal prosecutors in the Eastern District of New York reportedly opened an investigation into whether improper payments facilitated the commutation. That investigation was subsequently closed after Associate Deputy Attorney General Aakash Singh, an official in your office, raised concerns about it with U.S. Attorney Joseph Nocella Jr.

a. Did you authorize, approve, or know in advance of Mr. Singh's reported intervention in the Eastern District of New York's investigation? If so, please describe your role.

RESPONSE: The Department will not confirm or deny the reporting referenced in your question or the existence of any investigation. Any such communications referenced in your question, to the extent they occurred, would be protected by an applicable privilege.

b. Please explain the basis for the Department closing this investigation.

RESPONSE: Please see the response to subsection (a) above.

c. Did you, Mr. Singh, or anyone else in your office communicate with the White House, Reverend Mann, Mr. Gentile, or their representatives concerning either the commutation or the investigation? If so, please describe those communications.

RESPONSE: Please see the response to subsection (a) above.

24. During an April 2026 interview at the National Rifle Association's (NRA) annual meeting, when asked whether you were "part of the gun industry," you answered "yes, I am," citing your wife's four decades in firearms manufacturing. Your father-in-law founded Check-Mate Industries, a federal contractor that manufactures firearm magazines, and your mother-in-law currently serves as the company's chairman and chief executive.

a. Do you believe your close familial relationship with the leadership of Check-Mate Industries creates a conflict of interest or the appearance of impropriety related to the Department's regulation of firearms?

RESPONSE: I take my ethics obligations seriously. I have no financial or business relationship with Check-Mate Industries.

b. Do you or your wife hold any direct or indirect financial interest in Check-Mate Industries or receive any income, distributions, gifts, loans, or other financial

benefits from the company or its owners? If so, please describe those interests or benefits.

RESPONSE: My financial interests are reflected in my public financial disclosure report. We hold no financial interest nor receive any benefit of any kind.

c. Have you participated in any Department decisions concerning firearm magazine regulations, federal contracts, or other matters that could financially benefit Check-Mate?

RESPONSE: I have not participated in any particular matter in which Check-Mate is a party.

d. On April 8, 2025, then-Attorney General Pam Bondi established the Department's Second Amendment Enforcement Task Force and appointed you Vice Chair. Please explain why you did not recuse yourself from leading task force created to help develop and execute the Administration's firearm-related agenda.

RESPONSE: The Task Force develops general policy and enforcement priorities. That work does not constitute a particular matter involving Check-Mate as a party and does not require recusal under the governing standards.

e. Will you commit to recusing yourself from any Department matter that could materially affect Check-Mate, including regulatory and contracting decisions, litigation concerning firearm magazines, and antitrust or enforcement matters involving Check-Mate or its direct competitors?

RESPONSE: I make recusal determinations consistent with the governing ethics standards and the guidance of the Department's ethics officials.

f. In November 2025, Check-Mate shared a photo of you on the company's LinkedIn page, writing, "This week, we had the honor of hosting United States Deputy Attorney General Todd Blanche at our Georgia facility. He toured our operations, spent time with our CEO, Vice President, and our team members, and saw firsthand the precision, craftsmanship, and dedication that define Check-Mate." Was this visit made in your official capacity?

RESPONSE: I toured the facility with my family.

i. If so, did you receive ethics advice prior to this appearance and what was the nature of that advice?

RESPONSE: We seek ethics advice whenever appropriate.

25. The National Firearm Act of 1934 (NFA) regulates machine guns, short-barreled rifles and short-barreled shotguns, silencers, destructive devices, and other dangerous weapons.

    a. Do you agree that the NFA "was Congress's first major attempt at regulating firearms in the United States, a legislative effort animated by the emergence of armed crime as a major national problem?" If so, please explain.

    RESPONSE: In general, this is consistent with my understanding of the NFA.

    b. Do you agree that "[w]ith the NFA, Congress sought to design a 'remedy' to the 'growing frequency of crimes of violence in which people are killed or injured by the use of dangerous weapons?'" If so, please explain.

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 25(a).

    c. Do you agree that "Seeking to curtail armed crime, the NFA targeted particularly dangerous and easily concealable weapons that could be used readily and efficiently by criminals?" If so, please explain.

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 25(a).

    d. The Repeal the NFA Act, H.R. 335, would repeal the NFA. Do you believe the NFA should be repealed or weakened? If so, please explain.

    RESPONSE: I defer to the measured judgment of Congress on whether the NFA should be repealed or weakened. The Department's duty is to defend the constitutionality of the laws passed by this body. To that end, the Department is presently defending the NFA against constitutional challenges. *See*, *e.g.*, *Silencer Shop Found. v. ATF*, No. 25-cv-0056 (N.D. Tex. 2026).

    e. The Firearms Policy Coalition and Gun Owners of America have called for the repeal of NFA or the invalidation of the law through the courts. Do you believe that the NFA should be invalidated? If so, please explain.

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 25(d).

26. According to 28 U.S.C. § 530B(a), "an attorney for the Government shall be subject to State laws and rules . . . governing attorneys in each State where such attorney engages in that attorney's duties, to the same extent and in the same manner as other attorneys in that State." Please explain your understanding of this law.

    RESPONSE: Section 530B, commonly known as the McDade Amendment, provides that a government attorney is subject to the State laws and rules, and the local rules of federal courts, governing attorneys in each State where the attorney engages in that attorney's duties, to the same extent and in the same manner as other attorneys in that

State. In practice, it means Department attorneys are bound by the applicable rules of professional conduct where they practice.

27. In March 2025, President Trump met with chief executives from Chevron, ExxonMobil, and other oil and gas companies in the White House Cabinet Room. Reportedly, after some executives told the President that they wanted his help fighting Vermont and New York's Climate Superfund laws, which would allow each state to recover the costs of the impact of climate change from fossil fuel companies, White House Deputy Chief of Staff of Policy Stephen Miller told the group, "I'm on it," and started texting former Attorney General Pam Bondi.

    a. Has Stephen Miller requested that you conduct an investigation or file a case related to Vermont's Climate Superfund law? If so, please list which one(s).

    RESPONSE: No.

    b. Have other White House officials asked you to conduct an investigation or file a case regarding Vermont's Climate Superfund law?

    RESPONSE: No.

28. Do you acknowledge that Donald Trump had a friendship with Jeffrey Epstein?

    RESPONSE: I cannot characterize personal relationships between private individuals and public figures beyond what is publicly known.

29. From July 24-25, 2025, you interviewed Jeffrey Epstein's longtime associate Ghislaine Maxwell at the Federal Correctional Institution in Tallahassee, Florida.

    a. During that interview, you offered her proffer immunity. Please explain what proffer immunity is and why you granted her that immunity.

    RESPONSE: Proffer immunity generally protects the individual from having their statements from the interview used directly against them in a future prosecution, encouraging candid cooperation. Limited assurances consistent with standard Department practices were provided to facilitate full and truthful information on Epstein-related matters.

    b. On August 1, 2025, Maxwell was transferred to the Federal Prison Camp in Bryan, Texas, a Minimum-Security Prison Camp. Bureau of Prisons (BOP) policy Program Statement 5100.008 states that all re-designation decisions, including those made by the Attorney General, "are made without favoritism given to an inmate's social or economic status." Was this policy followed regarding Ms. Maxwell's transfer?

RESPONSE: I had no personal involvement in Ms. Maxwell's transfer. I understand all inmate transfers to be conducted pursuant to applicable regulations, including, among other things, inmate safety and facility security. Specific details on individual inmate management are protected by privacy and correctional confidentiality.

30. On February 2, 2026, you joined a letter with then-Attorney General Bondi that acknowledged "several thousands of documents and media" related to Jeffrey Epstein and released under the Epstein Files Transparency Act "may have inadvertently included victim-identifying information." Please describe all the steps that DOJ has taken since its January 30, 2026, production to determine why victim names and other personally identifiable victim information appeared.

    RESPONSE: After its release of responsive materials, the Department immediately initiated a comprehensive review to identify and correct instances where victim names or other PII were inadvertently disclosed. This included pulling affected documents, making additional redactions, establishing a dedicated victim tip line for reporting issues, coordinating with victims' counsel, and implementing enhanced redaction protocols for subsequent or re-released materials. We take victim privacy extremely seriously and continue to rectify any errors promptly.

31. In February 2026, New Mexico reopened its investigation into Jeffrey Epstein. New Mexico has requested access to unredacted federal records it says are necessary to identify survivors, corroborating witnesses, and potential co-conspirators, but DOJ has not yet provided that access.

    a. Why has the Department not provided New Mexico law enforcement officials with access to the unredacted records they say are necessary to investigate potential violations of state law?

        RESPONSE: The Department works cooperatively with state law enforcement partners on matters of mutual interest while carefully balancing federal law, privileges, victim privacy, and the terms of the EFTA. Unredacted or sensitive records are not shared broadly to avoid compromising ongoing federal interest, active investigations, or protected information. Any specific requests for access are handled through established intergovernmental channels and evaluated on a case-by-case basis consistent with applicable law.

    b. Will you direct the Department to provide New Mexico with the requested materials, subject to appropriate redactions, by the July 31, 2026, deadline requested by Attorney General Torrez? If not, please explain why.

        RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 31(a).

32. On April 14, 2026, the Department of Justice released the FY27 President's Budget Request, which said that "[a]s part of its reorganization plan, the Department plans to

consolidate the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), the Office of Justice Programs (OJP), and the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) into a single grants component named the Bureau of Justice Grants."

a. Please discuss your role in creating or approving the FY27 President's Budget Request for these three entities.

RESPONSE: We consulted with all pertinent stakeholders at the Department, as well as the Office of Management and Budget, and the White House.

b. Per 34 U.S.C. § 10442(b), OVW by law is a "separate and distinct office within the Department of Justice, not subsumed by any other office." How will you ensure that, if you are confirmed, OJP does not subsume OVW?

RESPONSE: OVW will remain a separate and distinct office within the new consolidated grants component. The new consolidated component will be named the Bureau of Justice Grants. Within it will also be the existing OJP.

c. The budget request proposed to lower funding for the three offices to $1.328 billion, or 30.3% below the FY26 enacted level. OJP's funding would decrease by 22.7% below the FY26 enacted level. If OJP's funding is reduced after you are confirmed, how do you intend to ensure that services to individuals and communities are not diminished?

RESPONSE: We continue to implement operational efficiencies by evaluating processes and procedures. This includes evaluating the efficacy of contracts and implementing the consolidation plan.

d. The Fraternal Order of Police has sent a letter to Congress, dated June 23, 2026, opposing this consolidation. Have you read this letter?

RESPONSE: My team has read this letter.

e. Have you met with, or heard from, groups supporting victims, including domestic violence victims, regarding this consolidation? If not, do you commit to meeting with these groups prior to approving this consolidation?

RESPONSE: My team has heard from these groups

33. Please describe the nature of your relationship with Article III founder Mike Davis.

RESPONSE: Mr. Davis is an attorney and the founder of the Article III Project. I know him professionally.

a. Since your confirmation, have you and Mr. Davis discussed any mergers that are pending or were pending before the Department?

RESPONSE: Yes.

b. Mike Davis was hired by Hewlett Packard Enterprise to lobby for the company's proposed merger with its rival Juniper Networks. According to sworn testimony, Mike Davis said of former Assistant Attorney General Gail Slater, "[i]f you don't approve this settlement, I will destroy you. I will destroy your job at the DOJ."

   i. Are you aware of Mr. Davis's comments to Ms. Slater?

   RESPONSE: I am aware of the reporting to which the question refers. I have no personal knowledge of the underlying exchange.

   ii. Did Mr. Davis ever communicate with you that he would like you to take disciplinary action against Ms. Slater?

   RESPONSE: No.

34. During your nominations hearing to become the Attorney General, Senator Booker asked about the Department's decision not to challenge Paramount Skydance's proposed $111 billion acquisition of Warner Bros. Discovery. You acknowledged you were "part of the decision" to close DOJ's investigation into the merger. You also acknowledged attending a private dinner hosted by Paramount Chairman and Chief Executive Officer David Ellison to honor the Trump Administration while the merger remained under review, but denied that your attendance created an appearance of impropriety because it had been approved by ethics officials.

   a. Please explain what your role was in the decision to close the Department's investigation.

   RESPONSE: The decision to close the Department's investigation was made by the Antitrust Division, which I supported.

   b. What recommendation had career Antitrust Division officials made at the time the investigation was closed, and were they permitted to complete their review before a final decision was reached?

   RESPONSE: Career officials in the Antitrust Division play an integral role in our enforcement of federal antitrust law and are always invited to provide their view in our analysis of pending mergers.

   c. Please identify any written ethics advice authorizing both your attendance at Mr. Ellison's dinner and your subsequent participation in the merger decision.

   RESPONSE: As I testified, every event—including appearances, dinners, and speeches—is cleared by ethics officials.

d. Please describe any communications you had with White House officials concerning the merger or your Department's review.

RESPONSE: I had no communications with any White House officials concerning the merger or the Department's review.

35. On May 19, 2025, you established the Civil Rights Fraud Initiative. Please summarize the work completed by this initiative.

RESPONSE: The Civil Rights Fraud Initiative, which utilizes the False Claims Act to investigate and, as appropriate, pursue claims against any recipient of federal funds that knowingly violates federal civil rights laws, is a priority of the Department. A recent example of the initiative's work is the recent settlement with IBM, which agreed to pay more than $17 million to resolve allegations that it False Claims Act through failure to comply with antidiscrimination requirements in federal contracts. *See* Press Release (Apr. 10, 2026), https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/ibm-pays-17-million-resolve-allegations-discrimination-through-illegal-dei-practices.

36. On January 13, 2026, you said there was "currently no basis" at the time for the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice to investigate the killing of Renee Good by an Immigrations and Customs Enforcement officer.

a. Explain how you concluded there was no basis for conducting a civil rights investigation into Ms. Good's death.

RESPONSE: The Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General is investigating the death of Ms. Good, and the Department of Justice is providing support and legal process as necessary. It would be inappropriate for me to discuss any further details of an ongoing investigation.

b. Do you continue to believe there is no basis for conducting a civil rights investigation into Ms. Good's death? Please explain.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 36(a).

37. National Security Presidential Memorandum #7, issued on September 25, 2025, directed the National Joint Terrorism Task Force, located at FBI headquarters, to "coordinate and supervise a comprehensive national strategy to investigate, prosecute, and disrupt entities and individuals engaged in acts of political violence and intimidation."

a. Please summarize the work completed by the National Joint Terrorism Task Force to further this directive from National Security Presidential Memorandum #7.

RESPONSE: Without disclosing active investigations or law enforcement methods, following issuance of National Security Presidential Memorandum #7, the Department and its components have implemented the memorandum by

investigating, prosecuting, and disrupting individuals engaged in political violence in violation of federal law.

b. In 2024, the DOJ National Institute of Justice (NIJ) published a research paper titled, "What NIJ Research Tells Us About Domestic Terrorism." As of September 12, 2025, NIJ's 2024 research paper has no longer been available on its website. If confirmed, will you ensure that this report is online and publicly available?

RESPONSE: If confirmed, I welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter further with Department officials, as appropriate.

38. Executive Order 14040 directed the Attorney General to declassify records that were previously withheld during discovery in *In re Terrorist Attacks on September 11, 2001*, the 2021 FBI electronic communication closing the subfile investigation, and all substantive records from the FBI's initial investigation of the 9/11 terrorism attack.

a. Will you commit to meeting with 9/11 families and their representatives to expedite the release of documents still being withheld?

RESPONSE: I recognize the profound and enduring significance of the September 11, 2001 attacks for the victims' families. Executive Order No. 14040 was issued by President Biden in September 2021. This Department of Justice is committed to transparency consistent with our legal obligations and the equities of other relevant agencies. If confirmed, the Department's efforts in this regard will continue, including ensuring victims' families can be heard through appropriate channels.

b. If confirmed, will you commit to complying with Executive Order 14040 within 90 days of your confirmation? If not, by what day will you certify the Department's compliance?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 38(a).

39. Do journalists have access to immigration court proceedings under current Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) rules?

RESPONSE: Subject to certain regulatory exceptions, EOIR proceedings are open to the public, including to journalists. Information regarding access to EOIR proceedings is available at https://www.justice.gov/eoir/media/1449716/dl?inline . As this issue is also the subject of ongoing litigation, it would not be appropriate for me to comment further.

Questions for the Record

Todd Blanche – Nominee to be Attorney General

Sen. Adam Schiff (D-CA)

1. How would you define public corruption as a matter of federal law?

   RESPONSE: I am not aware of a single definition of public corruption. The term "public corruption" is a broad term, and its definition would depend entirely on the exact facts of the case and the specific statutes at issue. That said, I understand that there are several sections of Title 18 of the United States Code that are used to prosecute crimes sometimes referred to as public corruption.

   a. If one of your subordinates at the Department of Justice used their position to give or steer money to their friends, would you consider that public corruption?

      RESPONSE: The Department of Justice takes all instances of public corruption seriously. As Acting Attorney General, however, it would not be appropriate for me to comment on a hypothetical set of facts or reveal how the Department of Justice would investigate Justice Department employees.

2. During your time at the Department of Justice, did you ever become aware of instances of public corruption involving political appointees appointed by President Donald Trump?

   RESPONSE: The Department of Justice takes all instances of public corruption seriously. As Acting Attorney General, however, it would not be appropriate for me to comment on any past or pending allegations, investigations, or cases concerning public corruption involving political appointees.

3. Did any employee of the Department, including within the Weaponization Working Group, ever mishandle or misuse Grand Jury material? In what way? Please identify the person or persons and manner of mishandling.

   RESPONSE: The Department of Justice takes the mishandling or misuse of grand jury material seriously. As Acting Attorney General, however, it would not be appropriate for me to comment on any past or pending allegations, investigations, or cases concerning a Justice Department employee's mishandling or misuse of Grand Jury material.

4. The Department of Justice plays a central federal role in investigating misconduct, including misconduct by government officials. Do you believe DOJ has an obligation to investigate allegations of misconduct by executive branch officials, regardless of their position or political affiliation?

   RESPONSE: The mission of the Department of Justice is to uphold the rule of law and to keep our country safe. The Justice Department works each day to earn the public's trust by following the facts and the law wherever they may lead.

5. Yes or No, if credible evidence emerges that a senior administration official abused their authority, would you authorize an investigation even if it could create political consequences for the President?

   RESPONSE: Before authorizing any investigation, the Department of Justice will evaluate all credible allegations to determine whether there is a sufficient basis and proper jurisdiction to proceed with an investigation.

6. If you are confirmed as Attorney General, would you have any obligation to investigate criminal misconduct by the President?

   RESPONSE: If confirmed, I will always uphold my oath to support and defend the Constitution, and I would follow the law. I will also follow all standard Department of Justice procedures.

7. If you are confirmed as Attorney General, would you have any obligation to investigate unofficial criminal acts by the President for which the Supreme Court has held there is no presidential immunity?

   RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 6.

8. Will you promptly notify this Committee if the Department of Justice determines that senior executive branch officials engaged in unlawful conduct?

   RESPONSE: If confirmed, I will always uphold my oath to support and defend the Constitution, and I would follow the law. I will also follow all standard Department of Justice procedures.

9. What is your familiarity with binding Supreme Court precedents that establish Congress's constitutional role in overseeing executive branch activities, including the Department of Justice?

   RESPONSE: I am generally familiar with constitutional law and relevant Supreme Court precedent.

   a. Under what circumstances do you consider it appropriate for DOJ to refuse to comply with a congressional oversight request?

      RESPONSE: If confirmed, the Department of Justice under my leadership would seek to fully comply with all reasonable congressional oversight requests subject to the constitutionally mandated accommodations process. As Deputy Attorney General, this Department of Justice has been the most responsive, transparent Department of Justice in American history.

10. **Recusals:** During your confirmation hearing to be Deputy Attorney General, you confirmed to me, under oath, you would "follow the rules as told to me by the experts,

career prosecutors, in the department when it comes to every recusal." You also committed to "following the law and following the rules" and that you would "not violate [your] ethical obligations." However, news reports state that Joseph Tirrell, the former top ethics official at the Department of Justice, instructed you to recuse yourself from cases involving President Trump in March 2025. Indeed, you so testified at the confirmation hearing on July 15, 2026. You also signed an ethics pledge addressed to Jolene Lauria, DOJ's Designated Ethics Official, in which you promised to "not participate personally and substantially in any particular matter involving specific parties in which I know a former client of mine is a party or represents a party for a period of one year after I last provided service to that client or until the client satisfies any outstanding bill, whichever is later, unless I am first authorized to participate, pursuant to 5 C.F.R. § 2635.502(d)." On May 18, 2026, I sent a letter to Assistant Attorney General Lauria requesting information regarding these apparent ethical violations. I have received no response.

a. Yes or No, at the time that you are answering these questions, are you still a personal attorney for Donald Trump?

   RESPONSE: No. I withdrew from that representation before taking the oath as Deputy Attorney General on March 6, 2025.

   i. When did you last provide personal legal advice to Donald Trump?

      RESPONSE: I last provided personal legal advice to President Trump in my capacity as his counsel, prior to taking the oath as Deputy Attorney General.

   ii. When did you last serve as Donald Trump's personal attorney?

      RESPONSE: I last served as President Trump's personal attorney prior to taking the oath as Deputy Attorney General on March 6, 2025.

   iii. Do you maintain an attorney-client relationship with Donald Trump to this day?

      RESPONSE: No.

b. What ethical duties did you have to Donald Trump when you served as his criminal defense attorney?

   RESPONSE: As his criminal defense attorney, I owed the ordinary duties counsel owes a client, including competence, diligence, confidentiality, and zealous advocacy within the bounds of the law.

c. How have your ethical duties to Donald Trump changed since you became a political appointee at the DOJ? Please be specific in identifying which duties changed, how they changed, and when they changed.

RESPONSE: Upon entering the Department on March 6, 2025, my oath is to the Constitution. My duty as Attorney General would be to the United States. I withdrew from the representation and am recused from the matters in which I represented the President. The duty of confidentiality as to privileged information I learned in the representation continues.

d. Have you or any DOJ officials sought advice from career ethics attorneys since January 2025 regarding your responsibility to recuse yourself from any past or ongoing investigations and matters?

RESPONSE: Yes. I have consulted the Department's career ethics officials as necessary.

i. If so, when was the last time you sought ethics guidance from the DOJ Departmental Ethics Office?

RESPONSE: We consult on a regular basis.

ii. How many times have you sought advice from career ethics attorney since January 2025?

RESPONSE: We seek advice on a regular basis.

11. Were you advised by ethics officials to recuse yourself from matters involving the January 6th case against the President, the Proud Boys, Oath Keepers and others involved in the insurrection on that date?

RESPONSE: I was advised to recuse from the matters in which I represented the President, including the January 6 case against him, and I am recused from those matters. I did not represent the Proud Boys, the Oath Keepers, or any other January 6 defendant.

12. You have testified that Joseph Tirrell advised you to recuse yourself from certain matters. Please be more specific about the advice you received from him and other ethics attorneys on the subject of recusal.

RESPONSE: I was advised to recuse from the matters in which I represented the President — the New York, District of Columbia, and Southern District of Florida cases — and I have done so.

a. Did you participate in any manner in those cases, by dismissing cases against those charged in connection with those matters, by playing any role in the firing of prosecutors or FBI agents handling those matters, by absolving the President of

any potential liability, including tax liability, in those matters, by establishing a fund to compensate people in those matters, by preventing the public from receiving information about those matters, or in any other manner?

RESPONSE: I was not involved in the dismissal of the cases against the Proud Boys or Oath Keepers, and I was not involved in the personnel actions concerning prosecutors or agents who worked on the matters in which I represented the President; as I have testified, my involvement in those personnel actions would itself have presented a conflict. I have had no role, since becoming Deputy Attorney General, in the litigation concerning Volume 2 of the Special Counsel's report. As to the tax-return litigation, my execution of the settlement was an official act of the kind statutes commit to the Attorney General or Deputy Attorney General; I was not a party to the negotiation of that settlement. That civil matter was separate from the criminal cases in which I represented the President and from which I am recused.

13. Have you recused yourself from any lawsuits filed by President Trump against the administration?
    a. If not, did you seek or receive any ethics advice on whether you could participate in lawsuits where President Trump is seeking personal financial compensation from taxpayers?

    RESPONSE: My recusal covers the matters in which I represented the President. As to the tax-return litigation, my role was limited to executing the settlement in my official capacity; I was not part of the negotiation.

14. Have you received guidance from Department of Justice ethics attorneys regarding whether the one-year moratorium on involvement in matters concerning a former client allowed you to subsequently join active DOJ matters once that time-period elapses?

    RESPONSE: I consult the Department's ethics officials on the application of the ethics pledge and 5 C.F.R. § 2635.502, including the one-year period, and I act consistent with their guidance.

15. You have previously provided public commentary on Department of Justice investigations, including those involving former FBI Director Jim Comey, Kilmer Abrego Garcia, and the Southern Poverty Law Center. Please provide a detailed and complete list of all past or ongoing investigations and matters from which you are currently or previously recused.

    RESPONSE: I am recused from the matters in which I represented the President in the New York, District of Columbia, and Southern District of Florida cases. It would not be appropriate to itemize specific investigations beyond the recusals reflected in the guidance I received.

16. Did career ethics officials advise you that your recusal from legal cases that involved President Donald Trump in his personal capacity was necessary?

    RESPONSE: Yes, as to the matters in which I represented the President, and I have recused from those matters.

17. Have you recused yourself from participation in any and all cases related to work in which you represented Donald Trump as his criminal defense lawyer?

    RESPONSE: Yes.

    a. If no, why not?

18. What Department of Justice matters have you recused yourself from, to date?

    RESPONSE: I am recused from the matters in which I represented the President, as described in Question 15 above.

    a. When did you recuse yourself from each of those matters?

       RESPONSE: Whenever an applicable matter came before the Department.

    b. Did you recuse yourself from each of these matters before or after discussing the matter with career ethics attorneys at DOJ?

       RESPONSE: My recusal was implemented in consultation with the Department's career ethics officials.

    c. Please provide any communication or confirmation of your recusals or such discussions with career ethics attorneys at DOJ.

       RESPONSE: Internal ethics communications are privileged and deliberative, and it would not be appropriate for me to produce them in this setting.

19. Please provide the specific legal justification, if any, allowing your continued work on any past or ongoing investigations or matters involving your former client, President Donald Trump, from which you did not recuse himself.

    RESPONSE: My recusal covers the matters in which I represented the President. Other matters, such as the execution of the tax-return settlement, were official acts committed by statute to the Attorney General or Deputy Attorney General and did not fall within the scope of that recusal. I consulted the Department's ethics officials as appropriate.

20. What efforts have you personally taken to preserve all records, communications, and materials involving Department of Justice personnel regarding the scope, execution, or modification of your recusal obligations?

RESPONSE: The Department maintains records in accordance with its recordkeeping obligations, and I comply with those obligations.

21. **Brad Bondi Recusals:** On December 16, 2025, I joined a letter to you with Representative Dave Min expressing concerns regarding a pattern of Department of Justice intervention in cases involving clients represented by Brad Bondi, the brother of then-Attorney General Pam Bondi. I requested detailed information regarding DOJ's efforts to prevent conflicts of interest between then-General Bondi and her brother. On March 11, 2026, after receiving no response, I wrote a letter to Deputy Inspector General William Blier requesting the DOJ OIG investigate this conduct. To date, I have received no response.

    a. Will you commit to providing my staff in advance of the Committee's Business Meeting considering your nomination all documents, communications, memoranda, or ethics evaluations reflecting any consideration, discussion, or implementation of a recusal or screening arrangement ("firewall") related to Attorney General Bondi and any matter involving her brother, Mr. Bondi?

    RESPONSE: Conflicts of interest at the Department are addressed under the applicable regulations with the assistance of career ethics officials. It would not be appropriate for me to commit to producing internal ethics deliberations, personnel records, or related communications.

    b. Please state whether DOJ instituted any recusal, firewall, or screening procedures pursuant to 5 C.F.R. § 2635.502 in any matter involving Mr. Bondi, and provide DOJ's justification for instituting or not instituting such procedures.

    RESPONSE: The Department addresses potential conflicts of interest under 5 C.F.R. § 2635.502 and related authorities, with the advice of career ethics officials. I am not personally familiar with the specific screening arrangements, if any, involving the former Attorney General, which were matters handled by career ethics officials under the governing regulations.

22. For each Department of Justice intervention, declination, dismissal, or other extraordinary action taken in a matter involving Mr. Bondi since January 1, 2024, including the Amesty, Chakraverty, and Cruise Lines cases, please provide the following information (in addition to what appears in any public filing):
    a. The identity and role of all DOJ officials, including political or career, who participated in, reviewed, or approved the decision;
    b. The stated rationale for each action, and any internal rationale, analysis, or justification not reflected in public filings;
    c. Whether political leadership, including AAG-level or higher, initiated, participated in, reviewed, or was briefed on these decisions;
    d. Whether career prosecutors recommended for or against the action, and the basis of those recommendations; and

e. Whether any written recommendations or dissenting views were submitted, either by political or career personnel.

RESPONSE: Internal deliberations regarding specific enforcement decisions are protected by the deliberative-process privilege and, where applicable, other privileges, and several of these matters remain in litigation. It would not be appropriate for me to itemize the internal decision-making, recommendations, or deliberations described in subparts (a) through (e).

23. Will you commit to providing my staff, in advance of the Committee's Business Meeting considering your nomination, all documents, communications, memoranda, and ethics evaluations produced or consulted by the Department of Justice's Office of the Pardon Attorney regarding the pardon of Mr. Trevor Milton—granted despite his 2022 conviction on multiple federal securities fraud and wire-fraud charges—including any materials indicating whether Attorney General Bondi or DOJ staff played any role, formal or informal, in this matter?

RESPONSE: To the best of my knowledge, no such material exists other than those that reflect the Department's implementation of Mr. Milton's pardon. However, if such deliberative material existed, it would be privileged.

24. Has any Department of Justice employee filed a complaint, referral, or allegation involving Attorney General Bondi, Bradley Bondi, or potential conflicts of interest related to matters in which Mr. Bondi appeared? If so, provide:
    a. The date of the complaint;
    b. Whether it was filed with OPR, OIG, an ethics official, or a supervisor;
    c. The status and resolution of each complaint; and
    d. Any associated documentation.

RESPONSE: The confidentiality of any internal complaint, referral, or misconduct inquiry is important to protecting both those who come forward and the integrity of any review. It would not be appropriate for me to confirm or describe the existence, status, or documentation of any such matter.

25. In July 2025, Joseph Tirrell was terminated from his position as the Director of the Department of Justice's Departmental Ethics Office. What specific legal justification exists for Mr. Tirrell's termination and removal from federal service, and why was this reasoning not provided in his termination letter?

RESPONSE: This concerns an individual personnel action taken pursuant to the Executive's authority under Article II and the laws governing the Department's personnel. It would not be appropriate for me to discuss the reasoning for an individual personnel decision, particularly to the extent it may be the subject of litigation.

a. Who assumed responsibility for providing ethics guidance previously provided by Mr. Tirrell, and what are their qualifications and experience, including in federal ethics law?

RESPONSE: The Departmental Ethics Office continues to operate and to provide ethics guidance to Department officials.

b. What steps will you take to ensure that the DOJ's Departmental Ethics Office maintains the independence and expertise necessary to provide impartial guidance to DOJ officials?

RESPONSE: I recognize the importance of a functioning ethics office staffed by qualified officials, and I will ensure that the Department continues to receive impartial ethics guidance consistent with governing law and regulations.

26. At your confirmation hearing to serve as Deputy Attorney General, you testified to the committee you would "follow the rules as told to me by the experts, career prosecutors, in the Department when it comes to every recusal." How do you reconcile that commitment with the fact that you have removed or reassigned many of the Department's career ethics officials?

RESPONSE: I do not adopt the premise of the question. I consult with the Department's ethics officials on recusal questions and act consistent with governing regulations, and I have done so, including by recusing from matters in which I represented the President.

27. **Ethics Delegation Order:** On February 20, 2025, I joined my Senate Judiciary Committee colleagues in a letter to then-Attorney General Bondi and Acting Deputy Attorney General Emil Bove regarding a January 27, 2025, memo Bove sent reassigning ethics responsibilities from a qualified career official to Mr. Bove's chief of staff and a former Trump defense attorney. These individuals were given decision-making authority regarding "adverse personnel actions and bar referral matters." Will you commit to providing my staff in advance of the Committee's Business Meeting considering your nomination:
    a. The January 27, 2025, memo or "delegation order" from Acting Deputy Attorney General Emil Bove detailing the responsibilities of Jordan Fox and Kendra Wharton;
    b. Records reflecting or relating to the scope of the January 27, 2025, memo or "delegation order" prior to its issuance;
    c. Records reflecting or relating to implementation of the January 27, 2025, memo or "delegation order" prior to its issuance;
    d. Records reflecting or relating to the removal of Associate Deputy Attorney General Bradley Weinsheimer from his position with authority over ethics and employee discipline; and
    e. Copies of "delegation orders" issued during the previous Trump Administration and the Biden Administration assigning authorities currently delegated to Jordan Fox and Kendra Wharton.

RESPONSE: The records described in subparts (a) through (e) concern internal personnel and deliberative matters. It would not be appropriate for me to commit to producing internal delegation, personnel, or deliberative records in this setting.

28. On June 30, 2026, the Department of Justice produced certain documents in response to a FOIA request by American Oversight that include emails appearing to be from your email account in the Office of the Deputy Attorney General. These documents confirm that you and your staff in the Office of the Deputy Attorney General closely oversaw the so-called weaponization efforts at the DOJ. In his capacity as Acting Deputy Attorney General, did Emil Bove continue to direct personnel decisions, including any firings, or prosecutorial decisions within the "Weaponization Working Group" after receiving formal notification of his potential conflict of interest?

    RESPONSE: I am not aware of information responsive to this question, and it would be inappropriate for me to comment on personnel matters within the Department in any event. Moreover, the Weaponization Working Group did not make any prosecutorial decisions.

29. Did you or any senior Department of Justice officials consult with the Office of Government Ethics regarding any investigations or matters from which Mr. Bove should recuse himself?

    RESPONSE: Ethics and recusal determinations for Department of Justice officials are administered in the first instance by the Department's designated ethics officials, consistent with applicable statutes and regulations and, where appropriate, in consultation with the Office of Government Ethics. It would be inappropriate for me to discuss any individual's ethics or recusal matters, which are confidential. I would also note that Mr. Bove has not served at the Department since his confirmation to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in July 2025, and recusal obligations for federal judges are administered by the judiciary, not by the Office of Government Ethics or the Department.

30. **Emil Bove Office of Inspector General Referral:** On July 28, 2025, I sent then-Acting Inspector General William Blier a letter requesting DOJ OIG open an investigation into reports of misconduct by then-Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General Emil Bove. To date, I have received no response.
    a. Do you know whether DOJ OIG opened an investigation into misconduct by Emil Bove?

        RESPONSE: As a matter of longstanding Department policy, I cannot comment on OIG investigative activity, including whether to confirm or deny the existence of any investigation.

    b. Have you at any time had any communications with DOJ OIG about Emil Bove, or directed any subordinate to communicate with DOJ OIG about Bove?

RESPONSE: Any such internal Department communications would be privileged and therefore inappropriate for me to discuss.

31. If confirmed, what measures will you implement to restore confidence in the Departmental Ethics Office and ensure that political considerations do not influence ethical determinations?

RESPONSE: I will ensure the Departmental Ethics Office is staffed by qualified officials and that ethics determinations are made in accordance with the governing statutes and regulations, free from improper influence.

32. Who is your chief client as Deputy Attorney General and Acting Attorney General – the American people or President Trump?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice seeks to do justice every day on behalf of the American people. Article II of the Constitution gives the President the Executive power, making him the head of the Executive branch. The Department of Justice is part of the Executive branch.

33. Who would be your chief client if confirmed as Attorney General – the American people or President Trump?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 32.

34. You were present at a press conference announcing the indictment against former FBI Director James Comey on April 28, 2026. Were you aware at the time of that press conference that President Trump had publicly demanded – as far back as his first term – the criminal prosecution of former FBI Director James Comey?

RESPONSE: *United States v. James Comey*, 4:26-cr-00016, is an ongoing federal criminal prosecution in the Eastern District of North Carolina (EDNC). A federal grand jury in EDNC returned an indictment against Mr. Comey for knowingly and willfully making a threat to take the life of, and to inflict bodily harm upon the President of the United States, and for knowingly transmitting a communication in interstate commerce that contained a threat to injure the person of another. I cannot comment on an ongoing criminal prosecution at the Department of Justice beyond what is available in public DOJ filings and hereby incorporate the positions of the United States from said filings in this response.

35. Were you aware that President Trump also explicitly named New York Attorney General Letitia James in his public demands, writing that she too was "guilty as hell" and demanding that the DOJ "act fast?"

RESPONSE: *U.S. v. Letitia James*, a criminal case filed in the Eastern District of Virginia (EDVA), is pending litigation in the Fourth Circuit. I cannot comment on an

ongoing litigation at the Department of Justice beyond what is available in public DOJ filings and hereby incorporate the positions of the United States from said filings in this response.

36. Were you aware that in August 2025, President Trump publicly declared that "Cook must resign, now!!!", referring to Federal Reserve Governor Lisa Cook, and explicitly told reporters he would "fire her if she doesn't resign?"

    RESPONSE: I cannot confirm or deny the existence of any ongoing investigation at the Department of Justice. All investigative and prosecutorial decisions made by Department attorneys are in accordance with the facts and the law. Any discussions, communications, or discussions concerning such matters would necessarily be privileged.

    a. Were you aware that shortly following the President's public threat, the Department of Justice launched an investigation into Governor Cook over alleged mortgage fraud?

       RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 36.

    b. Were you involved in any discussions about that investigation prior to or since its launch?

       RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 36.

37. Without getting into the details of your conversations, did the President ever discuss with you or anyone else at the Department of Justice, orally or in writing, the prosecution or potential prosecution of any of his political opponents? Which opponents?

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 36.

38. Without getting into the details of your conversations, did the President ever discuss with you or anyone else at the Department of Justice, orally or in writing, the prosecution or potential prosecution of any nonprofit organizations? Which organizations?

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 36.

39. Has it ever been necessary for you to discuss or discipline any lawyers or staff at the Department of Justice or other federal agencies for speaking about pending investigations in violation of DOJ policy? Who were those lawyers or staff? How were they in violation of DOJ policy?

    RESPONSE: I cannot comment on internal personnel matters.

40. What is the threshold for a Deputy Attorney General to be involved in or make the decision to charge a Congressmember in relation to a Congressional oversight visit to a detention facility?

RESPONSE: The Office of the Deputy Attorney General is responsible for overseeing the law enforcement components of the Department of Justice and the United States Attorneys' Offices.

a. Who did you consult with or seek advice from before personally retaining the oversight of the Department of Justice's case against Congressmember McIver?

RESPONSE: *U.S. v. LaMonica McIver* is an ongoing criminal prosecution pending in United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. A federal grand jury in New Jersey returned an indictment against Representative McIver for forcibly impeding and interfering with federal officers. I cannot comment on an ongoing criminal prosecution at the Department of Justice beyond what is available in public DOJ filings and hereby incorporate the positions of the United States from said filings in this response.

b. Have you had any discussions with Third Circuit Court Judge Emil Bove regarding charges against Congressmember McIver?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 40(a).

41. Do you believe that federal indictments against the President's political rivals constitute politically motivated prosecutions?

RESPONSE: All investigative and prosecutorial decisions made by Department attorneys are in accordance with the facts and the law.

42. Do you agree Americans have the right to criticize the President on social media?

RESPONSE: Yes.

43. What is the legal standard for determining a "true threat" under federal criminal law?

RESPONSE: *Counterman v. Colorado*, 600 U.S. 66, 74 (2023), establishes the current standard for a "true threat" under federal criminal law. The Court's opinion speaks for itself.

44. Do you agree that proving in court that a social media post about the President rises to the legal standard of a "true threat" is a difficult task because of the Supreme Court's ruling in *Counterman v. Colorado*?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 43. The "beyond a reasonable doubt" standard is, by constitutional design, a "difficult" standard without regard to *Counterman.* The Justice Department has an obligation to prove the elements of any criminal charge by the applicable legal standard.

45. On May 29, 2026, just months before the Department of Justice's criminal prosecution accusing former FBI Director James Comey of threatening the President by writing "86 47" in seashells and posting it on social media, the lead prosecutor in the case withdrew and was substituted by another Assistant United States Attorney.

    a. Why was the lead prosecutor replaced so close to this matter going to trial?

    RESPONSE: *United States v. James Comey*, 4:26-cr-00016, is an ongoing federal criminal prosecution in the Eastern District of North Carolina (EDNC). A federal grand jury in EDNC returned an indictment against Mr. Comey for knowingly and willfully making a threat to take the life of, and to inflict bodily harm upon the President of the United States, and for knowingly transmitting a communication in interstate commerce that contained a threat to injure the person of another. I cannot comment on an ongoing criminal prosecution at the Department of Justice beyond what is available in public DOJ filings and hereby incorporate the positions of the United States from said filings in this response. I further cannot comment on personnel matters within the Department.

    b. Was it because the newly assigned prosecutor was more willing to follow orders from President Trump?

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 45(a).

    c. Has DOJ investigated and brought charges against any individuals based on the President's request that DOJ target them?

    RESPONSE: All investigative and prosecutorial decisions made by Department attorneys are in accordance with the facts and the law.

46. Last fall, Acting United States Attorney Erik Siebert declined to prosecute James Comey because there was not sufficient evidence to bring charges. He resigned under immense pressure from the Trump Administration on September 19, 2025. The day after Siebert resigned, President Trump posted on Truth Social "Today I withdrew the Nomination of Erik Siebert as U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, when I was informed that he received the UNUSUALLY STRONG support of the two absolutely terrible, sleazebag Democrat Senators, from the Great State of Virginia. He didn't quit, I fired him!" However, later, in December, you went on Meet the Press to say that Siebert wasn't fired because he refused to bring cases, but that he resigned. If Siebert was not fired for refusing to bring a case against James Comey or Letitia James, why was he forced to resign?
    a. If he was not forced to resign, why did President Trump fire him?

    RESPONSE: Any President of the United States may appoint and terminate the employment of any U.S. Attorney for any reason. Any U.S. Attorney may resign from their position for any reason.

b. Why was Siebert forced to resign or fired by President Trump immediately after he determined there was insufficient evidence to prosecute James Comey?

RESPONSE: Any President of the United States may appoint and terminate the employment of any U.S. Attorney for any reason. Any U.S. Attorney may resign from their position for any reason.

47. Last February, you testified under oath that you knew nothing more about the dismissal of charges against Eric Adams than what was publicized in the media. Yet, internal Department of Justice documents reveal that Emil Bove, your former DOJ colleague and fellow personal criminal defense lawyer to Donald Trump, was assuring prosecutors you two were "on the same page" about dropping the case prior to your confirmation.

a. Did you ever discuss the dismissal of the case against Eric Adams with Emil Bove?

RESPONSE: I was not involved in the Department's decision-making prior to my confirmation as Deputy Attorney General; therefore, I had no involvement in the Department's decision to dismiss this case.

b. Did you ever tell him that you were on the same page, in agreement with him, or use other words to suggest you agreed with dismissing this case?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 47(a).

48. You publicly stated in April 2025 that there was nothing "unethical" or "illegal" about dropping the case against Eric Adams and labeled any statements that suggested otherwise as "disingenuous." You also called the prosecution against Mayor Adams "flawed."

a. What was "flawed" about the public corruption charges alleged against Mayor Adams?

Response: The reasons for the Department's decision to seek dismissal are set forth in the Department's February 10, 2025 memorandum and February 14, 2025 motion to dismiss, which speak for themselves. Those filings identified, among other things, appearances of impropriety arising from the timing of the charges and the conduct of the former U.S. Attorney, as well as the pendency of the prosecution during an ongoing mayoral election. As I have previously testified, I was not involved in the decision to seek dismissal, which was made before I joined the Department.

b. Part of the reason the case was dismissed was the assertion that it would interfere with his ability to help the administration with unrelated immigration matters. Do you think it is appropriate to dismiss a corruption case against a public official because that official can be useful to the administration on a policy matter?

RESPONSE: I respectfully reject the premise of this question. The Department's motion set forth multiple independent grounds for dismissal, as described in my response to Question 48(a).

49. Several federal prosecutors in the Southern District of New York were placed on administrative leave after refusing to sign the motion to dismiss the charges against Eric Adams, alleging that your office made it a mandatory "precondition" of employment that they sign a statement confessing to "wrongdoing" and "regret" before returning to work.
    a. If the DOJ's decision was legally sound, why were these prosecutors placed on administrative leave after refusing to dismiss the charges against Adams?

       RESPONSE: The personnel actions referenced occurred in February 2025, before I joined the Department, and I was not involved in them.

50. **Purges of DOJ Officials:** On February 3, 2025, I joined all Senate Judiciary Committee Democrats in a letter to you requesting detailed information regarding your involvement in purges of senior officials from the DOJ and FBI at the start of the Trump Administration. I asked you to confirm whether the president was consulted in the removal or reassignment of career DOJ officials, as well as detailed records on communications with Administration officials related to the firings. I sent a similar letter to then-Attorney General Bondi on September 4, 2025, where I requested additional information after your offices failed to provide adequate responses to our inquiries. To date, I have received no response.

    a. Were you consulted on the removal or reassignment of career civil servants in the Department of Justice or its components in any way or made aware of their pending removal or reassignment? If yes, please explain when this took place and describe the extent of your involvement.

       RESPONSE: I took office as Deputy Attorney General on March 6, 2025, and I had no role in, and was not consulted about, any personnel action taken before that date. It would not be appropriate for me to discuss individual personnel decisions or the deliberations surrounding them, and, as a general matter, personnel decisions should be based on performance and adherence to the law.

    b. What criteria has the Department of Justice used to determine which employees would be fired since January 21, 2025?

       RESPONSE: Decisions regarding the Department's personnel are committed to the Attorney General and component leadership and are made in furtherance of the Department's mission, its priorities, and the President's lawful direction. To the extent the question seeks the reasoning underlying specific personnel matters that are now in litigation, it would not be appropriate for me to comment.

    c. What laws, if any, were relied upon to authorize firing these employees?

RESPONSE: The removal authority exercised rests on Article II of the Constitution and the laws of the United States governing the Executive Branch's authority over its personnel. Where a particular removal has been challenged, the governing legal authority is a matter being addressed in the pending litigation, and I will not comment on those specific cases.

d. How many individual years of service did each Department of Justice employee fired since January 21, 2025, have at the Department?

RESPONSE: That information is maintained in the Department's personnel records, and its individualized disclosure implicates Privacy Act protections and the confidentiality of matters now in litigation. It is not appropriate to itemize it here.

e. How many collective years of service did the Department of Justice employees fired since January 21, 2025, have at the Department?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 50(d).

51. Were the supervisors of each of the Department of Justice employees fired since January 21, 2025, consulted prior to the employees' termination?

RESPONSE: Removal of Department personnel exercising Executive authority does not, as a legal matter, require the concurrence of an employee's immediate supervisor. Whether a particular supervisor was consulted in a specific instance concerns internal deliberations and, in a number of instances, matters now in litigation, on which it would not be appropriate for me to comment.

a. If so, did each of their supervisors expressly agree that they should be terminated?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 51.

b. If not, why were the employees terminated without their supervisors' consent or knowledge?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 51.

52. Will you commit to providing my staff, in advance of the Committee's Business Meeting considering your nomination:

a. All records between November 5, 2024, and the present reflecting or relating to communications between and among you, James McHenry, Emil Bove, Brian Driscoll, Robert Kissane, Pam Bondi, or Kash Patel concerning the removal, resignation, or reassignment of any career civil servant in the Department of Justice or its components;

RESPONSE: No. To the extent such communications exist, they are protected by an applicable privilege.

b. All records between November 5, 2024, and January 20, 2025, reflecting or relating to communications between and among you and any Trump-Vance transition team official concerning the removal, resignation, or reassignment of any career civil servant in the Department of Justice or its components;

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 52(a).

c. All records between January 20, 2025, and the present reflecting or relating to communications between and among you and any White House or Department of Justice official concerning the removal or reassignment of any career civil servant in the Department of Justice or its components;

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 52(a).

d. All records between November 5, 2024, and the present reflecting or relating to communications between and among you, James McHenry, Emil Bove, Brian Driscoll, Robert Kissane, Pam Bondi, or Kash Patel concerning investigations and/or prosecutions relating to (1) *United States v. Haniyeh*, 24 Mag. 438 (S.D.N.Y.); (2) events that occurred at or near the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021; and (3) President Trump's mishandling of classified documents;

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 52(a).

e. All records between November 5, 2024, and January 20, 2025, reflecting or relating to communications between and among you and any Trump-Vance transition team official concerning investigations and/or prosecutions relating to (1) *United States v. Haniyeh*, 24 Mag. 438 (S.D.N.Y.); (2) events that occurred at or near the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021; and (3) President Trump's mishandling of classified documents; and

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 52(b).

f. All records between January 20, 2025, and the present reflecting or relating to communications between and among you and any White House or Department of Justice official concerning investigations and/or prosecutions relating to (1) *United States v. Haniyeh*, 24 Mag. 438 (S.D.N.Y.); (2) events that occurred at or near the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021; and (3) President Trump's mishandling of classified documents.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 52(a).

53. **Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell Grand Jury Records:** The New York Times recently reported that you huddled in the Situation Room with other top administration

officials on July 17, 2025, to control reputational damage to President Trump related to the release of the Epstein files. One suggestion reportedly made in that meeting was to ask the federal courts to release grand jury testimony from the Epstein case, because they were "almost certain to contain no new significant information."

a. Did you participate in a meeting at the White House on July 17, 2025, where White House and Cabinet officials discussed the political consequences of the Epstein files for President Donald Trump?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on deliberations I had, or did not have, with White House officials.

b. Did you ever suggest that seeking the Epstein grand jury testimony would be a good option because the release was unlikely to damage President Trump?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on deliberations I had, or did not have, with White House officials.

54. The same day of that meeting, July 17, 2025, President Trump wrote on Truth Social "Based on the ridiculous amount of publicity given to Jeffrey Epstein, I have asked Attorney General Pam Bondi to produce any and all pertinent Grand Jury testimony, subject to Court approval. […]" When did you first review the grand jury transcripts related to the Epstein case?

a. Did you review those transcripts before or after President Trump gave a public message that they should be released?

RESPONSE: Grand jury transcripts are governed by strict secrecy requirements under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e) and other applicable privileges, including deliberative-process privilege. Details about my review or internal deliberations are therefore protected and cannot be discussed here.

b. Did you discuss the content of those grand jury transcripts with the President or his aides?

RESPONSE: I will not discuss my conversations with the President.

55. On July 18, 2025, the Department of Justice filed motions to unseal the Epstein and Maxwell case grand jury transcripts which two federal judges subsequently rejected. Judge Richard M. Berman in the Southern District of New York observed in his Order denying DOJ's request how little information was in the transcripts – just 70 pages – and no testimony from a single victim or survivor. Judge Berman concluded that DOJ's request "appears to be a 'diversion' from the breadth and scope of the Epstein files in the Government's possession." Judge Paul A. Engelmayer in Florida similarly concluded that the public might conclude that your motion "was aimed not at 'transparency' but at diversion."

a. Did you know in July 2025, when DOJ filed those motions, that releasing the grand jury files was a ploy to protect information in the government's Epstein files and President Trump's reputation?

RESPONSE: DOJ motions involving grand jury materials are filed consistent with Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e) and applicable law to address sealing, unsealing, or other matters as required by the court and statute. There was no improper "ploy." actions were taken to fulfill legal obligations while protecting legitimate interests. All decisions prioritized compliance with the law.

56. **Epstein Files Chain of Custody:** In late 2025, concerning reports indicated then-Attorney General Pam Bondi and FBI Director Kash Patel directed over 1,000 FBI personnel to examine files to be released under the Epstein Files Transparency Act and identify any mentions of President Trump. On December 10, 2025, I sent a letter to Acting Inspector General Don Berthiaume alongside Sen. Durbin requesting information regarding the chain of custody of those files. Transparency regarding the chain of custody of the Epstein files is important for ensuring the files have not been tampered with or otherwise modified. I have received no response.

a. Are there any irregularities in the chain of custody forms for evidence released under the Epstein Files Transparency Act?

RESPONSE: The Department maintains rigorous chain of custody protocols for all evidence in its possession, including materials processed and released under the EFTA. No irregularities have been identified that would affect the integrity of the released records.

b. Did the FBI or any other law enforcement agencies involved in the Epstein and Maxwell investigations create and maintain chain of custody forms in every required instance for material covered under the Epstein Files Transparency Act?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 56(a).

c. Since January 20, 2025, how many individuals have obtained custody over material covered under the Epstein Files Transparency Act?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 56(a).

d. Since January 20, 2025, how many agencies have obtained custody of material covered under the Epstein Files Transparency Act?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 56(a).

e. Did DOJ release all chain of custody forms for evidence that was released under the Epstein Files Transparency Act? If no, why were the forms not released? Please specify which statutory exception to the Act applies.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 56(a). The Department released all of the responsive records in its possession under the EFTA.

57. **Interview with Ghislaine Maxwell:** Former Attorney General Pam Bondi testified in the House Oversight Committee in May 2026 about the Department' actions in withholding and ultimately releasing the Epstein files. Bondi testified that she "delegated that oversight over the [Epstein] process to Deputy Attorney General Todd Blanche."

a. Do you agree this statement is accurate?

RESPONSE: As Deputy Attorney General, I oversaw the day-to-day operations of the Department. This included efforts to collect, review, redact, and release materials response under EFTA.

58. Former Attorney General Bondi was also asked who was briefing her on the Epstein matter when she took office as Attorney General. She testified it was you.

a. Do you agree this statement is accurate?

RESPONSE: As Deputy Attorney General, my duties included providing advice and counsel to the Attorney General. This included legal issues involving the Epstein matter.

59. Former Attorney General Bondi also testified that you were "leading the Epstein matter and the release of everything from the beginning."

a. Do you agree this statement is accurate?

RESPONSE: As Deputy Attorney General, I oversaw the day-to-day operations of the Department. This included efforts to collect, review, redact, and release materials response under EFTA.

60. In her testimony to the House Oversight Committee, former Attorney General Bondi testified that she learned about the transfer of Ghislaine Maxwell from a low-security prison to a minimum-security prison camp "in the newspaper or online, after it happened."

a. How did you learn about Maxwell's transfer?

RESPONSE: I learned about Maxwell's transfer to FPC Bryan through public reporting after it occurred.

b. Did you learn about the prison transfer from the news?

RESPONSE: Yes. See my response to Question 60(a)**.**

c. Did you know that Maxwell would be transferred from her low-security prison to a minimum-security prison camp before it was carried out by Bureau of Prisons?

RESPONSE: No.

61. You went on NBC's Meet the Press on December 21, 2025, and when asked about Maxwell's prison transfer by the Bureau of Prisons, stated "every decision that they make lands on my desk to the extent it needs to."

a. Did you personally approve the order to transfer Maxwell to a lower security prison?

RESPONSE: No. See response to Question 60(a).

b. Did you or your office oversee her transfer? If not, please explain.

RESPONSE: The Office of Deputy Attorney General oversees the day-to-day operations of the Department, including all components and agencies. This includes oversight of the Bureau of Prisons. See also my response to question 60(a).

c. You have stated repeatedly that the transfer to a lower security prison was for security reasons. Did the DOJ transfer Maxwell for her security?

RESPONSE: Ms. Maxwell was transferred after the DOJ and BOP learned about threats made against her at FCI Tallahassee.

62. The New York Times recently reported that you huddled in the Situation Room with other top administration officials on July 17, 2025, to control reputational damage to President Trump related to the release of the Epstein files. Vice President Vance, then-Attorney General Pam Bondi, and Kash Patel were part of that conversation, along with President Trump's top White House advisors. You reportedly offered to interview Ghislaine Maxwell after JD Vance suggested Maxwell could help President Trump.

a. Did you offer to interview Maxwell?

RESPONSE: As part of the Department's efforts to pursue all investigatory leads in the Epstein matter, the DOJ coordinated with Ms. Maxwell's counsel to schedule her proffer.

b. Did someone else direct you to or suggest you interview Maxwell?

RESPONSE: As part of the Department's efforts to pursue all investigatory leads in the Epstein matter, the DOJ coordinated with Ms. Maxwell's counsel to schedule her proffer.

c. What role did President Trump have in the decision to have you interview Maxwell?

RESPONSE: I will not discuss any communications I had with the President.

d. What role did President Trump's Chief of Staff Susie Wiles have in the decision to have you interview Maxwell?

RESPONSE: As part of the Department's efforts to pursue all investigatory leads in the Epstein matter, the DOJ coordinated with Ms. Maxwell's counsel to schedule her proffer.

e. Would you agree that it was unprecedented for a Deputy Attorney General to personally interview a defendant convicted for their role in a scheme to sexually exploit and abuse multiple minor children?

RESPONSE: While high-level DOJ officials do not routinely conduct such interviews personally, I participated to ensure thorough, first-hand assessment of available leads while protecting the integrity of the process.

f. Have you personally interviewed *any* other witnesses or criminal defendants while serving as Deputy AG or Acting AG?

RESPONSE: No.

g. What was it about your experience that made you better qualified to interview Maxwell over other DOJ prosecutors, such as those who spent their careers investigating sex crimes, or who had actual knowledge about the facts of the case?

RESPONSE: My extensive experience as a federal prosecutor handling complex, high-stakes cases—including sensitive witness interviews—equipped me to conduct a thorough, professional interview.

63. The transcript release by the Department of Justice states that only you and Deputy Associate Attorney General Diego Pestana were present from DOJ at the July 2025 interviews of Ghislaine Maxwell.

a. How much experience did Mr. Pestana have as a federal prosecutor before he started working for you?

RESPONSE: The preamble above before this question is inaccurate. Staff from the U.S. Marshals Service and the FBI were also present for the interview. Mr. Pestana has taken and defended numerous depositions and witness proffers.

64. After your two days of meetings with Maxwell, DOJ released transcripts and with audio recording of your questions to her. You were the primary person asking Maxwell questions.

    a. Do you agree that you were not an expert in the Epstein or Maxwell case before that interview?

       RESPONSE: My extensive experience as a federal prosecutor handling complex, high-stakes cases—including sensitive witness interviews—as well as my years in private practice interviewing witnesses, equipped me to conduct a thorough, professional interview.

    b. Did you take any notes when you interviewed Maxwell?

       RESPONSE: Any notes taken during the interview are internal deliberative materials protective by applicable privileges.

    c. Did Mr. Pestana take notes?

       RESPONSE: Any notes taken during the interview are internal deliberative materials protective by applicable privileges.

        i. If no, did you interview her for two days and did you prepare for the interview with notes or an outline or topic areas?

           RESPONSE: Any notes taken during the interview are internal deliberative materials protective by applicable privileges.

        ii. If yes, were your notes released to the public with the Epstein files? Were Mr. Pestana's notes?

           RESPONSE: Any notes taken during the interview are internal deliberative materials protective by applicable privileges.

        iii. Please identify any exception in the Epstein Files Transparency Act that would allow you to legally withhold documents that were prepared in anticipation or during your Ghislaine Maxwell interviews.

           RESPONSE: The basis for withholding nay privileged materials is outlined in my letters to Congress.

65. At the time of your interviews with Maxwell, were you aware that DOJ prosecutors had already told a judge that Maxwell had a "willingness to brazenly lie under oath about her conduct"? Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion, *United States v. Maxwell*, No. 1:20-cr-00330-AJN, ECF No. 22, at 10 (S.D.N.Y. July 13, 2020). If not, when did you learn that information?

    RESPONSE: Preparation details, including prior testimony review, and internal consultations are attorney work product and deliberative information; thus, that information is privileged.

66. At the time of your interviews with Maxwell, were you aware that DOJ had previously charged Maxwell with perjury?

    RESPONSE: Preparation details, including prior testimony review, and internal consultations are attorney work product and deliberative information; thus, that information is privileged.

67. Do you believe Maxwell told the truth when she denied knowing Jeffrey Epstein had underage girls at his house for massages?

    RESPONSE: Ms. Maxwell provided detailed responses during the interview, and the Department evaluated all information received against the broader record. I cannot comment on the credibility of specific statements to preserve the integrity of any potential further Department actions.

68. On January 30, 2026, you sent a letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee declaring that DOJ had completed its productions required by the Epstein Files Transparency Act. The letter laid out the protocol "established by the Department" and including several layers of review. Specifically, you wrote: "Following the first level of review, a second-level review was conducted by a group of 40 specialized attorneys. These attorneys conducted a sample-based review of the files reviewed by the first-level reviewers to maximize compliance with the Act and the identification and review protocol, including the FAQs." You noted that many of the second-level review attorneys were from the "Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties (OPCL) and Office of Information Policy (OIP), many of whom are experts in privacy rights."

    a. Was this second-level review completed via eDiscovery software, as is customary for a large-scale document review?

        RESPONSE: Yes**.** The review and redaction process occurred using eDiscovery software.

    b. Did the "specialized attorneys" you described in your letter to the Committee include any political appointees at the Department of Justice? If so, how many political appointees were part of the second level review?

RESPONSE: As stated in my January 30, 2026 letter to Congress, "[m]ore than 500 attorneys and reviewers from the Department contributed to this effort." Some attorneys were political appointees and some were career DOJ attorneys.

c. Please describe in detail what role political appointees had in reviewing the Epstein files in January 2026.

RESPONSE: As stated in my January 30, 2026 letter to Congress, "[m]ore than 500 attorneys and reviewers from the Department contributed to this effort."

d. Yes or No, have you personally participated in any decisions regarding whether specific Epstein-related records should be released?

RESPONSE: As Deputy Attorney General, I oversaw the day-to-day operations of the Department. This included efforts to collect, review, redact, and release materials response under EFTA.

e. If yes, why?

RESPONSE: As Deputy Attorney General, I oversaw the day-to-day operations of the Department. This included efforts to collect, review, redact, and release materials response under EFTA.

f. Have you personally reviewed any specific Epstein-related records?

RESPONSE: As Deputy Attorney General, I oversaw the day-to-day operations of the Department. This included efforts to collect, review, redact, and release materials response under EFTA.

g. Have you personally made decisions about what materials to release or withhold?

RESPONSE: As Deputy Attorney General, I oversaw the day-to-day operations of the Department. This included efforts to collect, review, redact, and release materials response under EFTA.

h. Do you know whether any political appointees who are not licensed attorneys were assigned to review Epstein files? If so, please list the political appointees, their title, and their qualifications to review sensitive records from the Epstein or Maxwell cases. And if so, please inform the Committee why that was appropriate.

RESPONSE: As stated in my January 30, 2026 letter to Congress, "[m]ore than 500 attorneys and reviewers from the Department contributed to this effort."

69. Which specific eDiscovery platform or "document management system" did the Department of Justice use to carry out the review of Epstein files?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

70. At your hearing, you stated that the Department of Justice has made available all documents from the Epstein files for Members of Congress to review without redaction.

    a. What is the "Project" name for the database provided to Members of Congress to review the Epstein files?

       RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

    b. Yes or No, is the eDiscovery Project provided to Members of Congress to review the Epstein files the same identical database as used for review and production of the Epstein files?

       RESPONSE: Yes.

    c. If no, what are the specific differences between the eDiscovery Project provided to Members of Congress versus the Department of Justice?

       RESPONSE: See subpart (b) above.

    d. Has the Department of Justice permitted any congressional staff to review unredacted Epstein files? If not, why not?

       RESPONSE: Yes**.** Although the EFTA does not require the creation of a Reading Room for Members of Congress to review all unredacted, nonprivileged, and duplicative materials, that effort has been undertaken to continue the Department's efforts towards maximum transparency. The Department has provided staff access to the Reading Room to assist any Member of Congress is using the eDiscovery platform.

71. In your January 30, 2026, letter to the Committee, you wrote, under the heading "Production Format," that "In general, documents have been produced in the format that they were collected and loaded into the document management system."

    a. Is that statement accurate?

       RESPONSE: Yes, the Department produced documents using the same format that they were collected and loaded.

72. **Missing Metadata from Epstein Files:** The Department of Justice has for many years required the recipients of document requests to produce electronically storied information

(ESI) in electronic file formats that produce metadata, or information about the records, such as file names, date created, date modified, and document authors. Similarly, when the Federal Bureau of Investigation, local law enforcement, or Department forensic experts extract information from a cell phone or electronic search warrant, metadata for the files is typically extracted for review and storage. Yet the vast majority of documents produced by the Department under the Epstein Files Transparency Act were published in a PDF format with no metadata, such as filename, date created, or author.

a. What types of metadata were contained in the millions of files reviewed under the Epstein Files Transparency Act? Please list all fields of metadata that are available for 10 or more records in the document management system used by the Department to review Epstein files for release pursuant to federal law.

RESPONSE: Depending on the nature of the electronic files or documents, the type of metadata will differ. For example, phone extractions will have different metadata than emails. Any member of Congress or their staff may access the unredacted database at the Reading Room.

b. How many of the documents produced by the Department pursuant to the Epstein Files Transparency Act contained metadata in the document management system used by the Department to review Epstein files for release pursuant to federal law?

RESPONSE: The database contains millions of documents, many of which has metadata attached. Any member of Congress or their staff may access the unredacted database at the Reading Room to review that information. In addition, document requests should be directed to the Department's Office of Legislative Affairs.

c. Do you believe the metadata for a responsive document constitutes a "record" in the meaning of the Epstein Files Transparency Act? If not, why not?

RESPONSE: All metadata was produced with responsive files pursuant to the EFTA, subject to withholding or redactions permitted by the EFTA.

d. At what stage in the process of producing these documents did Department employees remove metadata from the files produced to the public under the authority of the Epstein Files Transparency Act?

RESPONSE: All metadata was produced with responsive files pursuant to the EFTA, subject to withholding or redactions permitted by the EFTA.

73. Do you agree that if a corporation was compelled to produce documents to the government and intentionally deleted metadata from key documents before their production to law enforcement, the government would likely consider that act to be obstruction of justice?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate to comment on an incomplete, hypothetical scenario.

74. Do you believe the Epstein files contain no meaningful evidence of additional wrongdoing by others? If so, is DOJ continuing to investigate any related matters? If not, how do you justify that conclusion?

    RESPONSE: Consistent with the long-standing principles of federal prosecution as outlined in the Justice Manual, several experienced prosecutors and investigators have reviewed the materials and determined that no further individuals should be charged. If additional evidence of any federal crime is identified in the future, the DOJ will evaluate that evidence in accordance with long-standing policy.

75. Who made the decision to keep a significant number of the Epstein records sealed or unreleased?

    RESPONSE: All known responsive documents under the Act have been released.

    a. Did you personally approve that decision?

        RESPONSE: All known responsive documents under the Act have been released.

76. **Obstruction of the New Mexico Department of Justice:** The Attorney General of New Mexico wrote you on July 14, 2026, laying out New Mexico law enforcement's repeated requests for your cooperation in sharing documents related to the Epstein files. Over 130 days have passed since they initially contacted you for assistance.

    a. Has the DOJ produced the records requested by the New Mexico Attorney General?

        RESPONSE: The Department works cooperatively with state law enforcement partners on matters of mutual interest while carefully balancing federal law, privileges, victim privacy, and the terms of the EFTA. Unredacted or sensitive records are not shared broadly to avoid compromising ongoing federal interest, active investigations, or protected information. Any specific requests for access are handled through established intergovernmental channels and evaluated on a case-by-case basis consistent with applicable law.

    b. Will you instruct the United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York to provide the records to the New Mexico Attorney General?

        RESPONSE: See subpart (a) above.

77. Under your direction, the Department of Justice failed to release the records required by law. Refusing to help the New Mexico DOJ is just another step in your efforts to cover up

Epstein crimes, now by obstructing a state law enforcement criminal investigation. With appropriate confidentiality provisions built in, will you commit to providing the office of the New Mexico Attorney General the documents they need for their investigation?

RESPONSE: The Department works cooperatively with state law enforcement partners on matters of mutual interest while carefully balancing federal law, privileges, victim privacy, and the terms of the EFTA. Unredacted or sensitive records are not shared broadly to avoid compromising ongoing federal interest, active investigations, or protected information. Any specific requests for access are handled through established intergovernmental channels and evaluated on a case-by-case basis consistent with applicable law.

78. According to the New Mexico Department of Justice, their law enforcement officials have requested specific unredacted Epstein records no less than five times since February 2026. That law enforcement authority has publicly stated that it is actively conducting a criminal investigation into Jeffrey Epstein's alleged crimes at Zorro Ranch in Santa Fe County.

    a. Yes or No, will you commit to providing the unredacted Epstein records to the New Mexico Department of Justice within the next 10 days?

        RESPONSE: The Department works cooperatively with state law enforcement partners on matters of mutual interest while carefully balancing federal law, privileges, victim privacy, and the terms of the EFTA. Unredacted or sensitive records are not shared broadly to avoid compromising ongoing federal interest, active investigations, or protected information. Any specific requests for access are handled through established intergovernmental channels and evaluated on a case-by-case basis consistent with applicable law.

    b. Are you aware that a prosecutor at the United States Attorneys Office in the Southern District of New York told the New Mexico DOJ prosecutor that they would not provide any records in response to a formal request?

        RESPONSE: See subpart (a) above.

    c. Are there any current court orders that prohibit release of documents from the Jeffrey Epstein or Ghislaine Maxwell files to a law enforcement authority? If so, please list the case names, docket numbers, and the specific court order that prohibits disclosure of records to another law enforcement agency.

        RESPONSE: See subpart (a) above.

79. If the New Mexico Department of Justice formally moves to amend an existing protective order that is preventing your DOJ from producing records, will you direct the US DOJ to support that request?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on an incomplete hypothetical scenario. The Department works cooperatively with state law enforcement partners on matters of mutual interest while carefully balancing federal law, privileges, victim privacy, and the terms of the EFTA. Unredacted or sensitive records are not shared broadly to avoid compromising ongoing federal interest, active investigations, or protected information. Any specific requests for access are handled through established intergovernmental channels and evaluated on a case-by-case basis consistent with applicable law.

80. In February 2026, the New Mexico State House created a bipartisan legislative "Truth Commission" charged with investigating Jeffrey Epstein's activities at his Zorro Ranch and the systemic failures that allowed alleged abuse and sex trafficking to go unaddressed for decades. Yes or no, will you commit to providing any requested records to the bipartisan Truth Commission within the next 10 days?

    RESPONSE: The Department works cooperatively with state law enforcement partners on matters of mutual interest while carefully balancing federal law, privileges, victim privacy, and the terms of the EFTA. Unredacted or sensitive records are not shared broadly to avoid compromising ongoing federal interest, active investigations, or protected information. Any specific requests for access are handled through established intergovernmental channels and evaluated on a case-by-case basis consistent with applicable law.

81. **Intimidation of Elizabeth Oyer:** On April 23, 2025, I sent a letter to you expressing concern regarding reports you sent armed U.S. Marshals to the home of former Pardon Attorney Elizabeth Oyer to warn her against appearing before members of Congress. Oyer had been invited to present at a spotlight hearing on weaponization of the DOJ. Oyer confirmed receipt of the letter before the U.S. Marshals arrived at her residence. When the Marshals arrived, Oyer's teenage son was home alone. To date, I have received no response.

    a. Please provide the justification for directing Special Deputy U.S. Marshals to deliver a letter to Ms. Oyer at her personal residence.

        RESPONSE: The Department did not send "armed U.S. Marshals" or "Special Deputy U.S. Marshals" to Ms. Oyer's home. Instead, the Department's Justice Management Division (JMD) utilized an Inspector to attempt to deliver a letter to Ms. Oyer. Once JMD confirmed that Ms. Oyer received the letter by email, JMD called back the Inspector before he arrived at Ms. Oyer's home.

    b. Please provide the names and roles of individuals involved in the decision to direct Special Deputy U.S. Marshals to deliver the letter to Ms. Oyer at her personal residence.

        RESPONSE: See prior response. In addition, this request seeks internal deliberative information that would not be appropriate to provide.

c. Please provide all records reflecting or relating to communications between and among you, Attorney General Pam Bondi, Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General (PADAG) Emil Bove, Associate Deputy Attorney General Kendra Wharton, any other Office of the Attorney General (OAG) or ODAG official, the Security and Emergency Planning Staff and any other staff in the Justice Management Division (JMD), and/or any White House official concerning the decision to direct Special Deputy U.S. Marshals to deliver the letter to Ms. Oyer at her personal residence.

RESPONSE: See prior response.

d. Please provide all records reflecting or relating to communications between and among you, Attorney General Pam Bondi, PADAG Emil Bove, Associate Deputy Attorney General Kendra Wharton, any other OAG or ODAG official, the Security and Emergency Planning Staff and any other JMD staff, and/or any White House official concerning policies or procedures relating to direction of U.S. Marshals.

RESPONSE: No such written policies or procedures exist to the best of my knowledge.

e. From January 20, 2025, through the present, please list all instances in which you or anyone in your Office has directed Deputy U.S. Marshals to deliver a letter to a current or former federal employee.

RESPONSE: I am not aware of any such directives.

82. **January 6th Offenders Pardons:** While speaking at the Conservative Political Action Conference on March 26, 2026, you spoke approvingly about the sweeping clemency granted to the individuals who stormed the Capitol. You said: "If you look at what happened to the men and women convicted because of January 6th, by 5pm on January 20th every one of them was either pardoned or had their sentence commuted, okay? So when folks say 'you've done nothing,' I say 'you have a very short memory."

a. Please explain your statement.

RESPONSE: That statement describes the relief in the form of pardons and commutations President Trump provided to January 6 defendants on January 20, 2025.

b. If you were recused from involving yourself in these dismissals, many of which took place after you became DAG, was it appropriate for you to brag about actions like these that benefited your former client?

RESPONSE: I do not understand what is meant by "brag" in this question. The statement referenced above was a statement of fact regarding the pardons and commutations President Trump provided to January 6 defendants on January 20, 2025.

83. The Trump administration's blanket clemency erased the criminal convictions of individuals who violently assaulted law enforcement officers, some of whom have been arrested or convicted of new violent offenses *since* President Trump's sweeping pardons. And yet, when asked whether you would support taxpayer-funded payouts to January 6 rioters who assaulted police officers, you said: "People that hurt police get money all the time."

    a. Do you believe that American taxpayers should foot the bill for individuals who violently assault law enforcement officers?

    RESPONSE: Any violent assault on a law enforcement officer is abhorrent, and any individual who violently assaults a federal law enforcement officer will be prosecuted by the Department of Justice. Separately, there is a process by which individuals who claim a violation of their rights can seek recompense. In some of those cases, claimants receive monetary relief. It would be inappropriate for me to provide a categorical answer as to the validity of such cases.

    b. Do you believe that American taxpayers should foot the bill for individuals like Jared Wise, who was charged with multiple felony offenses and captured on police body camera footage on January 6th repeatedly yelling "kill 'em" as insurrectionists attacked law enforcement officers?

    RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 83(a).

    c. Why was Jared Wise employed with the Justice Department as a senior adviser in the Office of the Deputy Attorney General during your tenure?

    RESPONSE: I did not hire Jared Wise. It would otherwise be inappropriate for me to comment on personnel matters within the Department of Justice.

84. **Hiring of Jared Wise:** On September 3, 2025, I sent then-Attorney General Pam Bondi a letter strongly objecting to the Department of Justice's decision to hire January 6th insurrectionist Jared Wise as a senior advisor. Body camera footage from the January 6th insurrection reveals Wise referring to law enforcement officers protecting the Capitol as "disgusting", "Nazi[s]," and "Gestapo." Wise also called on protestors to "kill 'em," in reference to those same law enforcement officers. To date, I have received no response. Will you commit to providing my office in advance of the Committee's Business Meeting considering your nomination:

RESPONSE: I did not hire Mr. Wise and had no role in his appointment. He separated from the Department in April 2026 and is no longer employed at the Department of

Justice. As to the specific requests below, personnel matters and internal deliberations concerning a former employee are not appropriate subjects for public itemization, particularly where they may implicate Privacy Act protections and applicable privileges.

a. A list of all DOJ officials who proposed, reviewed, or approved Wise's appointment at DOJ.

RESPONSE: I did not hire Mr. Wise and had no role in his appointment. The hiring process for a former employee concerns internal personnel deliberations that I do not think it appropriate to detail here.

b. All documents and communications dated or occurring after January 20, 2025, between former U.S. Attorney Ed Martin and Wise relating to the charges against Wise for his conduct at the Capitol on January 6, 2021, or his pardon from President Trump.

RESPONSE: I am not a party to and have no personal knowledge of any such communications, and I will not characterize particular communications in this setting.

c. All documents and communications dated or occurring after January 20, 2025, between Martin and Wise relating to any prospective role for Wise at DOJ or its components.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 84(b).

d. A detailed description of Wise's relationship with Martin while Wise was a defendant subject to charges for his conduct at the Capitol on January 6, 2021.

RESPONSE: I have no personal knowledge of any relationship between Mr. Martin and Mr. Wise predating their Department service, and I will not speculate.

e. A detailed description of Wise's role at DOJ, including all officials to whom he reports.

RESPONSE: Mr. Wise, before his separation from the Department in April 2026, served in an advisory capacity in connection with the Weaponization Working Group. Beyond confirming that he is no longer employed by the Department, I do not think it appropriate to detail the internal assignments of a former employee.

f. A detailed description of all so-called "weaponization" matters within Wise's portfolio at DOJ.

RESPONSE: The work of the Weaponization Working Group centers around the seven areas outlined in General Bondi's memo of February 2025. It would not be appropriate to detail specific matters, particularly those of a former employee.

g. A detailed description of the clearance level, if any, provided to Wise, including all specific compartments.

RESPONSE: Information concerning an individual's security clearance and any access to classified compartments is itself sensitive and is not appropriately disclosed in this setting.

85. **Tulsi Gabbard Election Interference:** In a press conference earlier this year, you were asked to explain Tulsi Gabbard's presence in Fulton County, GA during an FBI search of an elections warehouse. You stated "Of course, that's a big part of her, of her job. And so the fact that she was present in Atlanta that day, you know, it's something that shouldn't surprise anybody." When pressed further by reporters, you stated "I said this administration works closely together in all kinds of different areas, and so I'm not sure if they're surprised that the administration is working together on things like election integrity." However, in a later interview with CNN's State of the Union, you stated you did not know why she was present at the warehouse.
    a. Did you, or did you not, know that Gabbard was present at the Fulton County search?

    RESPONSE: As I previously stated, nobody should have been surprised by DNI Gabbard's presence.

    b. Did you know why Gabbard was present at the Fulton County search?

    RESPONSE: As this question pertains to the substance of an ongoing criminal investigation, it would be inappropriate for me to comment.

    c. Did you request her presence at the search? If not, who did?

    RESPONSE: I did not request DNI Gabbard's presence at the search.

    d. Will the current Acting Director of National Intelligence also appear at elections warehouses or polling locations?

    RESPONSE: It is inappropriate for me to address hypothetical situations.

    e. Would you advise the President to request the Director of National Intelligence be present at elections warehouses or polling locations in the future?

    RESPONSE: It is inappropriate for me to speculate on hypothetical situations or otherwise comment on advice I may or may not give to the President.

86. **Law Enforcement at Federal Polling Places:** During an appearance at the CPAC, you appeared to endorse sending federal agents to polling places. Please clarify. Please cite the legal authority that empowers federal law enforcement to appear at polling places.

RESPONSE: The question does not provide any details about the date or text of this supposed endorsement. As I stated in my confirmation hearing, I am committed to following all laws, including those that govern federal law enforcement presence at polling places.

a. Do you agree it would be illegal for federal law enforcement agents to appear armed at a polling place?

RESPONSE: As I stated in my confirmation hearing, I am committed to following all laws, including those that govern federal law enforcement presence at polling places.

b. If confirmed, will you commit to ensuring all voters are allowed to vote freely and fairly without intimidation from federal law enforcement?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 86(a).

87. Under your tenure as Deputy Attorney General and Acting Deputy Attorney General, the Department of Justice has attempted to collect full, unredacted voter rolls with sensitive voter data across the country and has obtained complete voter rolls from several states. Has DOJ permitted access to this voter data to the Department of Homeland Security?

RESPONSE: This question pertains to ongoing litigation and as such, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on the same.

a. If so, which agencies within DHS accessed this information?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 87.

b. Under what legal authority did DOJ transfer or provide access to the information received from the states?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 87.

c. Have any other departments received this information? If so, for what purpose and under what legal authority?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 87.

d. Has DOJ shared any unredacted voter roll data with government contractors?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 87.

e. Do any of these transfers include information like social security numbers and driver's license numbers?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 87.

88. National Security Presidential Memorandum-7 proposes that the Attorney General has the authority to "recommend that any group or entity whose members are engaged in activities meeting the definition of 'domestic terrorism' in 18 U.S.C. 2331(5)" be designated as domestic terrorists.

    a. To date, has Department of Justice recommended to the President that any groups or individuals be identified as domestic terrorists? Which groups? If so, what was your role in reviewing that recommendation?

       RESPONSE: The advice and recommendations that the Department provides to the President are among the most closely protected executive communications. If confirmed, I will continue to commit to enforcing the laws enacted by Congress and the laws of the United States.

    b. Under your leadership, how does DOJ operationalize the statutory definition of "domestic terrorism"? In specific detail, please tell this Committee what kind of conduct defines domestic terrorism.

       RESPONSE: Domestic terrorism includes "activities that . . . involve acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State" that are intended to intimidate or coerce a civilian population, influence policy, or affect the conduct of the government through violence. If confirmed, I will continue enforce the laws enacted by Congress, to include 18 U.S.C. § 2331(5).

    c. What threshold is the DOJ using to open a "domestic terrorism" investigation or assessment after NSPM-7? Has DOJ created any written guidance or policy that sets out the factual threshold for opening a "domestic terrorism" matter?

       RESPONSE: Investigations into domestic terror are governed by the same legal standards that govern criminal investigations generally. The standard to initiate a criminal investigation requires facts or circumstances that reasonably indicate a crime has been, is being, or will be committed.

89. National Security Presidential Memorandum-7 directs the Joint Terrorism Task Forces to investigate alleged domestic terrorism. To your knowledge, have these task forces created a database of individuals or entities they are investigating or have identified as domestic terrorists?

    RESPONSE: To the extent I was even aware of any centralized database of individuals or entities, I would not be able to comment due to law enforcement sensitivities.

    a. If yes, how was the list generated?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 89.

b. Since you joined DOJ in January 2025, has the Department ever used participation in First Amendment-protected activity, such as peaceful protest or social media posts, as a reason or supporting fact to refer individuals for investigation to Joint Terrorism Task Forces or to add them to a domestic terrorist list?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice is a key defender of the rights enshrined in the First Amendment, and this Department does not investigate individuals for exercising their constitutional rights. Rather, the Department investigates and prosecutes potential violations of federal criminal law, based on the facts, all applicable law, the Justice Manual, and the Principles of Federal Prosecution.

c. Does DOJ work at all with the Department of Homeland Security to maintain a list of alleged domestic terrorists? If yes, how so?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 89.

90. **Statements about Members of Congress**: When addressing the Members of Congress who issued a video advising U.S. service members that they have a right not to follow unlawful or unconstitutional orders, you previously stated on Fox News, "I think they should be held to account. I think that those congressmen should be required to answer questions and to answer questions about why they did what they did. And the American people deserve that, and so does President Trump."

a. Please explain what you meant when you said President Trump *deserves* answers from the Members lawfully exercising their constitutional rights to communicate with the public.

RESPONSE: Under longstanding Department policy, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on pending litigation.

b. Please explain what you meant when you said these Members should be "held to account?"

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 90(a).

c. What should they be "held to account" for?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 90(a).

91. Please explain whether a court order issued orally from the bench is as legally binding as a written order.

RESPONSE: I will always advise a client, including agencies of the Executive Branch, to comply with court orders in force and applicable to them.

92. Do you believe all parties have to comply with oral orders from the bench?

RESPONSE: I will always advise a client, including agencies of the Executive Branch, to comply with court orders applicable to them.

93. If you are instructed by the President, the Vice President, or any White House personnel – directly or indirectly – to either defy, ignore, or delay the implementation of a court order, will you do it?

RESPONSE: I respectfully reject that premise. If confirmed, I will continue to always uphold my oath to support and defend the Constitution and I would follow the law.

94. In February 2026, Judge Schiltz in Minnesota issued an unprecedented statement demanding that "One way or another, ICE will comply with this Court's orders," after having to threaten civil or criminal contempt against the US Attorney for Minnesota.

    a. Do you believe judges should have to threaten the DOJ with civil or criminal contempt to get them to follow the law?

    RESPONSE: This is a gross mischaracterization and does not reflect my experience or observation of the diligent public servants and dedicated litigators who serve the American public at the Justice Department.

95. This administration has fired over 100 immigration judges, many with decades of experience and knowledge about the complexities of immigration law.

    a. Please explain how firing immigration judges promotes fair and orderly processing of immigration matters.

    RESPONSE: The Department of Justice, through EOIR, regularly monitors the performance and conduct of its adjudicators in order to promote the fair and orderly processing of immigration matters. The Department of Justice continually evaluates all immigration judges on factors such as conduct, impartiality/bias, adherence to the law, productivity/performance, and professionalism. The failure to meet such standards necessarily undermines the fair and orderly processing of immigration matters, and judges who fail to meet those standards, especially those who demonstrate partiality or bias, may face disciplinary action, including removal.

    b. How many Judge Advocate Generals have been assigned as Special Assistant U.S. Attorneys to date?

RESPONSE: There are currently 44 attorneys on detail from the Department of War as Temporary Immigration Judges. Those individuals are not assigned as Special Assistant U.S. Attorneys.

c. What analysis has your office done on the effect on our servicemembers, military law justice, and fairness in our civil immigration courts, before allowing JAGs to serve as immigration judges?

RESPONSE: The requirements for Temporary Immigration Judges are established by regulation. 8 C.F.R. § 1003.10(e). All detailed Department of War attorneys are well-qualified to serve in that capacity, and the Department of War has strongly supported those details.

96. **Abbott Laboratories Investigation:** On July 8, 2026, I sent you a letter regarding the Department of Justice's decision to drop a multiyear criminal investigation into Abbott Laboratories, despite obtaining significant evidence and a recommendation of charges relating to tainted baby formula. I requested detailed information on the decision to drop the criminal investigation. To date, I have received no response.

a. You have stated publicly that criminal cases targeting corporations should focus on charging individuals, yet the Abbott matter reportedly involved a high-level recommendation to charge executives for defrauding the government. Why does a case involving harm to American infants, including some who tragically died and a "culture of concealment" not merit the harsh penalties of criminal prosecution?

RESPONSE: As stated during my testimony, President Trump's Administration and this Department is focused on keeping America safe. We will always protect the most vulnerable Americans, including infants. Prosecutorial decisions by the Department should be made consistent with Chapter 9 of the Justice Manual, in particular section 9-27.000 (Principles of Federal Prosecution), and the Department reviews each case that comes before it on its own merits. It would otherwise be inappropriate for me to comment on prosecutorial decisionmaking within the Department.

b. Which "top decision makers" at DOJ determined that the Abbott case did not merit a criminal prosecution?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 96(a).

c. According to public reports, the Assistant Attorney General leading the Criminal Division recommended charges in this matter. Why did you overrule that recommendation?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 96(a).

d. Did you personally review the proposed criminal charges against Abbott, its executives or employees? If so, did you conclude that the charges lacked merit? If not, who did you assign to overrule career prosecutors and supervisors?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 96(a).

e. What criteria would you use to overrule a prosecution recommendation from an Assistant Attorney General?

RESPONSE: Prosecutorial decisions by the Department should be made consistent with Chapter 9 of the Justice Manual, in particular section 9-27.000 (Principles of Federal Prosecution), and the Department reviews each case that comes before it on its own merits.

f. Did "top decision makers" close the criminal investigation before or after Abbott made an offer to settle the False Claims Act case? If after, how do you respond to charges that justice in your DOJ is for sale?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 96(a). Furthermore, any suggestion that the Department "is for sale" is patently false.

g. Did your office complete an analysis of the principles of prosecuting business organizations as required by the Justice Manual after receiving a recommendation from career prosecutors? If so, what factors did DOJ political appointees weigh more heavily in overruling the career investigators' recommendation?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 96(a).

h. What is your relationship with Mark Filip? Did you know that he had advocated for removing authority to charge criminal cases from the very office that was investigating his client Abbott Laboratories? Please commit to providing copies of all communications and written materials related to criminal enforcement authorities that Kirkland & Ellis or Filip provided to DOJ within the next two weeks.

RESPONSE: I do not have a close relationship with Mark Filip, and I am not familiar with Mr. Filip's "advocacy" you reference. Furthermore, I am not familiar with the "communications" or "written materials" you reference, and it would be inappropriate for me to commit to the production of any materials, particularly when any such disclosure might implicate Department policy or applicable law.

i. When did you learn that Filip's law firm, Kirkland & Ellis LLP, was providing free legal services for the federal government?

RESPONSE: I am not aware of what you mean by "providing free legal services for the federal government," so I cannot answer that question.

j. Do you know the value of free legal services provided by Kirkland & Ellis to the federal government?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 96(i).

k. Acting FDA Commissioner Kyle Diamantas previously served as defense counsel for Abbott Laboratories in cases involving allegations of harm from infant formula. What contact, if any, did Diamantas have with DOJ officials regarding the decision to drop the criminal investigation of Abbott?

RESPONSE: I do not know.

l. If prosecuting cases involving injuries or death to premature infants are no longer a priority enforcement matter, what priorities are the DOJ Criminal Division's Health & Safety Unit pursuing?

RESPONSE: Any suggestion that "prosecuting cases involving injuries or death to premature infants are no longer a priority enforcement matter" is patently false. Each and every day, the Department investigates and prosecutes violations of federal laws designed to protect public health and safety. That mission is more important than ever before because, as stated numerous times during my testimony, President Trump's Administration and this Department is focused on keeping America safe. We will always protect the most vulnerable Americans, including infants.

97. **Binance Investigation:** On June 15, 2026, I sent a letter to you and Secretary Bessent requesting information regarding Treasury and DOJ efforts to prevent cryptocurrency exchange Binance from facilitating Iranian sanctions evasion. Binance was permitted to facilitate sanctions evasion despite agreeing to retain Compliance Monitors as part of a 2023 settlement with DOJ and Treasury for prior money laundering activity. Binance also holds nearly 80 percent of all USD1 tokens, a cryptocurrency tied to World Liberty Financial, the Trump-Witkoff cryptocurrency venture. President Trump's recent 2025 financial disclosure indicates his revenue from World Liberty Financial grew by over $742 million since he took office in January. I received a non-substantive response on July 14, 2026.

a. As part of its 2023 settlement with the Departments of Justice and Treasury, Binance agreed to maintain two independent Compliance Monitors for three and five years. In September 2025, reports suggested that "federal prosecutors are in discussions with Binance over a requirement to maintain an outside compliance monitor," possibly "moving toward a potential deal with the US Justice Department that would allow it to drop a key oversight requirement in its $4.3 billion settlement." The Departments of Justice and Treasury have failed to

meaningfully respond to congressional inquiries in recent months regarding its oversight of Binance.

i. Do these Compliance Monitors continue to remain in place, per the settlement agreement?

RESPONSE: While I cannot comment on ongoing enforcement, including the enforcement of terms of a specific agreement, the Department actively reviews corporate compliance following execution of settlement agreements.

ii. Please provide all records of compliance Binance has provided to your agencies and preserve all communications between agency officials and Binance staff or investors regarding the Compliance Monitor agreement and appointment.

RESPONSE: I am not familiar with these records, and it would be inappropriate for me to commit to their production. At the same time, the Department maintains records in accordance with applicable preservation regulations and policies.

iii. What measures does the Justice Department employ to ensure Compliance Monitors appointed as a condition of settlement function adequately?

RESPONSE: In general, to ensure compliance monitors function adequately and in accordance with Department policies, the Department has structural oversight and strict monitor management protocols which are overseen by specific divisions, such as the Criminal Division.

98. Reporting indicates Binance facilitated nearly $2 billion in transactions involving Iran despite Binance's agreement to host Compliance Monitors.

a. What oversight of these transactions has the Treasury or Justice Departments conducted?

RESPONSE: I am not familiar with this "reporting" and it would be inappropriate for me to comment on those reports. The Department takes seriously any allegations of criminal wrongdoing, particularly those by corporations and their employees under agreements with the Department and those that implicate national security concerns. I cannot comment on specific enforcement activity, including oversight of specific agreements. Generally, however, to help ensure compliance monitors function adequately, the Department has structural oversight and strict monitor management protocols which are overseen by specific divisions, such as the Criminal Division.

b. What actions did you take to preserve all relevant records between agency officials on this topic?

RESPONSE: At all times, my Office complies with applicable policies and law.

99. Is the Justice Department investigating Binance's continued role in facilitating over $1.7 billion in transactions involving Iran after the settlement agreement?

RESPONSE: The Department is committed to taking all measures to protect the U.S. financial system. However, it would be inappropriate for me to comment on potentially ongoing matters with the Department.

100. What steps is the Department of Justice taking to prevent any current or future terrorist financing activity through cryptocurrency exchanges?

RESPONSE: The Department takes seriously its obligation to protect all Americans and the U.S. financial system, including by identifying and prosecuting terrorist organizations. The Criminal Division and U.S. Attorneys' Offices personnel are well resourced to pursue relevant criminal prosecutions. It would be inappropriate, however, for me to comment on potentially ongoing matters with the Department.

101. Have you or other officials at the Department of Justice received any formal or informal communications or directives from other Administration personnel regarding investigations into Binance? If so, please provide those directives and any related communications.

RESPONSE: Given the potential applicability of communication privileges, it would not be appropriate for me to relay any "formal or informal communications or directives" in response to this question.

102. **Halkbank Investigation:** In 2019, federal prosecutors including Emil Bove charged Turkish bank Halkbank with money laundering, fraud, and conspiracy for facilitating Iranian sanctions evasion. However, in March 2026, the Department of Justice agreed to enter a deferred prosecution agreement and dismiss the indictment against Halkbank, allowing the Bank to avoid paying fines, forfeiture, or restitution. On April 15, 2026, I sent you a letter requesting information on this decision. To date, I have received no response.

a. Unlike a typical deferred prosecution agreement with a term of several years, the Halkbank settlement does not include any clear statement of when the agreement will expire such that the government would dismiss charges. How long do you expect Halkbank to show its ongoing compliance with sanctions laws?

RESPONSE: The terms of the resolution are set forth in the agreement itself, which speaks for itself. It would be inappropriate for me to characterize the parties' obligations beyond the terms of that agreement.

b. Please detail the Department of Justice's assessment of how the funds laundered through Halkbank were used by Iran or its proxies, including any portion that supported acts of terrorism against Americans. What methodology did the Department use to determine the extent of this connection?

RESPONSE: Consistent with longstanding Department policy, it would be inappropriate for me to disclose law-enforcement-sensitive information or the Department's confidential internal deliberations.

c. Was dismissing the Halkbank prosecution a condition of Turkey's assistance in Gaza, and if so, what was the potential financial value to the Turkish government?

RESPONSE: The resolution was based on the facts and the law. Beyond that, it would be inappropriate for me to discuss the Department's confidential internal deliberations or diplomatic communications of any kind, which fall outside the Department's purview.

d. Given that the Halkbank resolution includes no fine, forfeiture, or restitution, please explain how the Department of Justice intends to ensure consistent and meaningful compensation for victims of state-sponsored terrorism through the U.S. Victims of State Sponsored Terrorism Fund, which relies on deposits from sanctions-related cases. What alternative funding mechanisms did the Department of Justice identify?"

RESPONSE: The Department is committed to supporting victims of state-sponsored terrorism, including through the U.S. Victims of State Sponsored Terrorism Fund. If confirmed, I will continue to consult with relevant Department personnel regarding the Fund and its resources.

e. How will the use of an independent and expert evaluation for Halkbank further national security interests through "combatting money laundering and terror finance?"

RESPONSES: The terms of the resolution, including its compliance provisions, are set forth in the agreement, which speaks for itself.

f. Please explain how the Department of Justice assessed the potential impact of this resolution on future deterrence of sanctions evasion and the enforcement of U.S. sanction laws.

RESPONSE: Please see my response to question 102(b).

g. Considering that U.S. troops are currently engaged in a war in Iran, how will the Department of Justice guarantee that Halkbank is no longer laundering funds that could fund the Iranian regime's war effort?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to question 102(b).

h. Did the Department of Justice receive guidance, directly or indirectly, from the president or other political officials regarding the resolution of this case?

RESPONSE: As reflected in the Department's March 9, 2026 filing, the resolution took account of national-security and foreign-policy considerations described in that filing. Beyond the Department's public filings, it would be inappropriate for me to discuss any confidential deliberations that fall under any applicable privilege.

i. Were any communications made between the White House and the Department of Justice regarding Halkbank in the period leading up to the resolution?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to question 102(h).

j. At the time of the agreement was the Department of Justice aware of President Erdoğan's political and familial ties to individuals who would be potentially liable under the prosecution?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to question 102(b).

k. Is the Department concerned about whether dismissing this case will signal to foreign financial institutions, foreign governments, and other perpetuators of fraud that they can undermine our sanctions and anti-corruption laws so long as they please President Trump?

RESPONSE: No. The Department enforces the sanctions and anti-corruption laws of the United States based on the facts and the law.

l. If a foreign head of state is alleged to have had some influence on the resolution of a case, how does the Department ensure thorough investigation of this influence and prosecutorial independence?

RESPONSE: Charging and resolution decisions at the Department are made consistent with the Principles of Federal Prosecution and thus are based on facts and applicable law. If confirmed, I will continue to ensure the Department's decisions are made on that basis.

103. **Detention of SEIU President David Huerta:** On June 9, 2025, I sent then-Attorney General Bondi a letter regarding the detention of David Huerta, president of the Service Employees International Union California, by Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Drug Enforcement Agency officers. Mr. Huerta, a U.S. citizen, was injured by law enforcement officers when they tried to arrest him. To date, I have received no response.

a. Which DOJ components and personnel were involved in the actions that resulted in the injuries sustained by Mr. Huerta and what disciplinary actions were taken as a result?

RESPONSE: Although the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Central District of California took certain actions following Mr. Huerta's arrest, the Department of Justice did not have any involvement "in the actions that resulted in the [alleged] injuries sustained by Mr. Huerta."

b. Under what legal authority did DOJ detain Mr. Huerta?

RESPONSE: The Department of Justice did not detain Mr. Huerta.

104. ***Trump v. IRS*** **Lawsuit:** You personally signed the May 19, 2026, addendum granting tax immunity to President Trump, his family, his company, and related individuals. In response to a question by Senator Cornyn in your nomination hearing, you stated that "this type of settlement is not unique."

a. Have you personally signed any other documents that similarly deny the federal government's ability to bring tax fraud claims against a person or entity for more than a decade of tax claims?

RESPONSE: The premise of this question is flawed as the document does not do what the question states. Nevertheless, closing agreements contain confidential taxpayer return information and as such, the unauthorized disclosure of such information would violate the Revenue Code. It would be inappropriate for me to comment on agreements of this kind.

b. If yes, did any of those other releases also apply to an entire family and any "related companies, affiliates, or subsidiaries?"

RESPONSE: The premise of this question is flawed as the document does not do what the question states. Nevertheless, closing agreements contain confidential taxpayer return information and as such, the unauthorized disclosure of such information would violate the Revenue Code. It would be inappropriate for me to comment on agreements of this kind.

105. How does the Department of Justice define the scope of "related companies, affiliates, or subsidiaries" for the purposes of the May 19, 2026, agreement you signed to grant tax immunity to President Trump, his family, and companies?

a. How many "related companies, affiliates, or subsidiaries" were released from tax liability by your signature?

RESPONSE: The document speaks for itself.

106. Did you or any Department of Justice employee ask the IRS to sign the agreement?

RESPONSE: Conversations between the Department of Justice and the IRS are protected by attorney-client privilege. To the extent your use of the phrase "the agreement" refers to the parties' settlement agreement, the IRS Chief Executive Officer signed.

a. If yes, why did no one from the IRS sign the agreement granting tax immunity to President Trump, his family, and companies?

RESPONSE: I reject the premise of this question. The agreement does not grant tax immunity, it grants a release of limited claims related to the tax returns in question. Regardless of the flaws in the question, it is also the position of the Department of Justice that the Attorney General possesses plenary settlement authority of claims against the United States so no other signatories were required.

107. Did President Trump, either personally, through an attorney, employee or another agent, request the broad release of claims including tax audits?

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, I did not speak with the President about this matter prior to the execution of the Settlement and/or the issuance of the related Attorney General memoranda.

a. At your hearing on July 15, 2026, you stated that you spoke with President Trump about the anti-weaponization fund idea. How many times did you speak with the President about the idea?

RESPONSE: That is not an accurate characterization of my testimony. As I testified, I did not discuss the settlement with the President or his outside counsel. The only conversations I had with the President about the matter came after the Department had determined the Fund would not move forward. I will not further detail my communications with the President.

b. You also testified that the settlement agreement, dated May 18 and May 19, 2026, would not affect the President's tax liability, or that of his family and their businesses for the previous year, even though taxes were due to be filed by April 15. Why does the tax agreement you signed not preclude an audit or investigation into any crypto or other profits they filed taxes on prior to your signing the agreement? Did you testify falsely?

RESPONSE: The document speaks for itself.

c. You've said there were "negotiations included a discussion around the any pending audits" but that you were not involved. How is that possible, since you are the sole signatory to the release?

RESPONSE: The Attorney General is regularly a signatory to actions on which he had no direct involvement. Beyond that, it is inappropriate for me to comment on internal discussions that are deliberative in nature, including whether they may or may not have occurred.

d. Who came up with it? Who drafted it?

RESPONSE: It is inappropriate for me to comment on discussions that are deliberative in nature, including whether they may or may not have occurred.

e. Which White House staff were involved in settlement negotiations? Which ones did you discuss the release of claims with?

RESPONSE: It is inappropriate for me to comment on discussions that are deliberative in nature, including whether they may or may not have occurred.

f. Which of the President's personal lawyers did you discuss it with?

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, I did not speak with the President's personal counsel about this matter.

g. Did you have any conversations with Secretary Bessent about the release of claims?

RESPONSE: It is inappropriate for me to comment on discussions that may be attorney-client privileged and that are deliberative in nature, including whether they may or may not have occurred.

h. Did you talk to IRS CEO Bisignano about the release of claims, or any other IRS employee?

RESPONSE: It is inappropriate for me to comment on discussions that may be attorney-client privileged and that are deliberative in nature, including whether they may or may not have occurred.

108. Why did you refuse to put in writing, under penalty of perjury, that the anti-weaponization fund is over, and similar efforts will not be undertaken in another name?

RESPONSE: This response is in writing and supplements my sworn testimony: the Fund is not moving forward. There are no commissioners, no claims process, and no payments. Further, as I testified, the Department will provide Congress technical assistance on legislative language to resolve the matter permanently.

a. You have refused to rule out providing financial payouts from DOJ-controlled taxpayer funds to violent January 6 criminals convicted in federal courts. Is that still the case?

RESPONSE: No payment has been made from the Fund, and none will be under my leadership. Any claim any individual makes against the United States is evaluated on the facts and the law. A claimant's politics will neither advance a claim nor defeat one.

b. Are you aware that funding insurrectionists violates the 14th Amendment?

RESPONSE: No payment has been made from the Fund, and none will be under my leadership. My view of the underlying conduct has not changed. My view of the underlying conduct has not changed: individuals who assaulted law enforcement officers on January 6 should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

109. You personally signed the tax immunity deal for Trump and his inner circle – freeing them from charges due to past tax fraud, insider trading, sex trafficking, foreign corruption, or any other crime. Do you believe all presidents should receive this type of immunity, or just President Trump?

RESPONSE: The premise of this question is flawed. The document speaks for itself and does not extend to potential criminal charges. It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice. 26 U.S.C. 7217(e)(2) expressly authorizes the Attorney General to resolve IRS audits. As to whether the President of the United States is entitled to immunity, the Supreme Court has addressed this question. *See Trump v. United* States, 603 U.S. 607-09, 615 (2024) (holding that the President is "absolutely immune from criminal prosecution for conduct within his exclusive sphere of constitutional authority," and presumptively immune from prosecution for other official acts.).

110. If the President mischaracterized his hush money payments to porn star Stormy Daniels in a way that affected their tax treatment, would the settlement agreement you signed not prevent any audit of the matter?

RESPONSE: The premise of this question is flawed. The May 19, 2026 release speaks for itself and does not include the word "audit."

a. Did you consult with ethics lawyers about whether you should be recused from signing this tax settlement since you were Trump's former lawyer?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

b. What did ethics lawyers advise you?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

c. Did you follow their advice?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

d. If you did not consult them, why didn't you?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

111. Did ethics lawyers raise any other concerns with you about the tax settlement since the President Trump controlled parties on both sides of the agreement?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

112. Did the lawyers or other personnel at the Internal Revenue Service raise concerns about the settlement agreement?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

a. What concerns did IRS lawyers or other personnel raise?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

b. Did the IRS lawyers or other personnel believe that President Trump's lawsuit was barred by the Statute of Limitations? Wasn't it?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

113. Section 7 of Executive Order 14215 sets out the president's control over all executive agencies: "No employee of the executive branch may advance an interpretation of the law . . . that contravenes the President's opinion on a matter of law." Did you interpret this to mean that if the President said the Statute of Limitations did not apply to his tax suit against the IRS, that the IRS could not contest that?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

a. The IRS had a 25-page memo outlining major flaws in President Trump's case against the IRS. Did you read that memo before you agreed to the settlement? Did someone advocate for the points in the memo? Why were they ignored? Did you believe that Section 7 above required you to accept the president's legal arguments as controlling?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

b. If there were solid defenses to President Trump's suit, who made the decision not to assert them in court?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

c. If President Trump were to assert that his receipt of a $400 million plane from a country, Qatar, that has foreign policy interests before the U.S. government does not violate the Emoluments Clause, Article I, Section 9, Clause 8, of the Constitution then is his assertion on these self-serving matters controlling on the DOJ?

RESPONSE: The premise of this question is flawed. It would be inappropriate for me to comment on any communication I may have, or may not have, with the President.

114. When asked why the settlement agreement was not provided to the court in the *Trump v. IRS* lawsuit, you said "there is no judge" and "no mechanism" for reviewing the settlement agreement. You essentially made the same claim during your testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee on July 15, 2026, by suggesting that Judge Williams did not ask for the Department of Justice's input.

a. Was there anything that prevented DOJ from seeking court approval for the settlement? Or to assert its view prior to the court's decision finding that the lawsuit was collusive?

RESPONSE: Article III of the U.S. Constitution prevents courts from issuing advisory opinions. It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

115. Judge Williams found that "this matter was brought for an improper purpose – to gain the imprimatur of judicial legitimacy for a 'settlement' that had no viable basis in law or fact." The judge also found that "Plaintiffs acted in bad faith and for improper purpose by collusively filing a lawsuit with claims subject to multiple dispositive defenses solely to provide cover for a collusive settlement." Do you agree or disagree with these two findings? Why?

RESPONSE: The Department has yet to play any role in the litigation you reference. Nonetheless, I disagree with these findings. As I testified at my confirmation hearing, there was no improper coordination or collusion of any kind between the Department and the plaintiffs, and the matter was dismissed in a manner fully consistent with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41.

a. Will DOJ abide by Judge Williams' order that the settlement agreement may not be referred to or relied upon in any court proceeding or other official proceeding? Will President Trump abide by Judge Williams' order?

RESPONSE: The Department is reviewing the Court's Order and weighing whether any response by the United States is required.

b. In the wake of Judge Williams' opinion and order, is the IRS free to go forward with audits or investigations of the president until and unless the decision is stayed by an appellate court?

RESPONSE: The premise of this question is flawed. Judge Williams acknowledged she cannot invalidate the settlement agreement. That said, neither the settlement agreement nor the May 19, 2026 release use the word "audit."

116. Judge Williams' order and opinion also stated: "This is an attempt to use the Court to provide some legitimacy to an agreement to confer immunity to people and entities affiliated with the president to earmark billions of dollars from American taxpayers to redress grievances not defined by law." Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Why?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 115.

117. If you only represented one side of the settlement agreement, how could you unilaterally assert that the anti-weaponization fund was dead?

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, the Fund can only operate through action by the Department, namely, the appointment of commissioners, the creation of a claims process, the transfer of funds, and payments. At my direction, the Department will not take these steps.

118. What legal authority did you rely on to bind the entire executive branch from pursuing investigations into the President's family inner circle, including curtailing audits done by the IRS, which you do not oversee?

RESPONSE: It has been the longstanding position of the Office of Legal Counsel that the Attorney General has the authority to compromise and/or release claims on behalf of the United States.

a. Did you personally consult with the IRS in advance of signing the purported tax release on May 19, 2026?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

b. Which members of the Office of the Attorney General or the Office of the Deputy Attorney General assisted you with drafting, negotiating, or completing the IRS tax release that was part of the *Trump v. IRS* settlement?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

c. What legal authority supports conferring immunity to non-parties to the *Trump v. IRS* lawsuit?

RESPONSE: It has been the longstanding view of the Office of Legal Counsel that the Attorney General has the authority to compromise and/or settle claims on behalf of the United States.

119. Did you ever discuss with the president, White House officials, or the president's personal attorneys granting the President immunity from tax audits as a condition of settling *Trump v. IRS*?

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, I did not speak to the President about this settlement before it was executed. It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

a. If so, please list the individuals who communicated with you about the grant of tax immunity to the President, his family, or related entities.

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

b. If not, who did that idea come from?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

120. What are the limits of the Attorney General's authority to make payments pursuant to the DOJ Judgment Fund?

RESPONSE: The Judgment Fund was established by Congress in 1956 to alleviate the need for specific legislation following every successful claim against the United States. It is generally governed by Section 1304 of Title 31 of the United States Code, Section 4-10 of the Justice Manual, and Office of Legal Counsel opinions.

121. Has the IRS taken any steps to implement the *Trump v. IRS* tax immunity addendum? If so, what steps?

RESPONSE: I cannot speak for what any official at the IRS has, or has not, done.

122. When did you become aware of President Trump's long-running audit with the IRS, which according to reporting "could have cost him more than $100 million" in overdue taxes?

RESPONSE: The premise of this question is flawed. I have no personal knowledge of whether the IRS was, or was not, conducting any audit of President Trump's tax returns.

a. If you cannot recall the specific date, were you aware of the audit before you were confirmed as Deputy Attorney General?

RESPONSE: The premise of this question is flawed. I have no personal knowledge of whether the IRS was, or was not, conducting any audit of President Trump's tax returns.

123. When did you become aware of the presidential audit program, which generally requires the President's tax returns to be examined every year?

RESPONSE: I do not have specific knowledge of the presidential audit program.

a. Were you aware of the presidential audit program before you were confirmed as Deputy Attorney General?

RESPONSE: I do not have specific knowledge of the presidential audit program.

124. Section 7217 of Title 26 of the United States Code states that "It shall be unlawful for any applicable person [including "the President, Vice President, and any employee of the executive office of the President"] to request, directly or indirectly, any officer or employee of the Internal Revenue Service to conduct or terminate an audit or other investigation of any particular taxpayer with respect to the tax liability of such taxpayer." Department of Justice officials reportedly raised questions about the tax immunity release for President Trump was in violation of this law.

a. What is your understanding of Section 7217 of Title 26 of the United States Code?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice. 26 U.S.C. 7217(e)(2) expressly authorizes the Attorney General to resolve IRS audits.

b. Who raised the issue of Section 7217?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

c. Why was it not asserted in court to stop Trump's lawsuit? Is Trump under investigation for violating that law?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

d. Who made the decision not to assert this section as a defense to Trump's lawsuit in court?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

e. If the broad release of President Trump's claims were to be found in violation that law, which agency would have power to bring an enforcement action?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on legal hypotheticals.

125. President Trump's lawsuit also violated the Emoluments Clause, Article II, Section 1, Clause 7, which prohibits the president from receiving any other "emolument" from the federal government or individual state outside of his fixed salary. Why did no one from the IRS raise this in court as a defense to Trump's lawsuit?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

126. You signed the May 19, 2026, tax immunity document for President Trump, his family, and related companies, affiliates, or subsidiaries on behalf of the Department of Justice. At the time, did you consider the May 19 tax immunity to be part of the settlement agreement signed on May 18?

RESPONSE: The May 19, 2026 release speaks for itself.

a. What did you believe your authority was to release any and all claims the government might have against the parties described in the document?

RESPONSE: It has long been the opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel that the Attorney General has broad authority to compromise and/or settle claims on behalf of the United States.

b. Where did that authority come from?

RESPONSE: It has long been the opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel that the Attorney General has broad authority to compromise and/or settle claims on behalf of the United States.

c. Did you consult with anyone to determine whether you had that authority? If so, was any advice or recommendation provided to you in writing?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

d. Why were you the sole signatory on the IRS settlement agreement dated May 19, 2026?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice. 26 U.S.C. 7217(e)(2) expressly authorizes the Attorney General to resolve IRS audits.

127. Please describe your responsibilities in the litigation in *Trump v. IRS*?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

a. When did you become aware the United States did not intend to raise any defenses in that case?

   RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

b. What statutory authority does the Attorney General have to settle litigation is that already barred by the statute of limitations?

   RESPONSE: It has long been the opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel that the Attorney General has broad authority to compromise and/or settle claims on behalf of the United States.

c. Did President Trump and his co-plaintiffs correctly claim under 26 U.S.C. § 7431 that their claims were not barred by the two-year statute of limitations?

   RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

d. Why did the Justice Department not attempt to raise a defense against President Trump's claims?

   RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

e. During your Attorney General nomination hearing you stated that it would be inappropriate for you to comment on this case. If so, why did you discuss the outcome of this case before the Senate Appropriations Committee? What is the difference between questions in your confirmation hearing to be Attorney General and that other Senate hearing?

   RESPONSE: The premise of this question is flawed. I did address the Anti-Weaponization Fund at both my Confirmation Hearing and in the May Senate Appropriations Committee hearing. In both hearings I responded to questions that did not call for deliberative or internal case communications or decisions.

f. Were you involved or consulted with before, during, or after the drafting of the order releasing all future tax liability claims against President Trump, the Trump Organization, and his family?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice.

g. Did President Trump personally review drafts of the order before they were released to the public?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to comment on any communications I may have had with the President, or on internal deliberations that may or may not have occurred in conjunction with any official act by the Department of Justice. That said, as I testified at my confirmation hearing, I did not speak to the President about this settlement before it was executed.

h. Did attorneys for President Trump personally review drafts of the order before they were released to the public?

RESPONSE: As I testified at my confirmation hearing, I did not speak with counsel for President Trump and otherwise do not have personal knowledge sufficient to answer this question.

i. In an interview with CNN on May 21, 2026, you stated "The president has outside counsel, and their counsel, the Department of Justice, not me. And there was negotiations, and this was what was part of those negotiations included a discussion around the any pending audits." Were there pending IRS audits before signing this agreement?

RESPONSE: I do not have sufficient personal knowledge to answer this question.

128. If you do not believe it is appropriate for you to comment on this litigation before this committee, why did you believe it was appropriate to comment on this litigation to the media?

RESPONSE: I disagree with the premise of this question. I have answered all questions posed to me as fulsomely as I possibly can.

129. **FISA Section 702:** Following President Trump's appointment of Bill Pulte to be Acting DNI, Congress decided not to reauthorize Title VII of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. There is broad bipartisan agreement that intelligence collection under this authority is among the most important national security tools we have. Though reauthorization of FISA Section 702 is currently lapsed, the most recent authorization by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court allows for collection to continue for up to a year from per the Court's orders.

a. Since this part of FISA expired in June, has the Intelligence Community or the FBI terminated any intelligence collection ongoing until that point?

RESPONSE: Section 702 specifically, Pub. L. 110-261, 112 Stat. 2436, 2476 § 404(b) (July 10, 2008) ("any order, authorization, or directive issued or made under title VII of [FISA], as amended by section 101(a), shall continue in effect until the date of expiration of such order, authorization, or directive") permits the certifications currently in place to remain in effect until their stated expiration date. With the lapse of Title VII, the Government is unable to execute any new certifications or renew any existing ones.

b. Has the Intelligence Community or the FBI been unable to initiate new collection under the targeting and minimization procedures that remain in place?

RESPONSE: Please see the response above to Question 129(a).

130. On June 5, 2026, Senators Cotton and Grassley sent a letter to National Security Advisor Marco Rubio, copying you and other administration officials, regarding the expiration of Title VII of FISA. In the letter, Chairmen Cotton and Grassley asked the Administration to "determine alternative lawful and constitutional intelligence-collection methods by which the United States could continue collecting intelligence" on targets of collection under FISA, and to "if necessary, draft a new Executive Order to remedy the gap left by the lapse of FISA Title VII in a lawful and constitutional manner."

a. Given that FISA is the exclusive means for conducting electronic surveillance for intelligence purposes (50 U.S. Code § 1812), has the Administration identified or attempted to implement any other surveillance methods outside of FISA as Chairmen Grassley and Cotton suggest?

RESPONSE: Although Section 702 generally cannot be replicated through other methods, should Congress choose to leave this critical authority unauthorized, the Executive Branch will pursue all legal means for making up the intelligence gaps that would be created.

131. It has been publicly disclosed that the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court issued a March 17, 2026, opinion that in part rejected the Administration's position on FISA operations. On May 1, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Chair Cotton and Vice Chair Warner sent a letter to you asking that the government's declassification and publication of that opinion be completed within 15 days. More than two months later, the opinion still has not been declassified.

a. Are you aware of the law that requires you to consult with the Director of National Intelligence to review for declassification significant FISC decisions, orders, and opinions?

RESPONSE: Yes.

b. Please explain why you have not declassified this opinion to better inform the public debate around reauthorization of FISA section 702.

RESPONSE: There is a statutory deadline of 180 days, which has not yet passed. The Department of Justice and Office of the Director of National Intelligence have been working diligently with the Intelligence Community to process the opinion for declassification and public release as quickly and responsibly as possible. We anticipate being able to make the public release in advance of the statutory deadline.

c. Can you commit to declassifying the opinion by the statutory deadline of 180 days and complying with the law?

RESPONSE: Yes.

132. The Department of Justice recently changed the name of the Environment and Natural Resources Division (ENRD) to the Energy and Natural Resources Division. In its press release, the Department said that this name change "does not diminish its defense of the environment," while also listing numerous efforts to overturn state environmental protection policies. Does this name change signal a de-prioritization of DOJ's role as prosecutor of our federal environmental laws?

RESPONSE: The name change does not signal a de-prioritization of the Department's role as prosecutor of our federal environmental laws. ENRD was created in 1909 as the Public Lands Division. It has since been renamed three times in response to evolving responsibilities—most recently in 1990, when it became the Environment and Natural Resources Division to reflect its enforcement function under the environmental statutes Congress enacted in the 1970s and 1980s. ENRD's charge to steward America's environment responsibly is unchanged. The environment is our nation's greatest natural resource, and the new name captures that priority. Moreover, ENRD is still the nation's environmental lawyer, and the largest environmental law firm in the country. ENRD's environmental enforcement protects public health and ensures a level playing field for companies that play by the rules. *See, e.g.*, *Justice Department to Rename Division as Energy and Natural Resources Division*, DOJ Press Release (June 29, 2026) (listing enforcement actions), *available at* https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-rename-division-energy-and-natural-resources-division.

a. Has this rebrand led to or will it lead to a shifting of resources away from prosecuting environmental statutes managed by EPA, such as the Clean Air Act or Clean Water Act?

RESPONSE: The environment is our nation's greatest natural resource, and the new name captures that priority. I'm proud of the results we've achieved over the past 17 months against air and water pollution, lead poisoning, ozone depletion and radioactive waste. The Department's achievements include a landmark multistate settlement to address forever chemical pollution and a $100 million penalty secured at trial for industrial air pollution near Detroit. ENRD continues to enforce environmental laws, punish fraudsters, and defend federal agencies'

efforts to protect and develop responsibly our wildlife and natural resources. *See* Answer 132. Moreover, ENRD is currently hiring in its criminal and civil environment enforcement sections.

133. FERC, NRC, and TVA have some form of independent litigating authority, but EPA does not have independent litigating authority and relies on DOJ to be its lawyer in enforcement actions that the agency can't handle administratively. Why would DOJ rename ENRD to the Energy and Natural Resources Division given that DOJ only handles a fraction of federal energy litigation?

RESPONSE: The name change reflects the significant energy work ENRD has been doing over the past decades, including on behalf of other federal agencies such as the Department of Transportation, Department of Energy, and the Department of the Interior. For example, ENRD is currently handling energy litigation on behalf of the United States related to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, *see, e.g.*, *United States, et al. v. California Air Resource Board*, No. 2:26-00847−DJC−SCR (E.D. Cal.), the Defense Production Act, *see, e.g.*, *California v. Wright*, No. 2:26-cv-03396 (C.D. Cal.), and the Pipeline Safety Act, *see, e.g.*, *Enbridge v. Whitmer*, 813 F. Supp. 3d. 777, 791 (W.D. Mich. 2025). ENRD has also worked alongside NRC and other federal agencies with independent litigating authority in energy litigation. *See, e.g.*, *Nuclear Regulatory Commission v. Texas*, 605 U.S. 665 (2025).

134. Why did DOJ choose to hire Robert Levy, executive counsel at ExxonMobil, as a senior counsel in the newly renamed Energy and Natural Resources Division?

RESPONSE: With decades of diverse legal experiences in the energy industry, Mr. Levy brings significant experience related to energy litigation and is well-qualified to work at ENRD.

a. Did this hiring decision raise any conflicts of interest concerns for the Department?

RESPONSE: All attorneys at the Department of Justice, including Mr. Levy, must follow the Department's ethics and professional responsibility obligations.

b. Will Robert Levy be consulting with DOJ ethics officials to ensure he recuses himself from all matters related to his former employer?

RESPONSE: Consistent with the ethical responsibilities of all attorneys at the Department, Mr. Levy must consult with ethics officials to ensure that he appropriately recuses himself in all matters in which a conflict of interest arises, including with his former employer.

c. Levy's LinkedIn post announcing his new job said he would be joining the team to "support American energy dominance." Is Robert Levy's role going to be a

defender of the oil and gas industry and does this hire signal that the oil and gas industry will be shielded from enforcement actions under environmental statutes?

RESPONSE: Mr. Levy must recuse himself in all matters in which a conflict of interest arises. *See* Answer 134(c). Consistent with the ethics rules, Mr. Levy will work with ENRD leadership to advance the President's goal "to unleash America's affordable and reliable energy and natural resources." *Unleashing American Energy,* Executive Order, No. 14154 (Jan. 20, 2025). ENRD has been involved in litigation challenging the Administration's efforts to make America's energy more affordable and reliable. *See, e.g.*, *Lighthiser, et al. v. Trump, et al.*, No. 25-6714 (9th Cir.). The Department will continue to bring enforcement actions under environmental statutes where appropriate, including against companies in the oil and gas industry. *See also Justice Department to Rename Division as Energy and Natural Resources Division*, DOJ Press Release (June 29, 2026) (listing enforcement actions).

135. Why has the Department made it a priority to overturn environmental policies in certain states?

RESPONSE: The President issued an executive order to protect American energy from state overreach. *See Protecting American Energy from State Overreach*, Executive Order No. 14260 (Apr. 8, 2025). In this executive order, the President describes how the Administration is "committed to unleashing American energy, especially through the removal of all illegitimate impediments to the identification, development, siting, production, investment in, or use of domestic energy resources — particularly oil, natural gas, coal, hydropower, geothermal, biofuel, critical mineral, and nuclear energy resources." *Id*. § 1. The Department's efforts to remove illegitimate or unlawful impediments to American energy supports an "affordable and reliable domestic energy supply [that] is essential to the national and economic security of the United States, as well as our foreign policy." *Id*. Contrary to supporting an affordable and reliable domestic energy supply, "[m]any States have enacted, or are in the process of enacting, burdensome and ideologically motivated 'climate change' or energy policies that threaten American energy dominance and our economic and national security." *Id*. As many courts have held, such state actions, laws, and policies can be unlawful. *See, e.g.*, *Am. Elec. Power Co. v. Connecticut,* 564 U.S. 410 (2011); *City of New York v. Chevron Corp.*, 993 F.3d 81, 86 (2d Cir. 2021). Where appropriate, and consistent with its obligations under the Take Care Clause of the U.S. Constitution, the Department has brought enforcement actions to prevent States from violating the U.S. Constitution and federal law.

a. Does the Department no longer support cooperative federalism, which is a paradigm embraced by many of our bedrock environmental statutes?

RESPONSE: The Department continues to support cooperative federalism under bedrock environmental statues. For example, the Department continues to work closely with States on civil enforcement matters under the environmental statues, such as the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act.

136. The Office of Legal Counsel green-lit the Department of Energy's invocation of the Defense Production Act to allow Sable Offshore Corp. to circumvent California law and restart offshore oil operations in the Santa Ynez Unit.

a. Please provide the letter from Sable entitled "Letter for Jonathan Brightbill, General Counsel, Department of Energy, from James W. Noe, Partner, Holland & Knight LLP, Re: Sable Offshore Corp.—Request for Action Under the Defense Production Act at 1 (Dec. 12, 2025)."

RESPONSE: This letter was sent from Sable to the Department of Energy. That would be the appropriate recipient for this request.

b. The OLC opinion did not provide any evidence that the use of the DPA in this instance was vital to national security. What are the evidentiary requirements necessary to invoke the Defense Production Act, and do you think that the Department met them in this matter that favors a single specific corporation committed to offshore oil drillings in violation of California law?

RESPONSE: Consistent with principles of executive privilege and the confidential nature of the attorney-client relationship, it would be inappropriate to comment on legal advice that the Department may or may not have given to the President or other Executive Branch officials.

137. You issued an enforcement policy memo in January expressing that the Department would no longer prosecute companies who sell defeat devices that tamper with vehicle pollution control systems. You wrote in the memo that this was "to ensure consistent and fair prosecution under the law, as well as to ensure the best use of Department resources". Why do you believe that it is unfair to prosecute criminals for violating the Clean Air Act and using cheating devices to pump more pollution into the air Americans breathe?

RESPONSE: Consistent with the President's direction to stop overcriminalization of regulatory laws, the Department is focusing its criminal enforcement efforts on clear violations of criminal law that result in serious environmental harm. *See Fighting Overcriminalization in Federal Regulations*, Exec. Order 14294 (May 5, 2025).

138. At the start of the current administration, DOJ significantly hollowed out ENRD, with several senior attorneys were reassigned to other offices at DOJ and many others put on administrative leave or forced out entirely. How many FTEs has ENRD lost since January 20, 2025?

RESPONSE: ENRD has lost more than 150 employees since January 2025. The Division is working hard to hire well-qualified replacements to strengthen the Division.

a. What percentage of current staff attorneys possess fewer than three years of environmental litigation experience?

RESPONSE: ENRD has a wide spectrum of experience among its staff attorneys. ENRD routinely hires new attorneys, including honor graduates from law school with fewer than three years of legal experience, to join the division.

b. DOJ suspended the Honors Program to help recruit entry-level attorneys into ENRD. Is this program still suspended for ENRD?

RESPONSE: ENRD has reopened its honor graduate hiring and has a new class of honor grads starting in September.

c. How have staffing issues affected ENRD's case load? Has ENRD asked federal judges to extend, stay, or drop cases due to staffing shortages or reorganization priorities?

RESPONSE: The ENRD is a high-functioning component of the Department of Justice. There are a variety of reasons why our components seek to extend, stay, or drop cases, and there are a limited number of instances where in the ordinary course of business we have requested extensions to ensure adequate representation.

d. A February 2026 analysis by the Environmental Integrity Project (EIP) found that civil environmental enforcement actions have fallen to historic lows. According to the report, the Department of Justice has filed only 16 civil complaints in cases referred by EPA since January 20, 2025. That figure represents a 76 percent decline compared to the first year of the Biden Administration, an 81 percent decline compared to the first year of the first Trump Administration, and an 87 percent decline compared to the first year of President Obama's second term. Settlements of environmental enforcement cases have declined in similar fashion. Federal court records show that settlements dropped from 186 in 2013 to 40 in 2025, suggesting that far fewer cases are moving through the enforcement pipeline.

    i. What is the primary factor responsible for this drop-off in DOJ enforcement of environmental laws? Is it due to staffing shortages, de-prioritization of enforcement of environmental laws, or something else?

    RESPONSE: The ENRD is a high-functioning component of the Department of Justice. Our enforcement strategies differ widely from the previous Administration's, and we do not regulate by prosecution. We have a whole arsenal of strategic tools to enforce our nation's environmental laws. We strongly believe that environmental enforcement must focus on those actions that will bring the most tangible benefits to the American people.

ii. Can you explain how these numbers may have changed since February 2026?

RESPONSE: See subpart (i).

iii. How many cases referred to DOJ by EPA is DOJ declining to pursue?

RESPONSE: ENRD works closely with the EPA to identify cases to achieve the greatest possible benefits to the American people.

iv. Has DOJ coordinated with EPA to decrease the amount of cases EPA is referring and that DOJ is litigating on behalf of EPA? If so, in what way?

RESPONSE: No.

139. In response to a written question for the record from Sen. Cory Booker for your confirmation to be Deputy Attorney General, you stated that, in your experience as an AUSA, you "had ZERO discretion about whether to follow a lawful order or directive from my superiors."

a. Do you believe AUSAs have "ZERO discretion" regarding whether to follow an unlawful order?

RESPONSE: No. No attorney is required to follow an unlawful order.

b. If not, how should AUSAs respond when they receive an unlawful order from a superior?

RESPONSE: An attorney who believes an order is unlawful should raise the concern with supervisors and, as appropriate, with ethics officials, and should not carry out an order that would require them to violate the law or their ethical obligations.

c. Have you ever received an unlawful order during your career in the Department of Justice?

RESPONSE: No.

d. If so, how did you respond?

RESPONSE: Not applicable.

140. During your nine years as a federal prosecutor with the U.S. Southern District of New York, how many times did a grand jury refuse to indict in a case you brought before them?

RESPONSE: I do not recall any instance in which a grand jury declined to return an indictment in a matter I presented as an Assistant United States Attorney.

141. President Trump has proposed ending mail-in voting nationwide and claims that "A state is an 'agent' for the Federal Government in elections."

a. Do you agree with President Trump's statement that the States are merely an agent for the federal government in carrying out federal elections?

RESPONSE: The Constitution contemplates both federal and state roles in elections. I am committed to ensuring free and fair elections, and the Department of Justice will follow the Constitution and federal law. Likewise, we will support states in the enforcement of their state election laws as appropriate.

142. On April 21, 2026, you told Fox News you had "no information" suggesting Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) shared intelligence with law enforcement. SPLC attorneys have stated in contrast that they met with DOJ prosecutors on April 6, 2026 and provided that information.

RESPONSE: The matter involving the Southern Poverty Law Center is the subject of pending criminal litigation, and it would not be appropriate for me to discuss the evidence, internal briefings, or characterizations of that matter outside of court.

a. Did you review the briefing materials from that meeting before your Fox interview on national television?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 142. I do not think it appropriate to discuss internal briefing materials concerning a pending criminal matter.

b. What efforts have you made to correct this misstatement you made on national television about a pending criminal matter?

RESPONSE: I do not accept the premise that I made a misstatement. As the matter is in active litigation, I will not discuss it further outside of court.

143. In SPLC's memorandum in support of its motion to dismiss the United States' indictment on the basis of vindictive prosecution, SPLC noted that some language included in an FBI Incident Summary related to the investigation matched identically a letter sent by the leaders of Moms for Liberty, Turning Point USA, American Cornerstone Institute, Alliance Defending Freedom, WallBuilders, Liberty Counsel, Gays Against Groomers, and New Discourses to White House Deputy Chief of Staff for Policy, Stephen Miller.

RESPONSE: The SPLC matter is in active criminal litigation, including a pending motion, and it would not be appropriate for me to discuss the investigation, the sources of

any information, or internal or interbranch communications concerning that matter outside of court. This applies to subparts (a) through (d).

a. Do you know whether Stephen Miller provided any information that contributed to a criminal investigation or charges against SPLC?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 143.

b. Did Stephen Miller discuss with you personally, or with any attorney at the DOJ, the allegations against SPLC?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 143.

c. Did you notify Stephen Miller or any other White House employees, the President or Vice President of the charges against SPLC prior to the United States seeking an indictment?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 143.

d. Did you or members of your staff review the letter from the conservative organizations to Miller prior to filing your lawsuit against the SPLC?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 143.

144. In the case of Kilmar Abrego Garcia, you went on Fox News on June 6, 2025, and stated that the government started "investigating" Mr. Abrego Garcia after "a judge in Maryland…questioned that decision." In the opinion dismissing the government's case against Mr. Abrego Garcia, a federal judge stated, "Blanche's remarkable statements could directly establish that the motivations for Abrego's criminal charges stem from his exercise of his constitutional and statutory rights to bring suit against the Executive Official Defendants, rather than a genuine desire to prosecute him for alleged criminal misconduct."

a. Did you consult with DOJ career ethics attorneys before making public statements about the Abrego Garcia case on Fox News on June 6, 2025?

RESPONSE: I do not accept the court's characterization of my statements. Public statements by Department leadership about matters of public interest are made in the ordinary course and are not, as a general matter, a function of the ethics office. To the extent this matter remains subject to litigation, it would not be appropriate for me to comment further.

145. Following your confirmation hearing for your deputy attorney general role, Sen. Durbin asked you "Do you believe in the exercise of prosecutorial discretion at the Department of Justice? If so, under what circumstances?" You responded, "Prosecutorial

decisions by the Justice Department should made consistent with Chapter 9 of the Justice Manual, in particular section 9-27.000 - Principles of Federal Prosecution."

a. What are the current obligations of an Assistant United States Attorney or DOJ Trial Attorney to comply with the Justice Manual?

RESPONSE: All DOJ trial attorneys and AUSAs are expected to adhere to all rules and guidelines as contained in the Justice Manual (JM) 9-27.120.

b. Have you ever instructed a DOJ employee to disregard the Justice Manual or violate its provisions?

RESPONSE: No.

c. Is it ever appropriate for a supervising federal prosecutor to instruct their subordinates to disregard the Justice Manual?

RESPONSE: Generally, no. However, in JM 9-27.140 "United States Attorneys may modify or depart from the principles set forth herein as necessary in the interests of fair and effective law enforcement within the district. Any modification or departure contemplated as a matter of policy or regular practice must be approved by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General where required, see JM 9-2.400 and the Deputy Attorney General." In addition, if the JM conflicts with current law or policy, the component head, or designee, should submit a request for revision of the policy pursuant to JM 1-1.300.

d. How would you respond if you learned a subordinate had instructed a colleague or subordinate at the Department of Justice to disregard the Justice Manual?

RESPONSE: I would instruct the component head to investigate the circumstances of the action to determine what disciplinary action is warranted, if necessary.

146. During a Senate Appropriations hearing, you testified that you are asking to increase Executive Office for Immigration Review's budget by 12% because you "need more [immigration] judges," yet the Department of Justice has fired more than 100 immigration judges from the Executive Office for Immigration Review since the start of the second Trump Administration.

a. Please explain this contradiction.

RESPONSE: There is no contradiction. EOIR has hired over 200 immigration judges since October 2025 and needs additional resources to continue to effectively reduce the backlog of cases, particularly following a reduction in its annual appropriations for FY 2026.

147. What factors led the DOJ to open an investigation into the killing of Alex Pretti by federal immigration officials?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to discuss the details of any ongoing investigation.

148. Please describe the involvement of the DOJ Civil Rights Division in the investigation into the killing of Alex Pretti.

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate for me to discuss the details of any ongoing investigation.

149. Has DOJ shared all evidence related to the killings of Alex Pretti or Renee Good with state and local law enforcement in Minnesota?

Response: As with any investigation, federal law enforcement will work with State and locals in the appropriate way. DHS-OIG, FBI, and the U.S. Attorney's office have and will run these investigations professionally and in appropriate coordination with State and local partners.

a. If not, why has DOJ failed to share such evidence?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 149.

b. What is the DOJ's reasoning for delaying information sharing with state and local officials in Minnesota for more than six months?

RESPONSE: Please see the response to Question 149.

150. The Constitution protects the right of individuals to travel from state to state, and state governments cannot deny them this basic right. How will you protect the right to cross state lines for health care?

RESPONSE: I take seriously the responsibility of the Attorney General to protect the rights of every American under our laws. If confirmed, I will enforce our laws with fairness and impartiality.

a. Will you take action to protect individuals crossing state lines seeking abortions?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 150.

151. In recent years, violence and threats targeted at abortion providers and patients have increased significantly. The Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances (FACE) Act prohibits interfering or attempting to interfere with obtaining or providing reproductive health services, or intentionally damaging or destroying a reproductive health care facility. Do you agree that everyone deserves safe access to healthcare facilities?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 150.

a. If confirmed, will you commit to consistently enforcing the FACE Act in cases where individuals clearly violate the law by obstructing access to a reproductive health facility that provides abortion services?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 150.

b. Given the high rate of violence targeting abortion providers, please you identify all circumstances under which the Department under your leadership would decline to investigate or prosecute a violent attack against an abortion provider.

RESPONSE: As with all matters, any decisions regarding whether to charge cases under any applicable laws will be based on a thorough analysis of the facts and the governing law.

c. As Deputy Attorney General, what role did you play in drafting the Department's April 2025 report, *The Biden Administration's Weaponization of the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act*?

RESPONSE: As the report states, I approved a limited disclosure of privileged documents revealing abuses by Department personnel during the course of the underlying prosecutions. The weaponization that happened under the Biden Administration will not happen again, as we restore integrity to our prosecutorial system. The report referenced in your question not only details specific ways the Biden Justice Department weaponized federal law, but also outlines the corrective action taken by the current Justice Department to make right the wrongs of the prior administration.

152. HIPAA establishes critical protections for the confidentiality of patients' health information. If confirmed, will you commit to protecting patients' HIPAA-protected health information from being used by state authorities to investigate or prosecute patients for receiving abortion services or health care workers who provide abortion services?

RESPONSE: I have not studied the applicability of HIPAA to the question you have presented. If confirmed, I will enforce the laws in accordance with the relevant facts and law to protect the rights of all Americans.

a. Will you commit to enforcing HIPAA to prevent state actors or third parties from obtaining sensitive medical information, such as reproductive health care, to penalize patients, providers and/or anyone who helps them access this care?

RESPONSE: See my response to Question 152.

153. With challenges to privacy rights increasingly tied to reproductive health care, how do you plan to collaborate with other federal agencies, like the Department of Health

and Human Services (HHS) and the Office for Civil Rights (OCR), to strengthen protections for individuals seeking care in their home state and across state lines?

RESPONSE: If confirmed, I will continue to enforce the laws in accordance with the relevant facts and law and will consult with other federal agencies as appropriate.

154. **White House Ballroom:** On October 28, 2025, I joined eleven other Senators in sending White House Chief of Staff Susie Wiles a letter regarding the use of private donations to fund the construction of President Trump's White House ballroom. According to court documents, President Trump appears to be collecting donations to his ballroom project through a 501(c)(3) nonprofit and has failed to disclose the structure of the nonprofit and the conditions under which donors have contributed to the project. This lack of clarity creates significant ethical and conflict of interest concerns, especially given multiple donors listed by the White House as contributors have business before the Administration. I requested detailed information regarding the identities of donors and the ethical guardrails surrounding the project. To date, I have received no response.

a. Did the President or any Executive Branch officials seek guidance from the Department of Justice regarding whether it is permissible to accept private donations related to the White House ballroom construction?

RESPONSE: Under longstanding Department of Justice policy, I am unable to comment on matters that are in pending litigation. Moreover, the question seeks information that may be protected by applicable privileges concerning advice that the Department may have provided to Executive Branch officials.

b. If so, which Department of Justice officials were consulted regarding the solicitation or acceptance of private donations related to the White House ballroom construction project?

RESPONSE: Under longstanding Department of Justice policy and applicable privileges, I am unable to comment on matters that are in pending litigation, including matters related to the project. *See* Answer 154(a). Moreover, consistent with longstanding practice, I am unable to discuss internal deliberations at the Department.

c. Will you commit to providing all related records and correspondence to my staff?

RESPONSE: As part of the most transparent Executive Branch in history, I am committed to providing responsive and non-privileged records and correspondences consistent with applicable law, to the extent any such records or correspondences exist.

155. Reports have found that $24.5 million from the Alphabet, Inc. Settlement with President Trump has been allocated for the President's Trust for the National Mall, with $22 million being committed to the ballroom's construction.

a. Was the Department of Justice consulted about the allocation of these funds?

RESPONSE: Due to applicable privileges and consistent with longstanding practices discussed above, I am unable to share information about whether or not the Department was consulted about this matter. See Answer 154(a) & (b).

b. Will you commit to providing my staff a complete list of all individual and corporate donors to the ballroom project who are parties to, or hold a financial stake in any entity that is a party to, litigation or enforcement actions involving the federal government initiated on or after January 20, 2021?

RESPONSE: As part of the most transparent Executive Branch in history, I am committed to providing responsive and non-privileged records consistent with applicable law, to the extent of any of these records exist.

c. Has the White House provided the Department of Justice a detailed description of the terms under which donations by individuals and corporate donors who are parties to, or hold a financial stake in any entity that is a party to, litigation or enforcement actions involving the federal government were made?

RESPONSE: Due to applicable privileges and consistent with longstanding practices, I am unable to share information about whether or not the Department was consulted about this matter. *See* Answer 154(a) & (b). Nor can I share information about internal deliberations at the Department or communications with the White House regarding this or any other matter.

d. What steps has the Department of Justice taken to ensure donations received by individuals and corporate donors who are parties to, or hold a financial stake in any entity that is a party to, litigation or enforcement actions involving the federal government do not create a conflict of interest?

ESPONSE: Department employees are explicitly prohibited from participating in matters where they have a conflict of interest. These rules are governed by federal statutes, *see, e.g.*, 18 U.S.C. Ch. 11, Part I, and codified in regulations, *see, e.g.*, 28 C.F.R. § 45.2(b)(2). Longstanding ethics rules also forbid employees from participating in actions in which they have a conflict of interest. I am committed to ensuring that the Department of Justice follows all professional and ethical rules, including those concerning conflicts of interest.

156. What guardrails, if any, has the Administration put in place to ensure that companies and individuals who contribute to White House projects, including to the Trust for the National Mall or indirectly, to the White House ballroom construction project are not corruptly purchasing access to the President or members of his administration?

RESPONSE: As stated in my answer to 155(d), I am committed to ensuring that the Department of Justice follows all professional and ethical rules, including those

concerning conflicts of interest. My commitment is part of this Administration's efforts to be the most transparent and ethical Executive Branch in the history of our nation.

a. Was the Department of Justice consulted in developing these guardrails?

RESPONSE: As I stated in my answers to 154(a) & (b), I am unable to discuss privileged information or internal deliberations about specific matters.

b. Provide a detailed description of any guardrails the Administration may have put in place, and the legal justifications supporting them.

RESPONSE: As stated in my answer to 155(g), I am committed to ensuring that the Department of Justice follows all professional and ethical rules, including those concerning conflicts of interest. My commitment is part of this Administration's efforts to be the most transparent and ethical Executive Branch in the history of our nation.

157. You have previously acknowledged publicly your wife's family owns Check-Mate Industries, a manufacturer of high-capacity firearms magazines, and has "been in the gun manufacturing business for 40 years." Do you or your wife currently hold ownership in, or otherwise receive financial benefits from, Check-Mate Industries or its subsidiaries or affiliate businesses?

RESPONSE: My financial interests are reflected in my public financial disclosure report. We hold no financial interest nor receive any benefit of any kind.

a. If confirmed, will you or your wife divest all ownership, financial interests, or future financial interests you have in Check-Mate Industries?

RESPONSE: We have no stake of any kind in Check-Mate Industries.

158. Since becoming Deputy Attorney General in March 2025, have you ever communicated (in writing or verbally) with anyone employed by Check-Mate Industries about any:

a. Department or ATF administrative action, guidance, or policy? If so, please identify who you communicated with and when, and the nature of the communication.
b. Potential, ongoing, or now-completed legal challenge or settlement involving the Department or ATF? If so, please identify who you communicated with and when, and the nature of the communication.
c. Department or ATF inspection or enforcement action under federal firearms law? If so, please identify who you communicated with and when, and the nature of the communication.

RESPONSE: The November 2025 facility visit was a family tour and did not involve discussion of any specific Department or ATF administrative action,

guidance, policy, litigation, or enforcement matter. Apart from that, I am not aware of having communicated with anyone at Check-Mate about the matters described in subparts (a) through (c).

159. Has anyone from the Department or ATF ever communicated (in writing or verbally) with anyone employed by Check-Mate Industries about any:

a. Proposed or final Department or ATF rule or regulatory change? If so, please identify who from the Department or ATF and when, and the nature of the communication.
b. Department or ATF administrative action, guidance, or policy? If so, please identify who from the Department or ATF and when, and the nature of the communication.
c. Potential, ongoing, or now-completed legal challenge or settlement involving the Department or ATF? If so, please identify who from the Department or ATF and when, and the nature of the communication.
d. Department or ATF inspection or enforcement action under federal firearms law? If so, please identify who from the Department or ATF and when, and the nature of the communication.

RESPONSE: I am not personally aware of such communications, and I am not in a position to account for every contact by Department or ATF personnel.

160. Do you believe your familial relationship with Check-Mate Industries or any of its subsidiaries creates a conflict of interest?

RESPONSE: No.

a. If not, why do you believe your relationship does not create a conflict of interest?

RESPONSE: General policy and rulemaking are not particular matters involving specific parties and do not require recusal.

b. If confirmed, will you commit to recusing yourself from any cases or investigations involving Check-Mate Industries or its subsidiaries?

RESPONSE: I will follow the advice and counsel of Department ethics professionals.

161. During a January 2026 interview at the National Shooting Sports Foundation's annual Shooting, Hunting, Outdoor Trade Show, you responded "Yes, I am" when asked if you are "part of the gun industry." In reference to your relationship to Check-Mate Industries, you stated "I've been part of the fight, struggle, everything that we've been going through as a nation for really for 40 years."

a. What did you mean by this statement?

RESPONSE: I was referring to my wife's family's long involvement in firearms manufacturing. It was a personal reference to my family, not a statement about my official responsibilities at the Department.

162. Have you ever discussed regulations published by DOJ agencies, including by the Bureau of Alcohol, Firearms & Explosives, with lobbyists, employees, or shareholders of Check-Mate Industries – including those published on April 29, 2026? Did anyone from of the American Suppressor Association, Gun Owners of America, the National Association for Gun Rights, the National Rifle Association, the National Shooting Sports Foundation, and the Second Amendment Foundation organizations (or any other industry organization, leader, or other member or employee) draft, directly or indirectly, any rule or part of a rule that the Department and ATF announced on April 29, 2026?

a. Why has ATF stated that, "None of these rules were drafted directly or indirectly by any member of the gun industry"?
b. Please identify who from the firearms industry was involved in such drafting, and which rule(s) or parts thereof such individuals drafted.
c. Did any of the aforementioned industry organizations (or any other industry organization, leader, or other member or employee) ask, request, or otherwise seek any rule or part of a rule that the Department and ATF announced on April 29, 2026? If so, please identify who made such asks or requests, and which rule(s) or parts thereof such individuals asked or requested.
d. Did any of the aforementioned industry organizations (or any other industry organization, leader, or other member or employee) provide edits, revisions, feedback, or technical assistance on any rule or part of a rule that the Department and ATF announced on April 29, 2026?
e. If so, please identify who provided such edits, revisions, feedback, or technical assistance and summarize the nature of such edits, revisions, feedback, or technical assistance.

RESPONSE: The April 29, 2026 rules were developed by the Department and ATF. As ATF has stated, they were not drafted, directly or indirectly, by any member of the gun industry. It would not be appropriate to detail internal rulemaking deliberations. I am not aware of having discussed those rules with anyone at Check-Mate. This response applies to subparts (a) through (e).

163. Did you or anyone employed by the Department of Justice, including ATF, ever discuss or otherwise communicate (in writing or verbally) with anyone employed by or otherwise affiliated with GrabAGun, including but not limited to Donald Trump Jr., Omeed Malik, Colion Noir, Chris Cox, Blake Masters, and Dusty Wunderlich, about these rules at any point prior to their development or drafting or prior to the April 29 announcement?

a. If so, please identify who at GrabAGun you discussed or communicated with, when you discussed or communicated with them, and describe the nature of your discussion(s) and/or communication(s).

RESPONSE: I am not aware of having discussed these rules with anyone at GrabAGun, and I am not in a position to account for every contact by Department or ATF personnel.

164. Check-Mate has received federal contracts in FY26. Have you ever communicated with anyone within the Administration regarding Check-Mate's contracts?

RESPONSE: No.

a. If so, will you commit to providing complete records of those communications to my staff at least one week prior to a floor vote on your nomination?

RESPONSE: There have been no communications, so there are no records.

165. In November 2025, in your capacity as Deputy Attorney General, you conducted an official visit to Check-Mate Industries' Georgia facility. Why did you select Check-Mate Industries for this visit?
   a. What role did your family's connection to Check-Mate Industries play in your decision to visit?
   b. Were there other facilities you considered visiting? If so, please explain why you ultimately decided not to visit the other facilities.
   c. Since becoming Deputy Attorney General in March 2025—
      i. How many times have you visited Check-Mate Industries at its Georgia or New York facilities? Please identify the date and purpose of each visit.
      ii. How many other Department or ATF employees have visited Check-Mate Industries at its Georgia or New York facilities? Please identify the Department and/or ATF employee(s) as well as the date and purpose of each visit.

RESPONSE: It was a family tour during a family reunion. My appearances, where appropriate, are cleared by the Department's ethics officials.

166. Do you regularly conduct site visits to firearms equipment manufacturers?
   a. Did you attend SHOT Show in your official capacity as Deputy Attorney General? Who paid for your travel and accommodations?
   b. Did department ethics officials approve your attendance, and, if so, what ethics guidance, if any, did they provide? If approval was not sought or granted, why not?

RESPONSE: I attend a range of industry and public events and we consult with ethics officials regarding appearances.

167. In May 2025, the Department announced a settlement with Rare Breed Triggers and reversed a longstanding classification of forced-reset triggers (FRTs) as machine guns, effectively legalizing these devices – which have been previously banned under federal law for 40 years – for the civilian market.

a. Please describe the role you played in this settlement.
b. Did you or anyone employed by the Department or ATF discuss this matter with staff or lobbyists for Rare Breed Triggers? If so, with whom?
c. Did you or anyone at DOJ, including ATF, consult with individuals at Check-Mate Industries or its lobbyists at any point throughout the ongoing litigation with Rare Breed Triggers?
d. Who made the decision to settle this matter and who else was involved or otherwise part of the decision?
e. Did you participate in the Department's decision to challenge Colorado or Washington D.C.'s bans on high-capacity magazines?

RESPONSE: Decisions regarding particular litigation and settlements are made through the Department's established processes; internal deliberations regarding the settlement of litigation are protected by the deliberative-process privilege, and it would not be appropriate to detail them. I am not aware of any consultation with Check-Mate or its representatives in connection with that litigation. I did not have any meaningful participation in the Department's decisions in Colorado or Washington.

168. 26 U.S.C. § 5845(b) defines "machine[ ]gun" to include "any part designed and intended solely and exclusively, or combination of parts designed and intended, for use in converting a weapon into a machine gun."

a. Are all, some, or no forced reset triggers (FRTs) machine guns?

RESPONSE: The classification of forced reset triggers (FRTs) under the National Firearms Act involves technical and legal determinations that have been the subject of litigation and administrative review by the ATF. Given that this remains an area of increased attention, it would not be appropriate for me to offer a categorical characterization here. If confirmed, I will ensure that the Department continues to address these devices consistent with the NFA.

b. If *some* FRTs are machine guns and others are not, what is the difference between FRTs that are machine guns and those that are not?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 168(a).

c. If *no* FRTs are machine guns, why did the Department of Justice include a condition in its May 2025 settlement with Rare Breed Triggers that precludes the development and design of FRTs "for use in any handgun."

RESPONSE: In addition to my response to Question 168a, I will highlight that the May 2025 settlement agreement reflects specific terms negotiated to resolve that litigation and that I believe it is best to allow those provisions to speak for themselves.

169. It has been reported that the Department's settlement with Rare Breed Triggers was reached over the objections of ATF's Chief Counsel, Robert Leider, who joined ATF in March 2025.

a. Can you confirm whether Mr. Leider raised objections?

RESPONSE: It would be inappropriate to comment on internal Executive Branch deliberations concerning this settlement.

b. If Mr. Leider did raise objections, what was the nature of them, to whom did he raise them, and who overruled the objections?

RESPONSE: Please see my response to Question 169(a).

170. One of ATF's core responsibilities is to assist local law enforcement agencies by tracing firearms used to commit crimes each year. If confirmed, will you ensure that ATF has the resources, agents, and support from Main Justice to effectively carry out its mission?

RESPONSE: I firmly support ATF's work in assisting with local law enforcement firearms tracing, which is critical to investigating violent crime. If confirmed, I will continue to champion these capabilities.

171. Last year, DOJ abruptly canceled over $800 million of active discretionary public safety grants, including over $150 million in Community Violence Intervention programs. If you are confirmed, will you review and restore funding for these important, life-saving programs? To your knowledge, what were the arguments for canceling these grants, and what evidence was used to justify said cancelations?

RESPONSE: The Department reviewed discretionary grant programs to ensure that each award aligned with and advanced the priorities of the Trump Administration and the Department. Recipients were given the opportunity to appeal a grant termination, consistent with 2 C.F.R. § 200.342.

172. Federal law has long prohibited certain convicted criminals, including convicted felons and domestic abusers, from possessing firearms. Yet tens of thousands of people who are legally prohibited from possessing firearms have failed to relinquish them. What will DOJ do to help state authorities ensure that prohibited persons properly surrender their firearms upon conviction of a crime?

RESPONSE: I am committed to keeping firearms out of the hands of those who are prohibited by law from possessing them under 18 U.S.C. § 922(g). U.S. Probation and Pretrial Services currently monitors compliance by those under federal supervision. In parallel, the FBI ensures that prohibiting records are entered and available in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System. Because most convictions occur in state court, the Department supports—and will continue to support—state, local, and tribal

authorities in their efforts to implement effective surrender procedures for prohibited persons.

173. What actions will you take to ensure un-serialized "ghost guns" and firearms and components sold online are effectively regulated and that ATF has clear, enforceable authority over emerging technologies that circumvent existing law?

RESPONSE: The Department's role is to enforce that laws that Congress has enacted. The scope of ATF's regulatory authority over firearms and firearms components is defined by the Gun Control Act, the National Firearms Act, and other related statutes. Questions concerning the treatment of particular items and the reach of that authority have been the subject of ATF adjudications, rulemakings, and litigation. I cannot at this time prejudge specific regulatory or enforcement determinations that fall, in the first instance, to ATF through its established processes, as those may be affected by legal developments.