

---

**From:** (b)(6) per FBI  
**Sent:** Friday, August 12, 2022 8:43 PM  
**To:** NSD Public (NSD); CTS-Internship (NSD); NSD CES Intern Applications (b)(6) per NSD (NSD) (b)(6) per NSD (NSD); Matthews, Matrina (OLP); Olsen, Matthew (NSD); NSD LPO Applicant (SMO)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Check from Barbri - JP Morgan Chase - Relevant to Trump Case - Mar-A-Lago (b)(6) per FBI Pardons by the President  
**Attachments:** 20220812 170400.jpg; 20220812 170355.jpg; 20220812 170322.jpg; 20220812 170358.jpg; 20220812 170403.jpg; 20220812 170317.jpg

----- Forwarded message -----

From (b)(6) per FBI  
Date: Fri, Aug 12, 2022 at 5:40 PM  
Subject: Check from Barbri - JP Morgan Chase - Relevant to Trump Case - Mar-A-Lago (b)(6) per FBI  
Pardons by the President  
To: <[OGC-JOBS@fbi.gov](mailto:OGC-JOBS@fbi.gov)> (b)(6),(b)(7)(C),(b)(7)(E) per FBI, <[public.affairs@ic.fbi.gov](mailto:public.affairs@ic.fbi.gov)> (b)(6),(b)(7)(C),(b)(7)(E) per FBI, (b)(6),(b)(7)(C),(b)(7)(E) per FBI (b)(3) - 50 U.S.C. 3605

Dear Director Wray an (b)(6),(b)(7)(C) per FBI

See attached check from Barbri prep school for admission of wrongdoing as to refund from them. Thus, false claims of harassment of tutors rebutted. In fact, considering (b)(6) per FBI Barbri will not offer me anymore courses or tutoring services while making false claims. I have the check to offer to as proof not only do they want me to go away but two-fold the FBI and AG Offices and Mr. Garland Staff. Be advised, due to the fact Trump House Mar-a-Lago has been just raided and monies spent from (b)(6) per FBI when into JP Morgan Chase checking account this is directly relevant to you and Mr. Garland investigation of her funds that taken by Barbri an (b)(6) per FBI rendered b (b)(6) per FBI which led to unauthorized practice of law and several State Bar Complaint against (b)(6) per FBI in several states anonymously. I mean why do you think they want me gone, so fast!?

In addition to thi (b)(6) per FBI due to hi (b)(6) per FBI led to lobbying and commuted sentence b (b)(6) per FBI due undue influence of there visit to White House and connections with Donald Trump and his family known to Secret Service logs hence for all intensive purposes are linked to your investigation as the rumor was due to (b)(6) per FBI. Tha (b)(6) per FBI knew some of the people that the White House may have been recruiting and diplomatic ties due to connections hence knew when people ingress and egress from their house. Thus, contrary t (b)(6) per FBI speculatio (b)(6) per FBI do have contact with her due to reality tv shows and wanting their name on her brands to sell fashion wear and lobbying efforts. In addition to this Barbri account was whereb (b)(6) per FBI location fo (b)(6) per FBI via authorization of principal agen (b)(6) per FBI. This is the funding stream relevant to your investigation and enabling you via InfraGard knowledge.

(b)(6) per FBI ██████████ Barbri for the record while he admonished to those in webinars how proud he wa (b)(6) per FBI ██████████ (b)(6) per FBI ██████████ helping the brand assumed the risk she was practicing law without a license which you can confirm in New York Times, TMZ, CNN and other news agencies that she was giving advice to prisoners whic (b)(6) per FBI ██████████ (b)(6) per FBI ██████████ claimed on State Bar CLE that they where in ethical compliance and would report people they think could be breaching or assume the risk of losing there licenses under ABA 8.4. In addition, to thi (b)(6) per FBI ██████████ was aware while (b)(6) per FBI ██████████ she was doing this bragging about it and hence how I heard about it my session with him which he got cold feet due to the conflict interest issue.

I would like to point out the logical and legal relevance of all this that the bank account information of interest to Mr. Garland, Mr. Moy and Mr. Jacobs is this JP Morgan Chase account as it would also behoove the FBI to look into whether they donated to Trump campaign and to what amount meaning in general terms for Jury whether the Pardon was bought off by contributions or influenced b (b)(6) per FBI ██████████ friendships with the above rappers. While the White House may attest that he signed this under his own free will the issue at hand is whether the Secret Service can produce documents when he was in contact wit (b)(6) per FBI ██████████ because her money spent on Barbr (b)(6) per FBI ██████████ was directly correlated to those two pardons. Whereb (b)(6) per FBI ██████████ was re-arrested again due to influence from (b)(6) per FBI ██████████ into the overall decision making process usin (b)(6) per FBI ██████████ Barbri Prep school. In addition, to this it would behoove Mr. Garland to look into Barbr (b)(6) per FBI ██████████ hence in matter of lobbying have seriose influence akin to Pharmaceutical companies as to lawyers that become licensed that are for all intensive purpose enemies of the state due to sedition, treason and espionage act charges to which Donald Trump is currently being investigated for according NDI leakage in Politico reports. In addition, this is indirectly linked to the fact Barbri prep courses during previous investigation by the FBI during previous issues of Russian collusion some of the lawyers to whom FBI investigated used Barbri prep as matter of fact and willfully breached ethics and did not care. Which I also reported to you the behavior of students post Pasadena, Hyatt Place, after Convention Center when told as matter of copyright not to post, talk or chat about what is on the exam they proceeded to do on second, third and fourth floor students checked into there rooms on July 26, 27, 2022 399 E Green St, Pasadena, CA 91101, Phone: (626) 788 9108 if secret service and police where to pull ISP of students at the exam at that location whether phone or internet would show people may have not only been online and posting about it online but texting each other during restroom breaks as to cheating during the exam and note passing. Tell others still in law school what is on the exam and what to look for while contacting Barbri for new pass back guarantee free course due to percentage completion. While the clock still ran during the exam students would get up during the exam to look at people bubble sheets as open form of cheating while the proctor turned there back.

(b)(6) per FBI ██████████ may or may not have been an attorney who utilized Barbri prep course materials, and he was disbarred, and I think Bill Clinton may have as well. You may have to verify last sentence.

For all intensive purposes if USAO was taking a poll of where they learned criminal tradecraft some would venture to point the finger at condoned behavior by Barbri bar prep school as to ethics violations under oath via state bar admission in fifty-two states. Hence, relevance directly at issue as t (b)(6) per FBI ██████████ and Donald Trump pardons and contacts.

Do you copy over?

X-Ray, over out.

May you please restore my access to InfraGard account. I would like to get back into my system to check and have been locked out for several weeks.

For the record, at this current time as you and ODNI, NSD, NSA are aware I will be in Redding, California to speak with Homicide Division for Investigative Technician positions and DA Offices for Redding. Be advised, I promised if I was hired if you authorized it and conflict of interest waivers were signed. I could be shared and into every state or DA Offices, Coroner's Office, or Police Department with your approval. Moreover, I would be plugged into every state known as "the plug" in Mr. Moy and Mr. Jacobs terms. This travelling pattern would show and confirm with Governmentjobs.com all pending applications moving forward in line with the promise I kept. Be advised, I am not to be faulted if they make poor decision as InfraGard (b)(6),(b)(7)(C) per FBI [REDACTED], Mr. Moy, Mr. Jacobs got me ready and prepared for these interviews as selling points in your favor and the justice department.

I thank you for listening.

Thanks,

(b)(6) per FBI [REDACTED]

---

**From:** (b)(6) per FBI  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 24, 2022 8:41 AM  
**To:** Olsen, Matthew (NSD); Matthews, Matrina (OLP) (b)(6) per NSD (NSD) (b)(6) per NSD (NSD); NSD CES Intern Applications; NSD Public (NSD); CTS-Internship (NSD); NSD LPO Applicant (SMO)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fwd: FBI InfraGard Appeal Application - Part 2 - Direct Relevance - Code of Ethics

----- Forwarded message -----

From (b)(6) per FBI  
Date: Wed, Aug 24, 2022 at 5:38 AM  
Subject: FBI InfraGard Appeal Application - Part 2 - Direct Relevance - Code of Ethics  
To (b)(6),(b)(7)(C),(b)(7)(E) per FBI  
<[public.affairs@ic.fbi.gov](mailto:public.affairs@ic.fbi.gov)>, <[OGC-JOBS@fbi.gov](mailto:OGC-JOBS@fbi.gov)> (b)(3) - 50 U.S.C. 3605

**Part 2 Appeal Letter InfraGard Application**

[14] It states under Code of Ethics for InfraGard that “support the education of members and general public in diligent manner, loyal, and honest manner and knowingly be apart of illegal or improper activities.” On several occasions this was breached before (b)(6) per FBI b (b)(6) per FBI but FBI never took any legal action against for example calling members annoying in question and answer boxes when questions were relevant as IMBA and Illinois for guest moderator such as security clearance issues at this university. Claiming that the English speakers on Sky News cannot pronounce (b)(6) per FBI correctly b (b)(6) per FBI went onto insinuate that Pegasus was tracking (b)(6) per FBI that John Kirby may have lied to American People by claiming “we cannot confirm or deny” walked back his comments under National Security Law. Up to including (b)(6) per FBI while having these conferences claiming it was open to the public without proper vetting Ukraine-Sitrep which classified or sensitive information was shared about John Kirby or soon thereafter b (b)(6) per FBI to news outlets for glamour which was on his twitter feed that anyone can follow. This was breached and done wilfully to the point people believed that John Kirby Pentagon Spokesperson misled American People about tracking ships in Russia due to advance technology hence absolutely knew and could vehemently deny accusation but because he said “cannot confirm or deny” there was culpability as to improper use b (b)(6) per FBI not stopping (b)(6) per FBI that this condoned activity. In addition to this several jokes were cracked Hispanics in OSIF labs via CT Watch which (b)(6) per FBI attended about Hispanic males “Del Taco” pictures as to improper unprofessional manners of the labs creating issues of poking fun at Latinos in apartment buildings and postings and them laughing this posted by “benicio del taco” making fun of label they were searching OSIF lab 2 encore presentation. **Isn't it true if FBI Agents witness events that you are less likely to revoke VP Philip Siegel Clearance due to complicity but yet claim lack of candor, criminal history, lack meeting membership criteria in email or memo form as excuse?**

**Is it true all of this was witnessed b (b)(6) per FBI pursuant to internal policies was witnessed by her and you never reported or vote (b)(6) per FBI off the board for racial or improper activities violating the code of ethics creating misrepresentation in contractual agreements?**

**Is it true you are willing to exaggerate or lie in memos if FBI agents witness this about the lack of candor, membership requirements and criminal history despite vetting others already?**

**Is it true it creates a mockery of code of ethics if FBI Agents witness thus never arrested, through off board or sanctioned a member of InfraGard for violations despite openly calling John Kirby basically a liar on Ukraine-Sitrep due to classified clearance which was hosted b (b)(6) per FBI vi (b)(6) per FBI**

[15] Under Duty of Candor that under confidentiality and protecting sensitive information of Code of Ethics that post ICCS conference there was uptick in hacks reported by FBI directly correlated to leaks post the conference which Director Wray and General Nakasone attended. But yet no sanctions where ever made or overhaul of whom attended despite several reporters in attendance and others whom have penchant for leaking stuff and taking illegal activity under first amendment and reporting.?

[16] Isn't it true directly at issue the confidentiality clause of InfraGard code of ethics but ye (b)(6) per FBI utilize (b)(6) per FBI metrics or certain confidential information when speaking to news outlets for air time that you never actually stopped him from doing so. Including Gun Bills that were posed as questions that he further went on to put on his twitter feed directly correlated to records you can pull. Thus for all intensive purposes i (b)(6) per FBI is aware, you are less inclined to enforce code of ethics due to popularity i (b)(6) per FBI is involved.

[17] Isn't it true as to direct relevance during Cyber Briefing in San Diego in July by Special Agent as to impeachability factor before the court that you accused by audience members similar duty of candor as S2 officer claims that you did not fully read someone in to a case? Whereby Mr Moy responded is there a question built into that statement? Be advised, this was on film an (b)(6) per FBI was witness to the accusation that someone in the audience did try to help you before under duty of candor and claimed almost lost his clearance under similar factors due misleading or certain lack of transparency with mutual goal such as InfraGard.

[18] Isn't tru (b)(6) per FBI was cracking jokes about Russian sunspots and likening reporters to fruitless allegations in one the last sit-reps claiming that everything must be Russia in overall foray and 10 minute lull due to technical glitch? Isn't true on the issue of duty of candor that you never enforced code of ethics despit (b)(6) per FBI being wilful participant along wit (b)(6) per FBI almost starting to laughing during this conference as she could not believe he did this? Isn't it true this violates bylaws of mocking reporters, yet no action was taken as to complicity b (b)(6) per FBI and condoned behaviour due to his position?

[19] As, to direct relevance in addition to this isn't it true it was brought to your attention tha (b)(6) per FBI was offering \$60 dollar gas card bribes as posters for people living a (b)(6) per FBI and you did not take any action despite photographic evidence? But then claimed lack of candor in email setting? Isn't it true this was done on camera downstairs, and you are well aware of it but took no action to arrest or question him in reference to this while he played "confirmation game downstairs with tenants" claiming he could never verify peoples stories that he was not going to do anything. Isn't it true on Facebook FBI would find that Eaves Management and apartment is offering bribes and rewards for tenants who give favourable reviews? Known bought off reviews on google? Isn't it true (b)(6) per FBI gave away property for these review in bargained for exchange for biased reviews which FBI can pull records on Facebook?

[20] Isn't it true under the guise of rejection letter that you knew in email form that (b)(6) per FBI did not call police when she was aware of pictures of mail tampering and pizzas going missing in the front? Despite duties as landlord to maintain the property and common areas. But that you still allowed them to continue despite fully aware they are complicity as accomplices and their rebuttal was call public authorities when you as FBI officials had duty to act that continued? This is all directly relevant to appeal stage of membership lack of candor, membership requirements, criminal history. Which show ethical duty to report to you issues but you never called back or followed up despite member telling you these things. **In fact it was forwarded and brought to your attention that the classified and sensitive materials discussed b (b)(6) per FBI you could not testify under oath if someone of the information as to FBI clearance was not leaked to the media post or preconference creating dilution in the clearances?**

[21] Isn't it true under the duty of candor that you were provided a lead (b)(6) per FBI form of Barbri a known sieve for unethical behaviour and you did not follow up, thank the member following ethical rules but are willing to put in memo form you do not want him to be member? That you were provided with (b)(6) per FBI form which directly at issue to the relevance of Ukraine sit-reps as to boat seizures and bank wanting money back on their loan and kleptocapture that JP Morgan chase the same bank at issue with Merrick Garland and information seized in the raid of Trumps house and (b)(6) per [REDACTED] that you believe this lacks candor are willing to put in memo form as to grounds not grant access? Isn't it true you are arguing that he lacks candor when all this can be verified? Isn't it true that actionable intelligence was provided to you that DNI, CIA, NSD was willing to take on the directly at issue as to relevance, but you are willing to deny entry based on lack of candor? Isn't it true that the Barbri check was self-authenticated and is a massive lead into Barbri whom is willing to take money from actual or soon be attorneys whom breach ethics under oath and you never took action in fifty-two states against those individuals? When you knew based on personal knowledge when you investigated Trump the first time in the Russian probe that several of the lawyers you interviewed had ties to Barbri bar prep. Thus, was on the radar already as condone unethical activity against the state bar oaths. For example, you knew (b)(6) per FBI [REDACTED] was using Barbri has been sued before in 2017 for Crypto Scam, lobbied trump (b)(6) per FBI [REDACTED] and boasted in NY Times, CNN, and other tabloids due to her legal team that (b)(6) per FBI [REDACTED] known in People Magazine and claiming in same sentence that (b)(6) per FBI [REDACTED] This is directly at issue on the point of lack of candor that you were provided a lead in check form that she pays into Barbri prep via JP Morgan to (b)(6) per FBI [REDACTED] whereby failed to take action with her the state of California bar despite in email logs show this was reported to you as fellow member stumbling across this information. Isn't it true you could and USAO could pull logs of the show to show she was unethical or wilfully lying to state bar and posing in pornographic photos that was reported to you ethical breaches of state bar moral character but yet you are willing to put lack of candor in rejection letter despite already granting access before? Isn't it true as to directly at issue relevance you had notice of these issues and failed to take action but instead claimed they cannot have security clearance when they abided by code of ethics and above parties did not in wilful breach?

Isn't it true that the same member brought to your attention he was fearful due to LADA Offices corruption they would go after him with State of California bar due to telling you this information? Which you can verify they abuse their clearances wilfully in blacklisting comment a (b)(6) per FBI [REDACTED] stop by police officer. That he claimed he had the power to blacklist people without a trial as to breach of ethics as to bill attainder, but you are willing to claim in memos lack candor? Correct? Yes? Isn't it true directly at issue as to relevance that his integrity is at issue as to ethical breaches before the State Bar of California and you have email memos showing lead into investigation but never took LADA to task over this due to partnerships and team meetings with LA Offices?

Thanks,

(b)(6) per FBI [REDACTED]

---

**From:** (b)(6) per FBI  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 28, 2022 2:08 AM  
**To:** CTS-Internship (NSD); NSD CES Intern Applications (b)(6) per NSD (NSD) (b)(6) per NSD (NSD); Matthews, Matrina (OLP); Olsen, Matthew (NSD); NSD Public (NSD)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fwd: InfraGard Appeal Application – Further Evidence

----- Forwarded message -----

From (b)(6) per FBI  
Date: Sat., Aug. 27, 2022, 11:05 p.m.  
Subject: InfraGard Appeal Application – Further Evidence  
To (b)(6),(b)(7)(C),(b)(7)(E) per FBI  
<[public.affairs@ic.fbi.gov](mailto:public.affairs@ic.fbi.gov)>, <[OGC-JOBS@fbi.gov](mailto:OGC-JOBS@fbi.gov)> (b)(3) - 50 U.S.C. 3605

**InfraGard Appeal Application – Further Evidence**

It was put in memo form via InfraGard Application to lack of candor but yet FBI never took any action when (b)(6) per FBI put (b)(6) per FBI picture on TMZ recently going to making mockery security clearances directly at issue here as to lack of candor post search warrants. As, that information with him and father was revealed to him. In addition, this would be second time when (b)(6) per FBI made a joke before while on trial under similar circumstances going directly at issue of the parody of security clearances. This is directly at issue as to standard of InfraGard as some members of InfraGard or due to associations with police did have access to non public information for example storming the capitol and ending up on FBI website.

Isn't it true FBI busted some whom happened to be police officers with federal access on your website which is similar to InfraGard? More, specifically officers with Federal Clearances who used these clearances to plan an insurrection. But, yet they put in my memo of rejection lack of candor. This is directly at issue. As, the concern I do not pose problem or threat to public in fact the reason reasoning behind it is because (b)(6) per FBI was never accountable as to breach of ethics and duty of loyalty to members which was forwarded to you questions due to abuse of position to the detriment (b)(6) per FBI and (b)(6) per FBI in LA offices.

<https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/houston-police-officer-charged-capitol-riot-after-fbi-agents-find-n1254911>

<https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/justice-department/fbi-arrests-ex-marine-allegedly-assaulting-officers-capitol-jan-6-rcna44503>

Thus, as to standard beyond InfraGard. In fact, was it not dictated to FBI that Barbri in check form given with JP Morgan Account to which (b)(6) per FBI Barbri that to certain extent to lawyers previously surrounding him had used Barbri bar prep thru (b)(6) per FBI used the service whom boasted to everyone she go (b)(6) per FBI in NY Times, CNN, other news outlets. But yet FBI never took action about this. Which is directly at issue to my overall appeal as to candor. Therefore, further evidence of interest to the FBI in reference to unethical behavior to which goes against the letter as all this can be verified by looking it up. Thus, directly at issue as to candor metric and

being non issue as I have complied with ethics laws for truthfulness in State of California going to lack of merits or wilful ignorance in a security assessment which had an account before.

Isn't it true several that Barbri is known sieve for breaching ethics before State Bars in 52 states which is relevant to recent raids on Trump? Therefore, as to those whom he associated with in the past and present via counsel?

In relevance to (b)(6) per FBI brand and associations.

Isn't true some of her clothing that is sold is due to knowledge not known to the public to pitch those with security clearance such as Donald Trump and other to beat the market? Getting beyond her TV show. But yet, FBI believes this is not relevant when it known fact she boasted in the media via her legal team actually claimed credit (b)(6) per FBI due to pact with (b)(6) per FBI via White House visit to influence him as public official against MPRE ethics standards. That you are not to tell people you can influence government official which is directly relevant to Mar-a-Lago raids as she is not licensed in breach of ethics for State Bar of California. Yet, I get penalized when offered truth to you in relevance to the above.

Isn't it true the reason she associates with certain A-listers in Washington is because she wants to non-public information to brand her products?

Isn't it true FBI never took action to whom she associates with when she is known trove for Crypto Scam in 2017 as to lawsuit and other unethical behavior before the State of California Bar? But, yet no action was taken by FBI in fact to some at Pasadena Convention Center when testing in July believed that because of this State of California does not take seriously ethical infractions even under oath. July 26, 27 2022, out of 2997 students there where several whom openly stated "What the hell is FBI doing they should be investigating her. She tells everyone (b)(6) per FBI and Barbri. I get a money back guarantee from them if I don't pass. How do they let her write it when she has lawsuits pending against her?"

Yet, you claim in letter form I am not worthy via InfraGard when I meet all requirements. Yet, that I lack candor when I have offered on numerous occasions to speak to your offices in reference to Membership to clarify certain issues. In addition to this I have never jeopardized your operations and in fact the criminal history is non issue before California State Bar thus California State Supreme Court which is the highest court in the land as to licensing which trumps your letter overall. Overall, with respect to tutelage the interviews sell themselves due to tutelage hence for all intensive purposes denying me access only hinders DNI, CIA, NSA, FBI moving forward which against the best interest of the scope of partnership. In addition to this I was never granted interview on both occasions in breach of vetting process which is listed on your website FAQ.

Isn't it true you quote lack of candor in memo form as to factors when this was not done according to the letter of the law as to both times?

Isn't it true that all emails found off InfraGard are vetted and proper methods of reporting certain issues but now you claim in memo form do not meet membership requirements, criminal history, lack of candor? When, of course you granted access previously this would look misleading despite all the disclaimers and against public interest in new releases via San Diego USAO offices in newsletters.

<https://www.tzm.com/2022/08/27/donald-trump-jr-dick-pic-redacted-affidavit-documents/>



(b)(6) per FBI

**From:** Wilner, Michael  
**Subject:** Re: [EXTERNAL] McClatchy: Raid of Mar-a-Lago  
**To:** Rosello, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 8, 2022 7:24 PM (UTC-04:00)

Thanks Luis, you too

On Mon, Aug 8, 2022 at 7:15 PM Rossello, Luis (PAO) <[Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov](mailto:Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov)> wrote:

Hi Michael. Put us down for decline to comment.

Hope all is well.

L

---

**From:** Wilner, Michael <[mwilner@mcclatchydc.com](mailto:mwilner@mcclatchydc.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 8, 2022 7:06 PM  
**To:** Rossello, Luis (PAO) <[Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov](mailto:Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] McClatchy: Raid of Mar-a-Lago

Luis,

Does the Justice Department have comment on the FBI's raid of former President Donald Trump's residence at Mar-a-Lago this evening?

Thanks,

Michael

--

**Michael A. Wilner**

Senior National Security and White House Correspondent

**C** (b)(6)

**E** [mwilner@mcclatchydc.com](mailto:mwilner@mcclatchydc.com)

**T** [w@mawilner](https://twitter.com/mawilner)

--



**Michael A. Wilner**

Senior National Security and White House Correspondent

**C(b) (6)**

**E** [mw\\_ner@mcc.atohydc.com](mailto:mw_ner@mcc.atohydc.com)

**Tw** @maw\_ner

**From:** Harold Hutchison  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request for comment  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 8, 2022 8:53 PM (UTC-04:00)

I am a reporter with the Daily Caller News Foundation.

Does the Justice Department have any comments on claims that the raid on Mar-a-Lago is "lawless" and "corrupt?"

----

Harold Hutchison  
Daily Caller News Foundation  
[harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org)  
[harold@dcnf.org](mailto:harold@dcnf.org)

(b) (6)

**From:** Harold Hutchison  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request for comment on Mar-a-Lago raid  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 9, 2022 9:36 AM (UTC-04:00)

I am a reporter with the Daily Caller News Foundation.

Many congressional Republicans are claiming the raid on Mar-a-Lago is an abuse of power. Can the DOJ prove it is not an abuse of power?

----

Harold Hutchison  
Daily Caller News Foundation  
[harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org)  
[harold@dcnf.org](mailto:harold@dcnf.org)

(b) (6)

**From:** Harold Hutchison  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Request for comment on Mar-a-Lago raid  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 9, 2022 1:54 PM (UTC-04:00)

I'm with the Daily Caller News Foundation.

Did the Justice Department keep the White House in the dark about the raid on Mar-a-Lago?

----

Harold Hutchison  
Daily Caller News Foundation  
[harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org)  
[harold@dcnf.org](mailto:harold@dcnf.org)

(b) (6)

On Tue, Aug 9, 2022 at 9:35 AM Harold Hutchison <[harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org)> wrote:

I am a reporter with the Daily Caller News Foundation.

Many congressional Republicans are claiming the raid on Mar-a-Lago is an abuse of power. Can the DOJ prove it is not an abuse of power?

----

Harold Hutchison  
Daily Caller News Foundation  
[harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org)  
[harold@dcnf.org](mailto:harold@dcnf.org)

(b) (6)

**From:** Harold Hutchison  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Mar-a-Lago raid  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 9, 2022 3:05 PM (UTC-04:00)

I am a reporter with the Daily Caller News Foundation.

Does the Justice Department have any comment on criticism of Monday s raid on Mar-a-Lago?

----

Harold Hutchison  
Daily Caller News Foundation  
[harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org)  
[harold@dcnf.org](mailto:harold@dcnf.org)

(b) (6)

**From:** Harold Hutchison  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request for comment  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 10, 2022 10:19 AM (UTC-04:00)

I am a reporter with the Daily Caller News Foundation.

Does the Justice Department have any comment on the raid on Mar-A-Lago?

----

Harold Hutchison  
Daily Caller News Foundation  
[harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org)  
[harold@dcnf.org](mailto:harold@dcnf.org)

(b) (6)



**From:** Harold Hutchison  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request for comment  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 10, 2022 12:20 PM (UTC-04:00)

I am a reporter with the Daily Caller News Foundation.

Could the Justice Department comment on claims by former Rep. Tulsi Gabbard that the raid on Mar-a-Lago was a "blatant abuse of power?"

----

Harold Hutchison  
Daily Caller News Foundation  
[harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org)  
[harold@dcnf.org](mailto:harold@dcnf.org)

(b) (6)

**From:** Harold Hutchison  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request for comment  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 10, 2022 2:47 PM (UTC-04:00)

I am a reporter with the Daily Caller News Foundation.

Does the Justice Department have any comment on claims former President Trump made in a post on Truth social about the raid on Mar-a-Lago?

----

Harold Hutchison  
Daily Caller News Foundation  
[harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org)  
[harold@dcnf.org](mailto:harold@dcnf.org)

(b) (6)

**From:** Harold Hutchison  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request for comment  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 11, 2022 4:57 PM (UTC-04:00)

I am a reporter with the Daily Caller News Foundation.

Is the Justice Department going to release the affidavit for the warrant for the Mar-a-Lago raid?

----

Harold Hutchison  
Daily Caller News Foundation  
[harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org)  
[harold@dcnf.org](mailto:harold@dcnf.org)

(b) (6)

**From:** Harold Hutchison  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request for comment  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 12, 2022 12:09 PM (UTC-04:00)

I'm a reporter with the Daily Caller News Foundation.

Can DOJ comment on claims by Harmeet Dhillon that the raid on Mar-a-Lago was a fishing expedition?

----

Harold Hutchison  
Daily Caller News Foundation  
[harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org)  
[harold@dcnf.org](mailto:harold@dcnf.org)

(b) (6)

**From:** Harold Hutchison  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request for comment  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 12, 2022 1:56 PM (UTC-04:00)

I'm a reporter with the Daily Caller News Foundation.

Why was Christina Bobb, former President Trump's attorney, not allowed to observe the search of Mar-a-Lago?

----

Harold Hutchison  
Daily Caller News Foundation  
[harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org)  
[harold@dcnf.org](mailto:harold@dcnf.org)

(b) (6)

**From:** Harold Hutchison  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request for comment  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 12, 2022 5:18 PM (UTC-04:00)

Will the Justice Department release the affidavit that was used to obtain the search warrant?

----

Harold Hutchison  
Daily Caller News Foundation  
[harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org)  
[harold@dcnf.org](mailto:harold@dcnf.org)

(b) (6)

**From:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Subject:** FW: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Media Request-Axios  
**To:** sareen.habeshian@axios.com  
**Sent:** August 15, 2022 11:11 PM (UTC-04:00)  
**Attached:** USA response 8-15.pdf

Hi Sareen, attached please find a copy of the motion filed this afternoon. I would highlight the below language (found on page 8 of the motion) which addressed key reasoning behind the Department's opposition to the motion.

"In addition, information about witnesses is particularly sensitive given the high-profile nature of this matter and the risk that the revelation of witness identities would impact their willingness to cooperate with the investigation," prosecutors note -- highlighting stories regarding an increase in threats to law enforcement that has followed the search of Mar-a-Lago.

"Disclosure of the government's affidavit at this stage would also likely chill future cooperation by witnesses whose assistance may be sought as this investigation progresses, as well as in other high-profile investigations," the filing states. "The fact that this investigation implicates highly classified materials further underscores the need to protect the integrity of the investigation and exacerbates the potential for harm if information is disclosed to the public prematurely or improperly."

Best regard,

Luis

Luis R. Rossello  
Communications Advisor for National Security/Spokesperson  
U.S. Department of Justice  
(o) 202-514-1153  
(c) (b) (6)

[Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov](mailto:Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov)

Learn more about the Justice Department's national security work by following @DOJNatSec

---

**From:** Sareen Habeshian <sareen.habeshian@axios.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 15, 2022 5:23 PM  
**To:** Coley, Anthony D. (PAO) (b) (6)  
**Cc:** Rossello, Luis (PAO) <Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Media Request-Axios

Got it, thank you so much!

Does the DOJ wish to provide a comment?

Thank you!

**Sareen Habeshian**

Breaking News Reporter [sareen.habeshian@axios.com](mailto:sareen.habeshian@axios.com)  
(b) (6)

Pronouns: she/her

Get the news that matters in just 10 minutes with Axios Today & Axios How It Happened podcasts - [Subscribe!](#)

On Mon, Aug 15, 2022 at 2:19 PM Coley, Anthony D. (PAO) (b) (6) wrote:

Hi Sareen, Thanks for checking in.

The filing is available on PACER. CCing Luis Rossello in case you don't have access to see if he can get you a copy....

---

**From:** Sareen Habeshian <[sareen.habeshian@axios.com](mailto:sareen.habeshian@axios.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, August 15, 2022 5:09 PM

**To:** Coley, Anthony D. (PAO) (b) (6)

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Media Request-Axios

Hello,

I'm writing on behalf of Axios to request information on the DOJ opposing requests to unseal the Trump Mar-A-Lago search warrant saying. Can you confirm that the department is opposing this?

Can you share the court filing and provide any comment?

Thank you!

**Sareen Habeshian**

Breaking News Reporter [sareen.habeshian@axios.com](mailto:sareen.habeshian@axios.com)

(b) (6)

Pronouns: she/her

Get the news that matters in just 10 minutes with Axios Today & Axios How It Happened podcasts - [Subscribe!](#)



**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

**CASE NO. 22-MJ-8332-BER**

**IN RE SEALED SEARCH WARRANT**

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**UNITED STATES' OMNIBUS RESPONSE TO MOTIONS TO UNSEAL**

On August 8, 2022, the Department of Justice executed a search warrant at the premises located at 1100 S. Ocean Blvd., Palm Beach, Florida 33480, a property of former President Donald J. Trump. Given the circumstances presented in this matter and the public interest in transparency, and in the wake of the former President's public confirmation of the search and his representatives' public characterizations of the materials sought, the government moved to unseal the search warrant, its attachments, and the Property Receipt summarizing materials seized, which motion this Court granted. Those docketed items, which had already been provided to the former President's counsel upon execution of the warrant, have now appropriately been made public. The affidavit supporting the search warrant presents a very different set of considerations. There remain compelling reasons, including to protect the integrity of an ongoing law enforcement investigation that implicates national security, that support keeping the affidavit sealed.<sup>1</sup>

The government does not object to unsealing other materials filed in connection with

---

<sup>1</sup> The government has carefully considered whether the affidavit can be released subject to redactions. For the reasons discussed below, the redactions necessary to mitigate harms to the integrity of the investigation would be so extensive as to render the remaining unsealed text devoid of meaningful content, and the release of such a redacted version would not serve any public interest. Nevertheless, should the Court order partial unsealing of the affidavit, the government respectfully requests an opportunity to provide the Court with proposed redactions.

the search warrant whose unsealing would not jeopardize the integrity of this national security investigation, subject to minor redactions to protect government personnel, namely: cover sheets associated with the search warrant application, Docket Entry (“D.E.”) 1; the government’s motion to seal, D.E. 2; and the Court’s sealing order, D.E. 3. The government’s proposed redactions to those documents have been filed under seal as D.E. 57, and the government now asks the Court to unseal the materials contained in that filing.<sup>2</sup>

### **Procedural Background**

In recent days, following the execution of the search warrant, several news media organizations and other entities asked this Court to unseal the search warrant and related documents. *See* D.E. 4 (motion by Judicial Watch, Inc.) (Aug. 10, 2022); D.E. 6 (letter motion by *Times Union*) (Aug. 10, 2022); D.E. 8 (motion by New York Times Company) (Aug. 10, 2022); D.E. 20 (motion by CBS Broadcasting, Inc.) (Aug. 11, 2022); D.E. 22 (motion by Washington Post Company et al.) (Aug. 11, 2022); D.E. 23 (motion by *Palm Beach Post*) (Aug. 12, 2022); D.E. 30 (motion by Florida Center for Government Accountability) (Aug. 12, 2022); D.E. 31 (motion by *Miami Herald* and *Tampa Bay Times*) (Aug. 12, 2022); D.E. 32 (motion by Dow Jones & Company, Inc.) (Aug. 12, 2022); D.E. 33 (motion by Associated Press) (Aug. 12, 2022); D.E. 49 (motion by ABC, Inc.) (Aug. 15, 2022).

On August 10, 2022, after the filing of the first motion to unseal, the Court ordered the

---

<sup>2</sup> None of these documents contains new information that may implicate the privacy interests of former President Trump, so the government has not conferred with his counsel regarding their unsealing. In response to a request from the Washington Post Company group of intervenors (D.E. 22), the government conferred with counsel for those intervenors, who do not object to the proposed redactions. The government recognizes that they or other parties may seek additional time to file reply pleadings addressing any remaining disputed document(s), and the government does not object to such requests.

government to file a response by 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on August 15, 2022. D.E. 5. Following two additional such filings and in order to “avoid the need for individualized orders on any future motion(s) to unseal,” the Court directed the government to file “an omnibus response to all motions to unseal on or before 5:00 p.m. Eastern time on August 15, 2022.” D.E. 12.

On August 12, 2022, the government filed its own motion with the Court seeking to unseal, absent objection by the former President: (1) “the search warrant signed and approved by the Court on August 5, 2022, including Attachments A and B,” and (2) “the redacted Property Receipt listing items seized pursuant to the search, filed with the Court on August 11, 2022.” D.E. 18. The Court ordered the government to serve a copy of its motion on counsel for the former President and to advise the Court by 3:00 p.m. Eastern time on August 12, 2022, whether the former President opposed the government’s motion. D.E. 19. In accordance with that order and following consultation with the former President’s counsel, the government notified the Court that the former President did not object to its motion to unseal. D.E. 40. The Court then granted the government’s motion and unsealed the above-listed documents. D.E. 41.

### Argument

#### Disclosure of the Search Warrant Affidavit Would Irreparably Harm the Government’s Ongoing Criminal Investigation

The press and the public enjoy a qualified right of access to judicial proceedings and the judicial records filed therein. *See, e.g., Romero v. Drummond Co., Inc.*, 480 F.3d 1234, 1245 (11th Cir. 2007); *Chicago Tribune Co. v. Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc.*, 263 F.3d 1304, 1311 (11th Cir. 2001). The unsealing of judicial materials pursuant to the common-law right of access “requires a balancing of competing interests.” *Chicago Tribune Co.*, 263 F.3d at 1311. “In

balancing the public interest in accessing court documents against a party's interest in keeping the information confidential, courts consider, among other factors, whether allowing access would impair court functions or harm legitimate privacy interests, the degree of and likelihood of injury if made public, the reliability of the information, whether there will be an opportunity to respond to the information, whether the information concerns public officials or public concerns, and the availability of a less onerous alternative to sealing the documents.” *Romero*, 480 F.3d at 1246.<sup>3</sup>

“In the Eleventh Circuit, potential prejudice to an ongoing criminal investigation represents a compelling government interest that justifies the closure of judicial records.” *Bennett v. United States*, No. 12-61499-CIV, 2013 WL 3821625, at \*4 (S.D. Fla. July 23, 2013) (Rosenbaum, J.) (citing *United States v. Valenti*, 986 F.2d 708 (11th Cir. 1993)). *See generally Douglas Oil Co. of Cal. v. Petrol Stops Nw.*, 441 U.S. 211, 219 (1979) (“if preindictment proceedings were made public, many prospective witnesses would be hesitant to come forward voluntarily, knowing that those against whom they testify would be aware of that testimony,” and “[t]here would also be the risk that those about to be indicted would flee, or

---

<sup>3</sup> In addition, the First Amendment provides a basis for the press and the public's “right of access to criminal trial proceedings.” *Chicago Tribune Co.*, 263 F.3d at 1310. However, this Circuit has not addressed whether the First Amendment right of access applies to sealed search warrant materials. *See, e.g., Bennett v. United States*, No. 12-61499-CIV, 2013 WL 3821625, at \*3 (S.D. Fla. July 23, 2013) (“this Court has found no Eleventh Circuit decisions addressing whether a First Amendment right of access extends to sealed search-warrant affidavits, particularly at the preindictment stage”). The better view is that no First Amendment right to access pre-indictment warrant materials exists because there is no tradition of public access to *ex parte* warrant proceedings. *See In re Search of Fair Finance*, 692 F. 3d 424, 429-33 (6th Cir. 2012); *Baltimore Sun Co. v. Goetz*, 886 F.2d 60, 64 (4th Cir. 1989); *Times Mirror Co. v. United States*, 873 F. 2d 1210, 1212-18 (9th Cir. 1989). In any event, the Court need not determine whether a First Amendment right of access to search warrant affidavits attaches at this stage of an investigation because, even if there were such a right, a “compelling government interest,” *Bennett*, 2013 WL 3821625, at \*4, favors keeping the remaining materials under seal for the reasons laid out below.

would try to influence individual grand jurors”). In *Valenti*, for example, the Eleventh Circuit concluded that the district court properly denied a newspaper’s motion to unseal transcripts from closed court proceedings “as a necessary means to achieving the government’s compelling interest in the protection of a continuing law enforcement investigation.” 987 F.2d at 714.<sup>4</sup> As Judge Jordan explained in the context of one “highly-publicized criminal case,” there are compelling reasons not to release non-public information in an ongoing investigation that could “compromise the investigation and might . . . lead to the destruction of evidence.” *United States v. Steinger*, 626 F. Supp. 2d 1231, 1232, 1235 (S.D. Fla. 2009). Even when the public is already aware of the general nature of the investigation, revealing the specific contents of a search warrant affidavit could alter the investigation’s trajectory, reveal ongoing and future investigative efforts, and undermine agents’ ability to collect evidence or obtain truthful testimony. In addition to the implications for the investigation, the release of this type of investigative material could have “devastating consequences” for the reputations and rights of individuals whose actions and statements are described. See *Steinger*, 626 F. Supp. 2d at 1235. For these reasons, courts in this

---

<sup>4</sup> Out-of-circuit authority is similar. See, e.g., *Media Gen. Operations, Inc. v. Buchanan*, 417 F.3d 424, 431 (4th Cir. 2005) (affirming that “the government’s interest in continuing its ongoing criminal investigation outweighs the petitioners’ interest in having the document opened to the press and the public”); *Matter of EyeCare Physicians of Am.*, 100 F.3d 514, 519 (7th Cir. 1996) (affirming decision not to unseal search warrant affidavits in preindictment posture because that “might very likely impair the ongoing criminal investigation,” and observing that “disclosing even a redacted version of the search warrant affidavit would enable the subjects of the investigation the opportunity to alter, remove or withhold records”); *Times Mirror Co.*, 873 F.2d at 1219 (“the ends of justice would be frustrated, not served, if the public were allowed access to warrant materials in the midst of a preindictment investigation into suspected criminal activity”); *In re Search Warrant for Secretarial Area Outside Off. of Gunn*, 855 F.2d 569, 574 (8th Cir. 1988) (“The government has demonstrated that restricting public access to [investigative] documents is necessitated by a compelling government interest—the on-going investigation.”).

jurisdiction have consistently denied motions to unseal investigative records—including search warrant affidavits—in ongoing criminal investigations. *See Valenti*, 987 F.2d at 714 (affirming denial of motion to unseal transcripts from closed court proceedings); *Bennett*, 2013 WL 3821625 at \*4-8 (denying motion to unseal search warrant affidavit); *Matter of Search of Office Suites for World and Islam Studies*, 925 F. Supp. 738, 743 (M.D. Fla. 1996) (denying motion to unseal search warrant affidavits because they “contain the identifications of individuals that are subjects of the Government’s investigation” and they “state, at length, the scope and direction of its investigation”); *Steinger*, 626 F. Supp. 2d at 1235 (denying motion to unseal “motions, responses, replies, orders, and transcripts” related to an “ongoing federal grand jury corruption investigation”).

Courts have also denied requests to partially unseal redacted versions of investigative materials where doing so would fail to protect the integrity of law enforcement investigations. *See Valenti*, 987 F.2d at 715 (“release of a redacted version” of transcripts from closed proceedings “would have been inadequate to protect the government’s interest in the ongoing investigation”); *Patel v. United States*, No. 9:19-MC-81181, 2019 WL 4251269, at \*4 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 9, 2019) (“Given the details contained in the [search warrant] affidavit, the Court finds that redaction of names and other identifying information would not adequately assure the Government’s need to protect the integrity of an ongoing investigation.”); *Bennett*, 2013 WL 3821625, at \*7 (“line-by-line redaction is not practical” where the government’s justifications for sealing include protecting the identities of undercover agents as well as protecting identities of potential witnesses); *Matter of Search of Office Suites for World and Islam Studies*, 925 F. Supp. at 743-44 (observing that even if release of redacted affidavits “might protect the parties named in the affidavits” it would “offer[] no shield against revealing the other aspects

of the Government’s investigation,” and concluding that “unsealing even a portion of [an] affidavit would reveal, either explicitly or by inference, the scope and direction of the Government’s investigation”); *United States v. Corces*, No. 92-28-CR-T-17B, 1997 WL 447979, at \*3 (M.D. Fla. July 28, 1997) (“redaction may be impracticable or insufficient to protect the compelling interest” in protecting law enforcement investigations).

Here, the government has a compelling, overriding interest in preserving the integrity of an ongoing criminal investigation. As the government has readily acknowledged, the circumstances here—involving a search of the premises for a former President—involve matters of significant public concern. As a result, in an effort to ensure public access to materials that no longer needed to be sealed to protect the investigation, the government sought to unseal the search warrant, its attachments describing the premises to be searched and the property to be seized, and the Property Receipt provided to the former President’s counsel upon execution of the search. *See* D.E. 18. The Court granted that motion with the consent of former President Trump, who had previously received these materials, and the materials have now been made public. D.E. 40, 41. From these disclosures, the public is now aware of, among other things, the potential criminal statutes at issue in this investigation, *see* D.E. 17:4 (Attachment B to the search warrant) (permitting the government to seize materials “constituting evidence, contraband, fruits of crime, or other items illegally possessed in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 793, 2071, or 1519”), and the general nature of the items seized, including documents marked as classified, *see* D.E. 17:5-7 (Property Receipt). The government determined that these materials could be released without significant harm to its investigation because the search had already been executed and publicly acknowledged by the former President, and because the materials had previously been provided to the former

President through counsel.

Disclosure at this juncture of the affidavit supporting probable cause would, by contrast, cause significant and irreparable damage to this ongoing criminal investigation. As the Court is aware from its review of the affidavit, it contains, among other critically important and detailed investigative facts: highly sensitive information about witnesses, including witnesses interviewed by the government; specific investigative techniques; and information required by law to be kept under seal pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e). If disclosed, the affidavit would serve as a roadmap to the government's ongoing investigation, providing specific details about its direction and likely course, in a manner that is highly likely to compromise future investigative steps. In addition, information about witnesses is particularly sensitive given the high-profile nature of this matter and the risk that the revelation of witness identities would impact their willingness to cooperate with the investigation.<sup>5</sup> Disclosure of the government's affidavit at this stage would also likely chill future cooperation by witnesses whose assistance may be sought as this investigation progresses, as well as in other high-profile investigations. The fact that this investigation implicates highly classified materials further underscores the need to protect the integrity of the investigation and exacerbates the potential for harm if information is disclosed to the public prematurely or improperly.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> This is not merely a hypothetical concern, given the widely reported threats made against law enforcement personnel in the wake of the August 8 search. *See, e.g.*, Alan Feuer et al., "Armed Man Is Killed After Trying to Breach FBI's Cincinnati Office," *N.Y. Times* (Aug. 11, 2022), available at <https://www.nytimes.com/live/2022/08/11/us/fbi-cincinnati-shooting-news>; Josh Margolin, "Authorities Monitoring Online Threats Following FBI's Mar-a-Lago Raid," ABC News (Aug. 11, 2022), available at <https://abcnews.go.com/US/authorities-monitoring-online-threats-fbis-mar-lago-raid/story?id=88199587>.

<sup>6</sup> Given that the Court is considering motions to unseal this affidavit merely days after reviewing these materials and approving the warrant application, the government is mindful



As Judge Jordan explained in *Steinger*, the risks of disclosing specific details about an investigation are manifold and potentially devastating. *See* 626 F. Supp. 2d at 1235. Specific facts in a warrant affidavit may act as a roadmap of the ongoing investigation. Meanwhile, of their own accord, witnesses may be “hesitant to come forward voluntarily, knowing that those against whom they testify would be aware of their testimony,” *id.*, or that information they share in interviews would be publicized before any criminal proceeding has been initiated. These powerful concerns justify keeping the warrant affidavit under seal. *See also, e.g., In re Search of Fair Finance*, 692 F.3d 424, 432 (6th Cir. 2012) (disclosure of search warrant materials could “reveal the government’s preliminary theory of the crime being investigated,” and could cause the government to “be more selective in the information it disclosed [to courts] in order to preserve the integrity of its investigations”); *Matter of Search of Office Suites for World and Islam Studies*, 925 F. Supp. at 743 (denying motion to unseal affidavits that “contain the identifications of individuals that are subjects of the Government’s investigation”; that “state, at length, the scope and direction of its investigation”; and that contain “[r]eferences to cooperating witness(es) . . . throughout the documents”); *Bennett*, 2013 WL 3821625, at \*4 (“protecting [the] ongoing investigation of Dr. Bennett and the Gulfstream Pain Center constitutes a compelling interest justifying continued sealing,” especially in “this pre-indictment stage”); *id.* at \*6 (similar).

Further, and in view of what the government has already moved to make public, there is no “less onerous alternative to sealing” the affidavit. *Romero*, 480 F.3d at 1246. Unlike

---

that this Court is familiar with the highly sensitive contents of the affidavit and the specific harms that would result from its unsealing. However, if the Court would like the government to file a sealed *ex parte* supplement that addresses with more specificity the contents of the affidavit and the harms identified in this response, the government stands ready to do so.

the Property Receipt—which the government moved to unseal subject to minor redactions, including to protect the identity of law enforcement officials—the affidavit cannot responsibly be unsealed in a redacted form absent redactions that would be so extensive as to render the document devoid of content that would meaningfully enhance the public’s understanding of these events beyond the information already now in the public record. There is simply no alternative to sealing that could ensure the integrity of the government’s investigation and that would prevent the inevitable efforts to read between the lines and discern the identities of certain individuals, dates, or other critical, case-specific information. *Accord Matter of Search of Office Suites for World and Islam Studies*, 925 F. Supp. at 743 (“While this court is fully cognizant of the public’s and press’s right of access and has carefully considered redaction of names and extraction of excerpts as a less restrictive means to protect the Government’s investigation, in this instance, neither is sufficient to protect the Government’s compelling interests.”); *Bennett*, 2013 WL 3821625, at \*8 (“Given the detailed context in which [certain] persons and their actions are discussed in the affidavit, the Court finds that redaction of names and other identifying information would not adequately protect the Government’s need for closure.”).

The case law cited by the intervenors is readily distinguishable. Many of those cases involved unsealing requests made well after charges were filed. *See, e.g., United States v. Peterson*, 627 F. Supp. 2d 1359, 1374 (M.D. Ga. 2008) (“Defendant is already under indictment”); *United States v. Shenberg*, 791 F. Supp. 292, 293 & n.1 (S.D. Fla. 1991) (defendants were already under indictment, and charges were “well known and have been extensively reported by the media”); *United States v. Vives*, No. 02-20030 CR, 2006 WL

3792096 (S.D. Fla. Dec. 21, 2006).<sup>7</sup> In other cited cases that involved requests to unseal warrants in the investigation phase—in other words, before any charges—the court ultimately concluded that the government’s compelling interest in protecting the integrity of its investigation outweighed any public right of access. *E.g.*, *In re Search Warrant for Secretarial Area Outside Off. of Gunn*, 855 F.2d 569, 574 (8th Cir. 1988) (rejecting disclosure request); *Bennett*, 2013 WL 3821625 (same); *Patel*, 2019 WL 4251269, at \*4 (“The Court finds that unsealing the underlying [search warrant] affidavit and related documents would severely prejudice the Government’s ongoing investigation”); *In re Search of Wellcare Health Plans, Inc.*, No. 8:07-MJ-1466-TGW, 2007 WL 4240740, at \*2 (M.D. Fla. Nov. 28, 2007) (“The protection of this continuing law enforcement investigation is a compelling governmental interest that outweighs the public’s interest in immediate access to” the warrant affidavit). And in *In re Four Search Warrants*, 945 F. Supp. 1563 (N.D. Ga. 1996), involving the 1996 Atlanta Olympic bombing investigation, “the criminal investigation into [the search subject’s] participation in the bombing ha[d] ended” and he was “no longer considered a suspect” by the time the media sought the search warrant materials. *Id.* at 1568. Unsurprisingly, none of these cases concerned circumstances remotely similar to these—where there is an active investigation and a search was executed just days ago. Thus, while the intervenors quote these opinions for general principles about the right of access, the actual application of those principles in those cases favors the government’s position here.

### **Conclusion**

This Court should deny motions by third parties to the extent they seek to unseal the

---

<sup>7</sup> Although the court’s decision in *Vives* did not discuss the case history, the docket indicates that Vives and his codefendants were charged and tried years before the unsealing request at issue.

search warrant affidavit. Because the parties already have briefed this matter extensively, the government submits that the Court should rule on the motions without a hearing. The government does not object to the unsealing of Docket Entry 57.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Juan Antonio Gonzalez  
JUAN ANTONIO GONZALEZ  
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY  
Florida Bar No. 897388  
99 NE 4th Street, 8th Floor  
Miami, FL 33132  
Tel: 305-961-9001  
Email (b) (6)

/s/ Jay I. Bratt  
JAY I. BRATT  
CHIEF  
Counterintelligence and Export Control  
Section  
National Security Division  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20530  
Illinois Bar No. 6187361  
Tel: 202-233-0986  
Email (b) (6)

**Certificate of Service**

I **HEREBY CERTIFY** that I caused the attached document to be electronically transmitted to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF system for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing.

/s/ Juan Antonio Gonzalez  
Juan Antonio Gonzalez  
Assistant United States Attorney

**From:** Harold Hutchison  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request for comment  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 19, 2022 10:00 AM (UTC-04:00)

I am a reporter with the Daily Caller News Foundation.

Does the Justice Department have any comment on remarks made on "Hannity" last night that claimed "the Russia hoax team" was behind the search warrant used to justify the raid on Mar-a-Lago?

----

Harold Hutchison  
Daily Caller News Foundation  
[harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org)  
[harold@dcnf.org](mailto:harold@dcnf.org)

(b) (6)

**From:** Gurman, Sadie  
**Subject:** Re: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Quick Q for you  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 22, 2022 4:29 PM (UTC-04:00)

OK, so there was a garble in my understanding of our reportage. This is what we intend to report. Let me know if you spot a problem or have something we should add?

**The FBI agents who searched former President Donald Trump’s Mar-a-Lago home found highly sensitive and classified documents lying in unsecure places outside the complex storage room that Justice Department officials had earlier asked to be better secured, people familiar with the matter said.**

**At least one person familiar with the location of the documents at the complex had alerted investigators, the people said, heightening what officials believed to be the need for agents to take the dramatic step of seizing them from the private club after months of trying to retrieve them through less intrusive means, including negotiations and a subpoena.**

Sadie Gurman  
WASHINGTON BUREAU

O: (b) (6) | M: (b) (6)  
E: [sadie.gurman@wsj.com](mailto:sadie.gurman@wsj.com) | T: @sgurman  
A: [1025 Connecticut Ave. NW, Suite 800 Washington, D.C. 20036](https://www.wsj.com/1025-Connecticut-Ave-NW-Suite-800-Washington-D-C-20036)

Sign up for WSJ’s free Capital Journal newsletter [here](#).

On Mon, Aug 22, 2022 at 1:10 PM Rossello, Luis (PAO) <[Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov](mailto:Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov)> wrote:

Thanks Sadie. I did indeed just had a note from Anthony, with your email.

---

**From:** Gurman, Sadie <[sadie.gurman@wsj.com](mailto:sadie.gurman@wsj.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 22, 2022 1:01 PM  
**To:** Rossello, Luis (PAO) <[Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov](mailto:Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov)>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Quick Q for you

Sadie Gurman  
WASHINGTON BUREAU

□

O: (b) (6) | M: (b) (6)

E: [sadie.gurman@wsj.com](mailto:sadie.gurman@wsj.com) | T: @sgurman

A: [1025 Connecticut Ave. NW, Suite 800 Washington, D.C. 20036](https://www.wsj.com/contact)



Sign up for WSJ's free Capital Journal newsletter [here](#).

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Gurman, Sadie** <[sadie.gurman@wsj.com](mailto:sadie.gurman@wsj.com)>

Date: Mon, Aug 22, 2022 at 12:07 PM

Subject: Quick Q for you

To: Coley, Anthony D. (PAO) <[Anthony.D.Coley@usdoj.gov](mailto:Anthony.D.Coley@usdoj.gov)>

Anthony,

We are working on a story today reporting the following and wanted to see if you spotted any issues with this or had anything to add. Just tried you, but will try again:

The FBI's search of former President Donald Trump's Mar-a-Lago home was prompted in part by concerns that highly sensitive and classified documents were left lying in unsecure places around the sprawling Florida resort, people familiar with the matter said.

At least one person familiar with the location of the documents at the complex alerted investigators, heightening what officials believed to be the need for agents to take the dramatic step of seizing them from the private club after months of trying to retrieve them through less intrusive means, including negotiations and a subpoena.

Sadie Gurman

WASHINGTON BUREAU



O: (b) (6) | M: (b) (6)

E: [sadie.gurman@wsj.com](mailto:sadie.gurman@wsj.com) | T: @sgurman

A: [1025 Connecticut Ave. NW, Suite 800 Washington, D.C. 20036](https://www.wsj.com/contact)



Sign up for WSJ's free Capital Journal newsletter [here](#).



**From:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Subject:** Justice Dept Statement re: former President's motion for judicia oversight and add' reief  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Bcc:** Pierre.Thomas@abc.com; Alexander.W.Malin@abc.com; peguesj@cbsnews.com; Evan.Perez@cnn.com; Jessica.Schneider@turner.com; hannah.rabinowitz@warnermedia.com; david.spunt@fox.com; Jake.Gibson@FOXNEWS.COM; Ken.dianian@nbcuni.com; julia.ainsley@nbcuni.com; Kosnar, Michael; rucas@npr.org; CJohnson2@npr.org; MBa samo@ap.org; Tucker, Eric; cstrohm1@bloomberg.net; Sarah.N.Lynch@thomsonreuters.com; kjohnson@usatoday.com; sadie.gurman@wsj.com; aruna.viswanatha@wsj.com; Perry.Stein@washpost.com; Devin.Barrett@washpost.com; David.Nakamura@washpost.com; josh@joshgerstein.com; Charlotte.PLANTIVE@afp.com; Paul.HANDLEY@afp.com; cuced@UNIVISION.NET; savage@nytimes.com; rbarber@businessinsider.com; bwoodruff@politico.com; cdech@businessinsider.com; triaya@cbsnews.com; Ryan.Reilly@nbcuni.com; Kateyn.pozantz@warnermedia.com; egarer@cbsnews.com; sarah.wire@times.com; paula.reid@cnn.com; agoudsward@am.com; Coley, Anthony D. (PAO); genn.thrush@nytimes.com  
**Sent:** August 22, 2022 6:07 PM (UTC-04:00)

Good evening, below please find a statement from my colleague Anthony Coley regarding this afternoon's filing.

**“The Aug. 8 search warrant at Mar-a-Lago was authorized by a federal court upon the required finding of probable cause. The Department is aware of this evening’s motion. The United States will file its response in court.” – Justice Department Spokesman Anthony Coley**

Best,

Luis R. Rossello  
Communications Advisor for National Security/Spokesperson  
U.S. Department of Justice  
(o) 202-514-1153

(b) (6)

[Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov](mailto:Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov)

Learn more about the Justice Department's national security work by following @DOJNatSec

**From:** Lynch, Sarah N. (Reuters)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] RE: Justice Dept Statement re: former President's motion for judicial oversight and add'l relief  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 22, 2022 6:08 PM (UTC-04:00)

Thanks so much

---

**From:** Rossello, Luis (PAO) <Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 22, 2022 6:07 PM  
**To:** Rossello, Luis (PAO) <Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXT] Justice Dept Statement re: former President's motion for judicial oversight and add'l relief

**External Email:** Use caution with links and attachments.

Good evening, below please find a statement from my colleague Anthony Coley regarding this afternoon's filing.

**“The Aug. 8 search warrant at Mar-a-Lago was authorized by a federal court upon the required finding of probable cause. The Department is aware of this evening’s motion. The United States will file its response in court.” – Justice Department Spokesman Anthony Coley**

Best,

Luis R. Rossello  
Communications Advisor for National Security/Spokesperson  
U.S. Department of Justice  
(o) 202-514-1153  
(c) (b) (6)  
[Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov](mailto:Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov)

Learn more about the Justice Department’s national security work by following @DOJNatSec

**From:** Johnson, Kevin  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] RE: Justice Dept Statement re: former President's motion for judicial oversight and add'l relief  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 22, 2022 6:08 PM (UTC-04:00)

Thanks, Luis.

---

**From:** Rossello, Luis (PAO) <Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 22, 2022 6:07 PM  
**To:** Rossello, Luis (PAO) <Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov>  
**Subject:** Justice Dept Statement re: former President's motion for judicial oversight and add'l relief

Good evening, below please find a statement from my colleague Anthony Coley regarding this afternoon's filing.

**“The Aug. 8 search warrant at Mar-a-Lago was authorized by a federal court upon the required finding of probable cause. The Department is aware of this evening’s motion. The United States will file its response in court.” – Justice Department Spokesman Anthony Coley**

Best,

Luis R. Rossello  
Communications Advisor for National Security/Spokesperson  
U.S. Department of Justice  
(o) 202-514-1153  
(c) (b) (6)  
[Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov](mailto:Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov)

Learn more about the Justice Department’s national security work by following @DOJNatSec

**From:** Legare, Robert  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Justice Dept Statement re: former President's motion for judicial oversight and add'l relief  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 22, 2022 6:09 PM (UTC-04:00)  
Thank you

---

**From:** Rossello, Luis (PAO) <Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 22, 2022 6:07 PM  
**To:** Rossello, Luis (PAO) <Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov>  
**Subject:** Justice Dept Statement re: former President's motion for judicial oversight and add'l relief

External Email

Good evening, below please find a statement from my colleague Anthony Coley regarding this afternoon's filing.

**“The Aug. 8 search warrant at Mar-a-Lago was authorized by a federal court upon the required finding of probable cause. The Department is aware of this evening’s motion. The United States will file its response in court.” – Justice Department Spokesman Anthony Coley**

Best,

Luis R. Rossello  
Communications Advisor for National Security/Spokesperson  
U.S. Department of Justice  
(o) 202-514-1153  
(c) (b) (6)  
[Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov](mailto:Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov)

Learn more about the Justice Department’s national security work by following @DOJNatSec

**From:** Stein, Perry  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Justice Dept Statement re: former President's motion for judicial oversight and add'l relief  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 22, 2022 6:37 PM (UTC-04:00)

Thank you Luis, appreciate it.

---

**From:** Rossello, Luis (PAO) <Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 22, 2022 6:07 PM  
**To:** Rossello, Luis (PAO) <Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov>  
**Subject:** Justice Dept Statement re: former President's motion for judicial oversight and add'l relief

**CAUTION: EXTERNAL SENDER**

Good evening, below please find a statement from my colleague Anthony Coley regarding this afternoon's filing.

**“The Aug. 8 search warrant at Mar-a-Lago was authorized by a federal court upon the required finding of probable cause. The Department is aware of this evening’s motion. The United States will file its response in court.” – Justice Department Spokesman Anthony Coley**

Best,

Luis R. Rossello  
Communications Advisor for National Security/Spokesperson  
U.S. Department of Justice  
(o) 202-514-1153  
(c) (b) (6)  
[Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov](mailto:Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov)

Learn more about the Justice Department’s national security work by following @DOJNatSec

**From:** Lynch, Sarah N. (Reuters)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] RE: Justice Dept Statement re: former President's motion for judicial oversight and add'l relief  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 23, 2022 8:57 AM (UTC-04:00)

Hi

Do you have an estimated idea for when the DOJ response will be filed?

---

**From:** Rossello, Luis (PAO) <Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 22, 2022 6:07 PM  
**To:** Rossello, Luis (PAO) <Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXT] Justice Dept Statement re: former President's motion for judicial oversight and add'l relief

**External Email:** Use caution with links and attachments.

Good evening, below please find a statement from my colleague Anthony Coley regarding this afternoon's filing.

**“The Aug. 8 search warrant at Mar-a-Lago was authorized by a federal court upon the required finding of probable cause. The Department is aware of this evening’s motion. The United States will file its response in court.” – Justice Department Spokesman Anthony Coley**

Best,

Luis R. Rossello  
Communications Advisor for National Security/Spokesperson  
U.S. Department of Justice  
(o) 202-514-1153

(b) (6)

[Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov](mailto:Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov)

Learn more about the Justice Department’s national security work by following @DOJNatSec

**From:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Subject:** Media Inquiry from Caro ina Bo ado - Law360  
**To:** caro ina.bo ado@aw360.com  
**Sent:** August 24, 2022 9:58 AM (UTC-04:00)

Hi Carolina, thank you for reaching out to DOJ with your question. Please note that the Department declined to comment.

Best regards

L

Luis R. Rossello  
Communications Advisor for National Security/Spokesperson  
U.S. Department of Justice  
(o) 202-514-1153  
(c) (b) (6)  
[Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov](mailto:Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov)

Learn more about the Justice Department's national security work by following @DOJNatSec

From: Department of Justice via Department of Justice <no-reply@usdoj.gov>  
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2022 6:17 PM  
To: Press <Press@jmd.usdoj.gov>  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Media Inquiry from Carolina Bolado - Law360

Date Tuesday, August 23, 2022 - 6:17pm EDT

Name: Carolina Bolado

Email Address: carolina.bolado@law360.com

Topic: National Security

Media Outlet: Law360

Deadline: 8/23/2022 10pm

Inquiry:

Hi, I m writing about Judge Aileen Cannon s request today to President Donald Trump to supplement his request for a special master to oversee the FBI s search of the classified documents removed from Mar-a-Lago. Does the DOJ have any comment on this?

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** Legare, Robert  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: CBS Inquiry - Bratt  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 25, 2022 11:29 AM (UTC-04:00)

Hey Luis. Just circling back on this. Also. Curious if you foresee any other cases about threats to public officials coming out? Our producers are interested if so. Thanks

Rob Legare CBS News (b) (6) (m) (b) (6) (o)

---

**From:** Legare, Robert  
**Sent:** Monday, August 15, 2022 4:12:07 PM  
**To:** Rossello, Luis (PAO) <Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: CBS Inquiry - Bratt

Thank YOU for the help. I'm sure you saw this, but scary stuff.

Guy charged in western PA for posting on Gab that if you an FBI agent, you should die...

---

**From:** Rossello, Luis (PAO) <Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 15, 2022 3:38 PM  
**To:** Legare, Robert <LegareR@cbsnews.com>  
**Subject:** RE: CBS Inquiry - Bratt

Externa Emai

Thanks man, let me look into it and I'll follow up.

---

**From:** Legare, Robert <LegareR@cbsnews.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 15, 2022 3:15 PM  
**To:** Rossello, Luis (PAO) <Luis.Rossello@usdoj.gov>  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] CBS Inquiry - Bratt

Hey Luis. As I mentioned, a few of our investigative producers are looking into the doxing of US officials online after the MAL search warrant. A former Trump Admin official Garrett Ziegler posted info about Bratt...his email and linkedin...online and told his followers to "lawfully" express concerns. Still concerning, however.

Question for you has Bratt received any threats or an increase in them since the MAL search warrant was executed and if so, have any been referred to the FBI/USMS? Is he under any increased security protocol (I know you may not be able to answer that...just asking) .

Thanks, again,  
Rob





Garrett Ziegler



Garrett Ziegler

The feds arguing on behalf of Garland (and Biden and—ne...



Juan Antonio Gonzalez (left)

(b) (6)

- [floridabar.org/directories/find-mbr/profile/?num=897388](http://floridabar.org/directories/find-mbr/profile/?num=897388)
- [floridabarcls.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Bio-Tony-Gonzalez.pdf](http://floridabarcls.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Bio-Tony-Gonzalez.pdf)

Jay Ishmael Bratt (right)

(b) (6)

- [linkedin.com/in/jay-bratt-9ab86142/](https://www.linkedin.com/in/jay-bratt-9ab86142/)

Please lawfully express your concerns about the excessive use of force (among many other abuses). Outrageous what they did.

28.3K 16:16

**From:** Harold Hutchison  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request for comment  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 25, 2022 1:30 PM (UTC-04:00)

I am a reporter with the Daily Caller News Foundation.

Does the Justice Department have any comment on polling by Trafalgar group that shows that trust in the FBI has decreased since the raid on Mar-a-Lago?

----

Harold Hutchison  
Daily Caller News Foundation  
[harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org)  
[harold@dcnf.org](mailto:harold@dcnf.org)

(b) (6)

**From:** Harold Hutchison  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request for comment  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 26, 2022 3:53 PM (UTC-04:00)

I am a reporter with the Daily Caller News Foundation.

Does the Justice Department have any comments on claims that the raid on Mar-a-Lago was political, and that President Trump had constitutional and legal authority to declassify documents?

----

Harold Hutchison  
Daily Caller News Foundation  
[harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org)  
[harold@dcnf.org](mailto:harold@dcnf.org)

(b) (6)

**From:** Harold Hutchison  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Request for comment  
**To:** Rosse o, Luis (PAO)  
**Sent:** August 26, 2022 5:15 PM (UTC-04:00)

I am a reporter with the Daily Caller News Foundation.

Why did the Justice Department redact the reasons for making redactions in the affidavit that led to the raid on Mar-a-Lago?

----

Harold Hutchison  
Daily Caller News Foundation  
[harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:harold@dailycallernewsfoundation.org)  
[harold@dcnf.org](mailto:harold@dcnf.org)

(b) (6)