

# House Calendar No. 152

114TH CONGRESS }  
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

{ REPORT  
114-792

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FIND BRYAN PAGLIANO IN CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS FOR REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH A SUBPOENA DULY ISSUED BY THE COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

---

## R E P O R T

OF THE

### COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

together with

MINORITY VIEWS



SEPTEMBER 27, 2016.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

59-006

WASHINGTON : 2016



## CONTENTS

	Page
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	2
II. AUTHORITY AND PURPOSE .....	2
III. BACKGROUND ON THE COMMITTEE'S INVESTIGATION .....	4
IV. MR. PAGLIANO'S REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH THE COMMITTEES SUBPOENA FOR TESTIMONY AT THE SEPTEMBER 13, 2016 HEARING .....	5
V. MR. PAGLIANO'S REFUSAL TO APPEAR WHEN THE HEARING RESUMED ON SEPTEMBER 22, 2016 .....	6
VI. CONCLUSION .....	6
VII. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS .....	7
VIII. MINORITY VIEWS .....	11
IX. APPENDIX .....	19
Invitation from Chairman Jason Chaffetz, Chairman of the Com- mittee on Oversight and Government Reform, to Mr. Mark J. MacDougall, Esq., Attorney for Mr. Bryan Pagliano, September 7, 2016 .....	19
Letter from Mr. Mark J. MacDougall, Esq., Attorney for Mr. Bryan Pagliano, to Chairman Jason Chaffetz, Chairman of the Com- mittee on Oversight and Government Reform, September 12, 2016 .....	26
Letter from Mr. Mark J. MacDougall, Esq., Attorney for Mr. Bryan Pagliano, to Chairman Jason Chaffetz, Chairman of the Com- mittee on Oversight and Government Reform, September 12, 2016 .....	28
Letter from Chairman Jason Chaffetz, Chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to Mr. Mark J. MacDougall, Esq., Attorney for Mr. Bryan Pagliano, September 12, 2016 .....	29
Letter from Mr. Mark J. MacDougall, Esq., Attorney for Mr. Bryan Pagliano, to Chairman Jason Chaffetz, Chairman of the Com- mittee on Oversight and Government Reform, September 13, 2016 .....	31
Letter from Chairman Jason Chaffetz, Chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to Mr. Mark J. MacDougall, Esq., Attorney for Mr. Bryan Pagliano, September 15, 2016 .....	33
Letter from Mr. Mark J. MacDougall, Esq., Attorney for Mr. Bryan Pagliano, to Chairman Jason Chaffetz, Chairman of the Com- mittee on Oversight and Government Reform, September 21, 2016 .....	37
Letter from Mr. Mark J. MacDougall, Esq., Attorney for Mr. Bryan Pagliano, to Chairman Jason Chaffetz, Chairman of the Com- mittee on Oversight and Government Reform, September 21, 2016 .....	40
Letter from Chairman Jason Chaffetz, Chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to Mr. Mark J. MacDougall, Esq., Attorney for Mr. Bryan Pagliano, September 22, 2016 .....	42



## House Calendar No. 152

114TH CONGRESS }  
2d Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT  
114-792

---

---

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
FIND BRYAN PAGLIANO IN CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS FOR REFUSAL TO  
COMPLY WITH A SUBPOENA DULY ISSUED BY THE COMMITTEE ON  
OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

---

SEPTEMBER 27, 2016.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. CHAFFETZ, from the Committee on Oversight and Government  
Reform, submitted the following

### R E P O R T

together with

### MINORITY VIEWS

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, having considered this Report, report favorably thereon and recommend that the Report be approved.

The form of the resolution that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform would recommend to the House of Representatives for citing Bryan Pagliano for contempt of Congress pursuant to this report is as follows:

*Resolved*, That because Mr. Bryan Pagliano, having been compelled to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, refused to testify before the Committee, Mr. Pagliano shall be found to be in contempt of Congress for failure to comply with a congressional subpoena.

*Resolved*, That pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 192 and 194, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall certify the report of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, detailing the refusal of Mr. Pagliano to testify before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform as directed by subpoena, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that Mr. Pagliano be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

*Resolved*, That the Speaker of the House shall otherwise take all appropriate action to enforce the subpoena.

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Mr. Bryan Pagliano, formerly a Senior Advisor in the Bureau of Information Resource Management at the U.S. Department of State, refused to comply with a congressional subpoena for testimony before the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. Mr. Pagliano was expected to testify regarding the circumstances that resulted in a failure to preserve federal records belonging to the State Department. His testimony is vital to the Committee's investigation into this matter.

Mr. Pagliano did not appear, much less provide testimony, before the Committee, despite a duly issued subpoena issued on September 8, 2016 that compelled him to appear on September 13, 2016. No legal basis exists for his failure to appear.

Mr. Pagliano was subsequently advised that his failure to appear exposed him to the possibility of being held in contempt and potential criminal liability pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 192 and 194. Mr. Pagliano was notified that the hearing would resume on September 22, 2016, and on September 16, 2016 he was issued a subpoena that compelled him to appear before the Committee on that date. He again failed to appear.

Accordingly, the Chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform recommends that the House find Mr. Pagliano in contempt for his failure to comply with the subpoenas issued to him on September 8, 2016 and September 16, 2016.

## II. AUTHORITY AND PURPOSE

An important corollary to the powers expressly granted to Congress by the Constitution is the responsibility to perform rigorous oversight of the Executive Branch. The U.S. Supreme Court has recognized this Congressional power and responsibility on numerous occasions. For example, in *McGrain v. Daugherty*, the Court held:

[T]he power of inquiry—with process to enforce it—is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function. . . . A legislative body cannot legislate wisely or effectively in the absence of information respecting the conditions which the legislation is intended to affect or change, and where the legislative body does not itself possess the requisite information—which not infrequently is true—recourse must be had to others who do possess it.”<sup>1</sup>

In addition, as Chief Justice Earl Warren wrote in *Watkins v. United States*: “The power of Congress to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process. That power is broad.”<sup>2</sup>

Further, both the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (P.L. 79-601), which directed House and Senate Committees to “exercise continuous watchfulness” over Executive Branch programs under their jurisdiction, and the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-510), which authorized committees to “review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, and execution” of laws, codify the powers of Congress.

<sup>1</sup>*McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135, 174 (1927).

<sup>2</sup>*Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178, 1887 (1957).

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is a standing committee of the House of Representatives, duly established pursuant to the rules of the House of Representatives, which are adopted pursuant to the rulemaking Clause of the U.S. Constitution.<sup>3</sup> House rule X grants the Committee broad jurisdiction over federal “[g]overnment management” and reform, including the “[o]verall economy, efficiency, and management of government operations and activities,” the “[f]ederal civil service,” and “[r]eorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.”<sup>4</sup> House rule X further endows the Committee with broad oversight jurisdiction, including authority to “conduct investigations of any matter without regard to clause 1, 2, 3, or this clause [of House rule X] conferring jurisdiction over the matter to another standing committee.”<sup>5</sup> Finally, the House rules direct the Committee to make available “the findings and recommendations of the committee . . . to any other standing committee having jurisdiction over the matter involved.”<sup>6</sup>

House rule XI specifically authorizes the Committee to “require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it considers necessary.”<sup>7</sup> The rule further provides that the “power to authorize and issue subpoenas” may be delegated to the Committee chairman.<sup>8</sup> Pursuant to Committee rule 12(d), the Chairman may “Authorize and issue subpoenas as provided in House rule XI, clause 2(m), in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities within the jurisdiction of the Committee.”<sup>9</sup> The September 8 subpoena discussed in this report was issued pursuant to this authority.

The Committee has undertaken its investigation into the circumstances that resulted in a failure to preserve federal records belonging to the State Department pursuant to the authority delegated to it under the House Rules, including as described above.

The oversight and legislative purposes of the investigation at issue here, described more fully immediately below, include, but are not limited to: (1) seeking information about former Secretary Hillary Clinton’s use of a private, non-secure email server during her time at the Department of State, as well as the transmittal of classified national security information on that server; (2) examining the circumstances that resulted in the failure to preserve federal records arising during Secretary Clinton’s tenure, as required by the Federal Records Act, and to produce such records pursuant to Congressional requests or requests made pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act and; (3) determining what, if any, changes to the Federal Records Act of 1950, Freedom of Information Act of 1966, Ethics in Government Act of 1978, or any other federal law(s) may be necessary to prevent these or similar circumstances from recurring.

<sup>3</sup> U.S. CONST., art I, § 5, clause 2.

<sup>4</sup> House rule X, clause (1)(n).

<sup>5</sup> House rule X, clause (4)(c)(2).

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*

<sup>7</sup> House rule XI, clause (2)(m)(1)(B).

<sup>8</sup> House rule XI, clause 2(m)(3)(A)(1).

<sup>9</sup> Rules of the Comm. on Oversight & Gov’t Reform, U.S. House of Representatives, 114th Cong., rule 12(d).

### III. BACKGROUND ON THE COMMITTEE'S INVESTIGATION

The Committee has conducted longstanding oversight over the use of non-official email accounts for official business.<sup>10</sup> In the context of that oversight, on December 12, 2012, Chairman Darrell Issa wrote to Secretary Clinton regarding whether she or other senior State Department officials had ever used a personal email account to conduct official business.<sup>11</sup> In the course of its investigation on a separate matter, the House Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi discovered that Secretary Clinton had in fact used a personal email account for official business.<sup>12</sup> On March 10, 2015, former Secretary Clinton publicly acknowledged that she exclusively used a personal email account, set up on a private server in her home, to conduct government business as Secretary of State.<sup>13</sup>

The Committee has monitored what implications these events have for federal laws within its jurisdiction.<sup>14</sup> On December 16, 2015, the Committee held a hearing with the Office of Government Ethics, which enforces the Ethics in Government Act, to consider possible legislative changes.<sup>15</sup> On January 11, 2016, on the same day the House passed bipartisan Freedom of Information Act legislation, the Committee released a report entitled *FOIA Is Broken: A Report*.<sup>16</sup> On July 12, 2016, the Committee favorably reported by voice vote H.R. 5709, the Federal Records Modernization Act of 2016, which creates direct penalties for violations of the Federal Records Act.<sup>17</sup>

On July 7, 2016, James Comey, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), testified before the Committee regarding the FBI's investigation into whether classified information was transmitted or stored on unclassified systems in violation of federal criminal statutes and whether classified information was compromised by unauthorized individuals.<sup>18</sup> The FBI did not make findings regarding the Federal Records Act, the Freedom of Information Act, the Ethics in Government Act, or potential false statements to Congress. On July 11, 2016, the Committee requested the FBI case file and all attachments.<sup>19</sup> On August 16, 2016, the FBI produced a heavily redacted portion of the file to the Sergeant at Arms of the U.S. House of Representatives.<sup>20</sup> When Congress re-

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g., Letter from Hon. Henry Waxman, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform, to Hon. Michael Astrue, Comm'r, U.S. Soc. Sec. Admin, *et al.*, Apr. 12, 2007.

<sup>11</sup> Letter from Hon. Darrell Issa, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform, to Hon. Hillary Rodham Clinton, Sec'y, U.S. Dep't of State, Dec. 13, 2012.

<sup>12</sup> See Letter from Hon. Trey Gowdy, Chairman, H. Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi, to David E. Kendall, Williams & Connolly LLP, Dec. 2, 2014.

<sup>13</sup> Statement of Hillary Rodham Clinton, Mar. 10, 2015.

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g., Letter from Hon. Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform, to Hon. John F. Kerry, Sec'y, U.S. Dep't of State, Jan. 19, 2016.

<sup>15</sup> *Merit Sys. Prot. Bd., Office of Gov't Ethics, and Office of Special Counsel Reauthorization: Hearing Before the H. Subcomm. on Gov't Operations*, 114th Cong. (Dec. 16, 2015).

<sup>16</sup> H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform Staff Report, *FOIA Is Broken: A Report*, 114th Congress (Jan. 11, 2016).

<sup>17</sup> Fed. Records Modernization Act, H.R. 5709, 114th Cong. (as reported by the H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform, July 12, 2016).

<sup>18</sup> *Oversight of the State Dep't: Hearing Before the H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform*, 114th Cong. (July 7, 2016) (testimony of Hon. James Comey, Dir., Fed. Bureau of Investigation).

<sup>19</sup> Letter from Hon. Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform, to Hon. James Comey, Dir., Fed. Bureau of Investigation, July 11, 2016.

<sup>20</sup> Letter from Hon. James Comey, Dir., Fed. Bureau of Investigation, to Hon. Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform, to Aug. 16, 2016.



sumed its session in September, the Committee scheduled multiple hearings regarding various issues related to its investigation, including the individuals from the State Department who set up and/or maintained Secretary Clinton's private server.<sup>21</sup>

#### **IV. MR. PAGLIANO'S REFUSAL TO COMPLY WITH THE COMMITTEE'S SUBPOENA FOR TESTIMONY AT THE SEPTEMBER 13, 2016 HEARING**

On September 6, 2016, Committee staff contacted Mr. Pagliano's attorney to inform him of the need for his client's testimony at an upcoming Committee hearing.<sup>22</sup> The next day, Mr. Pagliano's attorney advised Committee staff that Mr. Pagliano would not appear voluntarily, and that if he did appear, he would assert his rights under the Fifth Amendment and decline to answer questions related to the matters that were the subject of the hearing. Committee staff informed Mr. Pagliano's attorney of the Committee's established practice of requiring witnesses to appear in person to assert their right pursuant to the Fifth Amendment to decline to answer questions.<sup>23</sup>

Later on September 7, 2016, Chairman Chaffetz sent Mr. Pagliano's attorney a formal witness invitation letter indicating the Committee expected Mr. Pagliano's attendance.<sup>24</sup> On September 8, 2016, the Chairman issued to Mr. Pagliano's attorney a subpoena compelling Mr. Pagliano's appearance before the Committee on September 13, 2016, at 10:00 a.m.<sup>25</sup>

The Committee received no response from Mr. Pagliano or his attorneys until late on September 12, 2016, when Mr. Pagliano's attorneys transmitted a letter to the Committee (1) advising that Mr. Pagliano would continue to assert his right under the Fifth Amendment;<sup>26</sup> and (2) requesting that "the Committee formally excuse Mr. Pagliano from personally appearing on September 13, 2016."<sup>27</sup>

That same evening, Chairman Chaffetz sent Mr. Pagliano's attorney a letter stating that Mr. Pagliano's prior experience makes clear (1) Mr. Pagliano is uniquely qualified to answer questions that will assist the Committee's investigation, which is why at least two other investigative entities sought his testimony; and (2) Mr. Pagliano has in fact provided testimony under certain conditions, specifically, to the FBI pursuant to an immunity agreement.<sup>28</sup> The letter advised that the Committee required Mr. Pagliano's appearance because of, among other reasons, (1) the possibility that he would waive or choose not to assert the privilege

<sup>21</sup>See, e.g., *Examining FOIA Compliance at the Dep't of State: Hearing Before the H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform*, 114th Cong. (Sept. 8, 2016), *Examining Preservation of State Dep't Records: Hearing Before the H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform*, 114th Cong. (Sept. 13, 2016); see also *Classifications and Redactions in FBI's Investigative File: Hearing Before the H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform*, 114th Cong. (Sept. 12, 2016).

<sup>22</sup>Telephone Call from Majority Staff, H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform, to Mark J. MacDougall, Esq., Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP, Sept. 7, 2016.

<sup>23</sup>Telephone Call between Majority Staff, H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform, and Mark J. MacDougall, Esq., Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP, Sept. 7, 2016.

<sup>24</sup>Letter from Hon. Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform, to Mark J. MacDougall, Esq., Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP, Sept. 7, 2016.

<sup>25</sup>Subpoena from H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform to Mr. Bryan Pagliano (Sept. 8, 2016).

<sup>26</sup>Letter from Mark J. MacDougall, Esq., *et al.*, Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP, to Hon. Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform, Sept. 12, 2016, at 2.

<sup>27</sup>*Id.*

<sup>28</sup>Letter from Hon. Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform, to Mark J. MacDougall, Esq., Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP, Sept. 12, 2016, at 1-2.

as to some or all questions; (2) the possibility that the Committee would agree to hear his testimony in executive session; and (3) the possibility that the Committee would seek, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 6005, to obtain a court order immunizing his testimony.<sup>29</sup> Therefore, the subpoena for Mr. Pagliano remained in effect, compelling him to appear on September 13, 2016 at 10:00 a.m.<sup>30</sup>

On September 13, 2016 at 8:51 a.m., Mr. Pagliano's attorneys transmitted a letter to the Committee stating that in the event the Committee voted to proceed in executive session, Mr. Pagliano's attorneys believed Mr. Pagliano would agree to appear on short notice to formally decline to answer all questions in reliance on the Fifth Amendment.<sup>31</sup> Chairman Chaffetz advised Mr. Pagliano's attorneys that the subpoena remained in effect and that Mr. Pagliano was expected to appear. At 10:00 a.m. on September 13, 2016, Mr. Pagliano did not appear before the Committee as compelled by the valid subpoena issued by Chairman Chaffetz on September 8, 2016. The Chairman recessed the hearing. On September 15, 2016, the Committee noticed its intent to resume the hearing on September 22, 2016.

#### **V. MR. PAGLIANO'S REFUSAL TO APPEAR WHEN THE HEARING RESUMED ON SEPTEMBER 22, 2016**

On September 15, 2016, Chairman Chaffetz advised Mr. Pagliano's attorneys that the Committee would proceed to enforce the subpoena if Mr. Pagliano refused to appear when the hearing resumed on September 22, 2016.<sup>32</sup> In a letter, Chairman Chaffetz stated:

The Committee will permit him the opportunity to cure his failure to comply by agreeing to appear and produce his immunity agreement when the Committee's hearing resumes on September 22, 2016. The Committee remains interested in his testimony, but also has a substantial interest in holding Mr. Pagliano accountable for his knowing and intentional failure to appear. Neither this Committee, nor the House, can countenance witnesses blatantly ignoring validly issued subpoenas for testimony and documents.<sup>33</sup>

On September 16, 2016, Chairman Chaffetz issued a subpoena to compel Mr. Pagliano to appear on September 22, 2016. When the hearing resumed at 10:00 a.m. on that date, Mr. Pagliano again failed to appear before the Committee.

#### **VI. CONCLUSION**

The refusal of Mr. Bryan Pagliano to appear before the Committee pursuant to a subpoena has no legal basis. Such complete refusal to comply with a lawful subpoena, or even to negotiate in good faith to determine a mutually agreeable date to testify, threat-

<sup>29</sup> *Id.* at 2.

<sup>30</sup> *Id.*

<sup>31</sup> Letter from Mark J. MacDougall, Esq., *et al.*, Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP, to Hon. Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform, Sept. 12, 2016, at 2.

<sup>32</sup> Letter from Hon. Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight & Gov't Reform, to Mark J. MacDougall, Esq., Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP, Sept. 15, 2016.

<sup>33</sup> *Id.* at 3.

ens the ability of this Committee, and every House Committee, to carry out its legislative and oversight functions. The House cannot accept a process whereby a subpoena can simply be ignored.

Mr. Pagliano willfully failed to comply with a duly issued subpoena from a standing Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. It is imperative to protect the institutional interests of the House by enforcing the subpoena through the contempt process. This serious matter requires the Committee to seek action by the full House in this manner.

There is no constitutional impediment to (1) the Committee approving a resolution recommending that the full House hold Mr. Pagliano in contempt of Congress; (2) the full House approving a resolution holding Mr. Pagliano in contempt of Congress; (3) if such resolutions are approved, the Speaker certifying the matter to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 194 and; (4) a grand jury indicting, and the United States Attorney prosecuting, Mr. Pagliano under 2 U.S.C. 192.

## **VII. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

### **EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS**

During Full Committee consideration of the resolution, Chairman Jason Chaffetz (R-UT) offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the report. The Chaffetz amendment in the nature of a substitute was adopted by voice vote.

### **COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION**

On September 22, 2016 the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform met in open session with a quorum present to consider a report of contempt against Bryan Pagliano for refusal to comply with a valid Congressional subpoena. The Committee approved the report by a roll call vote of 19 to 15 and ordered the report favorably reported to the House.

### **ROLL CALL VOTES**

There was one roll call vote during consideration of the contempt report:

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM  
114TH CONGRESS  
ROLL CALL

Vote #: 1

Vote on: Favorably Reporting Pagliano Contempt Resolution, as amended Date: 9-22-16

Republicans	Aye	No	Present	Democrats	Aye	No	Present
MR. CHAFFETZ (UT) ( <i>Chairman</i> )	X			MR. CUMMINGS (MD) ( <i>Ranking</i> )		X	
MR. MICA (FL)	X			MRS. MALONEY (NY)		X	
MR. TURNER (OH)				MS. NORTON (DC)		X	
MR. DUNCAN (TN)	X			MR. CLAY (MO)		X	
MR. JORDAN (OH)	X			MR. LYNCH (MA)		X	
MR. WALBERG (MI)	X			MR. COOPER (TN)			
MR. AMASH (MI)	X			MR. CONNOLLY (VA)		X	
MR. GOSAR (AZ)				MS. DUCKWORTH (IL)		X	
MR. DesJARLAIS (TN)	X			MS. KELLY (IL)		X	
MR. GOWDY (SC)	X			MS. LAWRENCE (MI)		X	
MR. FARENTHOLD (TX)	X			MR. LIEU (CA)			
MRS. LUMMIS (WY)	X			MS. WATSON COLEMAN (NJ)		X	
MR. MASSIE (KY)	X			MS. PLASKETT (VI)		X	
MR. MEADOWS (NC)	X			MR. DeSAULNIER (CA)		X	
MR. DeSANTIS (FL)	X			MR. BOYLE (PA)		X	
MR. MULVANEY (SC)				MR. WELCH (VT)		X	
MR. BUCK (CO)				MS. LUIAN GRISHAM (NM)		X	
MR. WALKER (NC)	X						
MR. BLUM (IA)	X						
MR. HICE (GA)	X						
MR. RUSSELL (OK)							
MR. CARTER (GA)							
MR. GROTHMAN (WI)	X						
MR. HURD (TX)	X						
MR. PALMER (AL)	X						

Roll Call Totals: Ayes: 19 Nays: 15 Present:

Passed: X Failed: \_\_\_\_\_

## APPLICATION OF LAW TO THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Section 102(b)(3) of Public Law 104–1 requires a description of the application of this report to the legislative branch where the report relates to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services and accommodations. The contempt report does not relate to employment or access to public services and accommodations.

## STATEMENT OF OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

In compliance with clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII and clause (2)(b)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee's oversight findings and recommendations are reflected in the descriptive portions of this report.

## STATEMENT OF GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

In accordance with clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee's performance goal or objective of this report is to assist the House of Representatives in considering whether to cite Bryan Pagliano for contempt for refusal to comply with a valid Congressional subpoena.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

The Committee finds the authority for this report in article 1, section 1 of the Constitution.

## DUPLICATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

No provision of this report establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government known to be duplicative of another Federal program, a program that was included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111–139, or a program related to a program identified in the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

## DISCLOSURE OF DIRECTED RULE MAKINGS

The Committee estimates that enacting this report does not direct the completion of any specific rule makings within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. 551.

## FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT

The Committee finds that the report does not establish or authorize the establishment of an advisory committee within the definition of 5 U.S.C. App., Section 5(b).

## EARMARK IDENTIFICATION

This report does not include any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

With respect to requirements of clause (3)(c)(3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee has not received a cost estimate for this measure from the Director of Congressional Budget Office. The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform estimates that the report would have no cost.

## VIII. MINORITY VIEWS

The Democratic Members of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform opposed the resolution of contempt for Bryan Pagliano. Every Democratic Member that was present voted in opposition to the resolution.

- Since Labor Day, the Oversight Committee has held five days of “emergency” hearings on Hillary Clinton’s emails. In those three weeks, the Chairman issued 12 subpoenas, which is more than one a day excluding weekends. It is also more than a third of the total number of subpoenas the Chairman issued in all of 2016. The Chairman issued all of the subpoenas unilaterally, without any debate or vote.

- The actions by the Committee raise serious legal, ethical, and Constitutional concerns, and Members should not be placed in a position of voting in favor of a resolution that could subject them or their staffs to potential disciplinary action.

- Mr. Pagliano has already asserted his Fifth Amendment rights before the Select Committee on Benghazi—a key fact that the current contempt resolution completely disregards.

- There is no legitimate legislative purpose in forcing Mr. Pagliano to appear before the Committee to assert his Fifth Amendment rights before Congress for a second time, and there is certainly no legitimate legislative purpose in forcing him to do so in public.

- Although Republicans argue that Mr. Pagliano received immunity from the Department of Justice, his attorneys have already explained that this immunity agreement was limited, and a federal court has already ruled that Mr. Pagliano continues to have the right to assert his Constitutional privileges in separate proceedings.

- The current contempt resolution inaccurately accuses Mr. Pagliano of a “complete refusal to comply with a lawful subpoena, or even to negotiate in good faith to determine a mutually agreeable date to testify.”

- In fact, despite the abusive and unilateral subpoena, Mr. Pagliano’s attorneys offered to have him appear in person to assert his Fifth Amendment rights in executive session on the date set by the Committee. The Chairman refused, but he has not offered a valid reason for doing so.

- On September 16, 2016, the Chairman secretly sent armed U.S. Marshals into Mr. Pagliano’s workplace to personally serve a second subpoena for his public appearance before the Committee. This action—using armed Marshals instead of Committee staffers in business attire—served no purpose but to further harass and intimidate Mr. Pagliano. There was no vote, debate, consultation, or even notification to Democratic Committee Members before the Chairman took this unilateral action.

- If the Chairman wants to obtain Mr. Pagliano’s Fifth Amendment assertion for the record, he could easily hold a deposition, as Chairman Trey Gowdy did with Mr. Pagliano before the Select Committee on Benghazi. Alternatively, he could have moved the hearing into executive session, recessed, notified Mr. Pagliano’s attorneys, and received his assertion on-the-record. Chairman Chaffetz has declined to follow either approach and instead, demanded a public hearing.
- The actions of the Committee demonstrate a fundamental disrespect for the principles of separation of powers in an effort to re-investigate the work of the FBI, which has already concluded that no criminal charges were warranted. FBI Director Jim Comey reported that “we found no evidence that any of the additional work-related emails were intentionally deleted in an effort to conceal them” and that “we didn’t find any evidence of evil intent and intent to obstruct justice.”
- The sole purpose of compelling Mr. Pagliano to appear in public to invoke his Fifth Amendment rights for a second time before Congress is to harass and embarrass him and those associated with him, and to create fodder for political attack ads against Secretary Clinton during her presidential campaign. This is a blatant abuse of taxpayer funds for partisan political purposes.

#### I. ETHICS RULES PROHIBITING HARASSMENT OF WITNESSES

Legal ethics rules set forth by the American Bar Association (ABA) and the District of Columbia Bar prohibit attorneys from taking actions to embarrass, harass, or burden an individual.

According to the ABA’s professional ethical standards for attorneys, Rule 4.4 of the Model Rules of Professional Conduct states that “a lawyer shall not use means that have no substantial purpose other than to embarrass, delay, or burden a third person.”<sup>1</sup>

Rule 8.4(a) considers it to be “professional misconduct” for an attorney to “violate or attempt to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, knowingly assist or induce another to do so, or do so through the acts of another.”<sup>2</sup>

Rule 8.4(d) states that it is professional misconduct for lawyers to “engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice.”<sup>3</sup>

The District of Columbia Bar has interpreted these rules to prohibit attorneys—including congressional staff attorneys—from being involved in the process to compel witnesses who have indicated that they intend to assert their Fifth Amendment privilege at a public hearing when the sole purpose of that action is to “harass or embarrass” the witness.

In January 2011, the D.C. Legal Ethics Committee upheld an earlier opinion barring attorneys from subpoenaing a witness when “it is known in advance that no information will be obtained and

<sup>1</sup>American Bar Association, *Model Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 4.4: Respect for the Rights of Third Persons* (2016) (online at [www.americanbar.org/groups/professional\\_responsibility/publications/model\\_rules\\_of\\_professional\\_conduct/rule\\_4\\_4\\_respect\\_for\\_rights\\_of\\_third\\_persons.html](http://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/publications/model_rules_of_professional_conduct/rule_4_4_respect_for_rights_of_third_persons.html)).

<sup>2</sup>American Bar Association, *Model Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 8.4: Misconduct* (2016) (online at [www.americanbar.org/groups/professional\\_responsibility/publications/model\\_rules\\_of\\_professional\\_conduct/rule\\_8\\_4\\_misconduct.html](http://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/publications/model_rules_of_professional_conduct/rule_8_4_misconduct.html)).

<sup>3</sup>*Id.*



the sole effect of the summons will be to pillory the witness.” The Legal Ethics Committee explained that ethical obligations are violated when an attorney compels a witness to appear knowing that the appearance “(1) will provide no information to the committee and (2) is intended merely to degrade a witness.”<sup>4</sup>

The Legal Ethics Committee explained that these rules apply to all attorneys involved in these unethical actions, which includes staff attorneys who participate in preparation for hearings or participate in the hearings themselves. The opinion states:

Opinion 31 correctly asserted that when an attorney causes a witness to be called for the sole purpose of harassing or degrading that witness, that attorney violates our rules. See Rules 4.4, 8.4(d). Similarly, a lawyer would violate Rule 8.4(d) by engaging in abuse or harassment of the witness. Further, such conduct by a staff lawyer might constitute assisting another in violating the rules. See D.C. Rule 8.4(a). In addition to participation in the hearing itself, such related activities as preparing subpoenas also could subject a lawyer to sanctions, though we note that Rule 5.2 protects a subordinate lawyer who acts at the direction of a supervising attorney so long as there is a reasonable argument that calling the witness is permitted by the Rules.<sup>5</sup>

In addition, House Rules and the Code of Official Conduct generally proscribe unethical behavior. House Rule XXIII provides: “A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House shall behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House.”<sup>6</sup>

## II. SUBPOENAS AND PROPOSED CONTEMPT CONSTITUTE HARASSMENT

Mr. Pagliano has already asserted his Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination before the Select Committee on Benghazi—a key fact that the Chairman’s contempt resolution completely disregards. There is no legitimate legislative purpose in forcing Mr. Pagliano to appear to assert his Fifth Amendment rights before Congress for a second time, and there is no legitimate legislative purpose in forcing him to do so in public.

Approximately one year ago, the Chairman of the Select Committee on Benghazi, Rep. Trey Gowdy, subpoenaed Mr. Pagliano to testify in a closed-door deposition about this same topic, during this same Congress. In a letter prior to his appearance, Mr. Pagliano’s counsel informed the Select Committee that Mr. Pagliano would invoke his Fifth Amendment privilege as to any and all questions.<sup>7</sup>

Chairman Gowdy explained at that time that he had “appropriate potential reasons for the Committee to go forward with Mr. Pagliano’s appearance,” including “the committee’s right to evalu-

<sup>4</sup>D.C. Bar, Ethics Opinion 358: Subpoenaing Witness When Lawyer for Congressional Committee Has Been Advised that Witness Will Decline to Answer Any Questions on Claim of Privilege; Legal Ethics Opinion 31 Revisited (Jan. 2011) (online at [www.dcbbar.org/bar-resources/legal-ethics/opinions/opinion358.cfm](http://www.dcbbar.org/bar-resources/legal-ethics/opinions/opinion358.cfm))

<sup>5</sup>*Id.*

<sup>6</sup>House rule XXIII, clause 1.

<sup>7</sup>Letter from Mark J. MacDougall, Counsel for Bryan Pagliano, to Chairman Trey Gowdy, House Select Committee on Benghazi (Sept. 8, 2015).

ate the privilege assertion, the possibility that the witness will waive or not assert the privilege, the possibility that the committee will agree to hear the witness in executive session, and the possibility that the committee will immunize the witness's testimony under 18 U.S.C. § 6005.”<sup>8</sup>

Instead of requiring Mr. Pagliano to appear in a public hearing, however, Chairman Gowdy permitted Mr. Pagliano to invoke his privilege in a closed deposition. Similar to an executive session hearing, a deposition is an official Committee activity with a transcribed official record. Mr. Pagliano attended the deposition and invoked his Fifth Amendment privilege to all substantive questions.

In June 2016, Mr. Pagliano again invoked his Fifth Amendment rights in a civil deposition brought by conservative group Judicial Watch. Mr. Pagliano invoked his Fifth Amendment rights for every substantive question asked, including more than 125 questions regarding “the creation and operation of clintonemail.com for State Department business.”<sup>9</sup>

The Justice Department provided Mr. Pagliano with limited use immunity during its criminal investigation, and a federal district court judge examining that immunity agreement determined that it did not preclude Mr. Pagliano from continuing to invoke his Fifth Amendment rights in separate proceedings.<sup>10</sup>

Despite these facts, the Oversight Committee demanded that Mr. Pagliano come before Congress once again to invoke his Fifth Amendment privilege in public.

On September 7, 2016, the Chairman sent a letter inviting Mr. Pagliano to testify before the Committee in six days and threatening the imminent use of the compulsory process, stating: “The Committee will send a subpoena shortly and expects Mr. Pagliano’s attendance.”<sup>11</sup>

The next day, on September 8, 2016, the Chairman issued a unilateral subpoena, with no debate or vote, compelling Mr. Pagliano’s appearance at the hearing scheduled for September 13, 2016.<sup>12</sup>

On September 12, 2016, Mr. Pagliano’s attorneys objected to these short-notice demands, writing: “we must object to the attempted service of a subpoena at 9:00 P.M. that seeks to compel a private citizen to appear before your Committee two business days later.”<sup>13</sup> Mr. Pagliano’s attorneys explained that Mr. Pagliano “will continue to assert his rights under the Fifth Amendment and will decline to appear” before the Committee’s hearing.<sup>14</sup> Noting that Mr. Pagliano had already asserted his Fifth Amendment

<sup>8</sup>Letter from Chairman Trey Gowdy, House Select Committee on Benghazi, to Mark J. MacDougall, Counsel for Bryan Pagliano (Sept. 9, 2015).

<sup>9</sup>Deposition of Bryan Pagliano (June 22, 2016), *Judicial Watch, Inc., v. U.S. Department of State*, D.D.C. (No. 13-cv-1363) (online at [www.judicialwatch.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/JW-v-State-Pagliano-Deposition-01363.pdf](http://www.judicialwatch.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/JW-v-State-Pagliano-Deposition-01363.pdf)); see also *Judicial Watch: Clinton IT Staffer Pleads 5th 125 Consecutive Times*, CNN (June 22, 2016) (online at [www.cnn.com/2016/06/22/politics/bryan-pagliano-judicial-watch-deposition/](http://www.cnn.com/2016/06/22/politics/bryan-pagliano-judicial-watch-deposition/)).

<sup>10</sup>Minute Order Issued by Judge Emmet G. Sullivan (June 14, 2016), *Judicial Watch, Inc., v. U.S. Department of State*, D.D.C. (No. 13-cv-1363).

<sup>11</sup>Letter from Chairman Jason Chaffetz, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to Mark J. MacDougall, Counsel for Bryan Pagliano (Sept. 7, 2016).

<sup>12</sup>House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subpoena to Bryan Pagliano (Sept. 8, 2016).

<sup>13</sup>Letter from Mark J. MacDougall, et al., Counsel for Bryan Pagliano, to Chairman Jason Chaffetz, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (Sept. 12, 2016).

<sup>14</sup>*Id.*

rights before the Select Committee on Benghazi, his attorneys explained:

Any effort to require Mr. Pagliano to publicly appear this week and again assert his Fifth Amendment rights before a committee of the same Congress, inquiring about the same matter as the Benghazi Committee, furthers no legislative purpose and is a transparent effort to publicly harass and humiliate our client for unvarnished political purposes.<sup>15</sup>

On Friday, September 16, 2016, without notifying other Members of the Committee, the Chairman sent armed U.S. Marshals into Mr. Pagliano's workplace to serve yet another unilateral subpoena compelling him to appear before the Committee on September 22, 2016.

There was no reason to send armed Marshals to serve the subpoena. Even if the Chairman believed personal service was required, House rules allow Committee staff to serve subpoenas rather than armed law enforcement authorities.

### III. NO LEGITIMATE LEGISLATIVE PURPOSE TO COMPEL MR. PAGLIANO TO APPEAR

On the evening of September 12, 2016, Chairman Chaffetz informed Mr. Pagliano's attorneys that the Committee's subpoena remained in effect. The Chairman set forth three possible reasons for Mr. Pagliano to appear:

The Committee requires Mr. Pagliano's appearance because of, among other reasons, the possibility that he will waive or choose not to assert the privilege as to some or all questions, the possibility that the Committee will agree to hear his testimony in executive session, and the possibility that the Committee will immunize his testimony pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 6005.<sup>16</sup>

However, there was no reasonable basis or legitimate expectation that any of these three possibilities would materialize.

#### NO POSSIBILITY THAT MR. PAGLIANO WOULD REVERSE HIS FIFTH AMENDMENT ASSERTION

First, with respect to the Fifth Amendment assertion, on September 21, 2016, the day before the second day of hearings was scheduled to occur, Mr. Pagliano's attorneys sent yet another letter reiterating that the "facts have not changed," and that their client would continue to assert his Fifth Amendment rights as to all questions:

You and the Committee have been told from the beginning that Mr. Pagliano will continue to assert his Fifth

<sup>15</sup>*Id.*

<sup>16</sup>Letter from Chairman Jason Chaffetz, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to Mark J. MacDougall, Counsel for Bryan Pagliano (Sept. 12, 2016).

Amendment rights and will decline to answer any questions put to him by your Committee.<sup>17</sup>

NO POSSIBILITY OF GOING INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION

Despite claiming that Mr. Pagliano must appear before the Committee because of the possibility that the Committee would vote to go into executive session, the Chairman made clear that he had no intention of doing so.

As described above, the letter from Chairman Chaffetz on September 12, 2016, stated: “The Committee requires Mr. Pagliano’s appearance because of, among other reasons . . . the possibility that the Committee will agree to hear his testimony in executive session.”<sup>18</sup>

During the hearing, however, the Chairman made clear that he never intended to permit Mr. Pagliano to make his appearance in executive session. This was expressed in the following exchange with Ranking Member Cummings:

Rep. Cummings: Last night, the Chairman sent another letter to Mr. Pagliano saying that our Committee might go into executive session to accept his Fifth Amendment assertion.

Rep. Chaffetz: No, I did not say that.

Rep. Cummings: Well, what did you say?

Rep. Chaffetz: I want this Committee to be open and transparent. We do things as everything we can possibly do out in the open. That is the American way. That’s the way this Committee is going to be run.<sup>19</sup>

The Chairman’s claim directly contradicted the statements he had made in his letter to Mr. Pagliano the night before, while at the same time making clear that executive session was not a real option under consideration by the Committee.

In those comments at the hearing, the Chairman also clearly rejected an offer from Mr. Pagliano’s attorneys to appear before the Committee and assert his Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination in executive session. Earlier that morning, Mr. Pagliano’s counsel had offered:

In the event the Committee votes to proceed in executive session on September 13, 2016, however, we believe that Mr. Pagliano would agree to appear on short notice in order to formally decline to answer all questions in reliance on the Fifth Amendment. If the Committee actually wants Mr. Pagliano to personally appear and invoke his constitutional rights, then this offers a simple and direct path toward that objective. If you decline to pursue this avenue, then there can be no doubt that the Committee is seeking only to promote the public spectacle of a private

<sup>17</sup>Letter from Mark J. MacDougall, et al., Counsel for Bryan Pagliano, to Chairman Jason Chaffetz, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (Sept. 21, 2016).

<sup>18</sup>Letter from Chairman Jason Chaffetz, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to Mark J. MacDougall, Counsel for Bryan Pagliano (Sept. 12, 2016).

<sup>19</sup>House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, *Hearing on Examining Preservation of State Department Federal Records* (Sept. 13, 2016).

citizen repeatedly asserting his Fifth Amendment rights for no legitimate legislative purpose.<sup>20</sup>

#### NO POSSIBILITY OF GRANTING IMMUNITY

On September 22, 2016, the Department of Justice provided Committee Members and staff with access to Mr. Pagliano's immunity agreement with the Department, and the Committee was able to confirm that it is a limited grant of use immunity that permits Mr. Pagliano to continue to assert his Fifth Amendment rights in separate proceedings, including a congressional hearing.

Republican Committee Members have publicly criticized the Justice Department for its decision to grant immunity to Mr. Pagliano. As Rep. Gowdy stated in a television interview:

These are the two people the FBI decides to give immunity to, Bryan Pagliano and this guy at Platte River, if it happened, if it happened. Those are the two that you would want to prosecute, so you're giving immunity to the trigger people, and everybody goes free.<sup>21</sup>

Rep. Gowdy continued:

That's why those of us who used to do it for a living didn't like to give immunity. That's why you never heard me calling for giving Bryan Pagliano immunity. You better be right on who the trigger person is.<sup>22</sup>

Similarly, Chairman Chaffetz has criticized the Justice Department's decision to grant immunity to individuals in the case, stating to the Associated Press: "No wonder they couldn't prosecute a case. . . . They were handing out immunity deals like candy."<sup>23</sup>

#### IV. CONCLUSION

There was no credible expectation that Mr. Pagliano would choose to waive his Fifth Amendment rights, that the Chairman would permit Mr. Pagliano to invoke those rights in executive session, or that the Chairman would seek immunity for Mr. Pagliano. As a result, the Committee has failed to set forth any legitimate legislative purpose for demanding that Mr. Pagliano appear in public before the Committee to invoke his rights for a second time.

At the September 13, 2016, hearing, Ranking Member Cummings expressed his concerns about the Committee's actions:

There's no legitimate reason for Republicans to force Mr. Pagliano to appear yet again before Congress just to assert his Fifth Amendment rights one more time. How many times will Republicans do this? Will they force him to take the Fifth in front of the Science Committee next? How about the Homeland Security or Intelligence Committee? Should we have them go to those Committees too? This is an absolute abuse of authority.

<sup>20</sup> Letter from Mark J. MacDougall, et al., Counsel for Bryan Pagliano, to Chairman Jason Chaffetz, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (Sept. 13, 2016).

<sup>21</sup> *America's Newsroom*, Fox News (Sept. 9, 2016).

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*

<sup>23</sup> *GOP Lawmaker: FBI Gave Immunity to Top Clinton Aide*, Associated Press (Sept. 23, 2016).

Now, Chairman Gowdy and I disagree about many things, but I give him full credit for one thing that he did. At least when he subpoenaed Mr. Pagliano, he did it in a private session. He did not force Mr. Pagliano to assert the Fifth in public just to humiliate him, and I respect Mr. Gowdy for that.

Let me say this as plainly as I can. If this Committee's goal were just to get Mr. Pagliano or other witnesses on the record asserting their Fifth Amendment rights, we could do that easily in a private session just like Mr. Gowdy did with Mr. Pagliano a year ago. There's no legitimate reason to force Mr. Pagliano, or the other witnesses who were subpoenaed for this hearing, to assert the Fifth in open session. There's only an illegitimate reason—to get a photo op that Republicans think could harm Secretary Clinton's presidential campaign.<sup>24</sup>

When the sole purpose of the Committee's actions is to pillory, harass, and abuse an individual, those actions are illegitimate and unethical. The Committee's actions in the past three weeks raised serious legal, ethical, and Constitutional concerns, and therefore, Democratic Members of the Committee chose to vote against the resolution of contempt for Mr. Pagliano.

ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS,  
*Ranking Member.*

---

<sup>24</sup>House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, *Hearing on Examining Preservation of State Department Federal Records* (Sept. 13, 2016).

IX. APPENDIX

JASON CHAFFETZ, UTAH  
CHAIRMAN

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, MARYLAND  
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

2157 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6143

Majority (202) 225-5074  
Minority (202) 225-5051  
<http://oversight.house.gov>

September 7, 2016

Mark J. MacDougall, Esq.  
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP  
1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036


Dear Mr. MacDougall:

As my staff indicated to you on the phone last night and this morning, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform requests the testimony of your client Bryan Pagliano at a hearing. The hearing will be Tuesday, September 13, 2016, at 10:00 a.m. in room 2154 of the Rayburn House Office Building. The Committee will send a subpoena shortly and expects Mr. Pagliano's attendance.

The hearing will examine federal recordkeeping, including the circumstances that resulted in a failure to preserve federal records belonging to the State Department. As a Senior Advisor in the Department's Bureau of Information Resources Management from May 2009 to February 2013, your client reported directly to the Deputy Chief Information Officer for Operations, and is uniquely positioned to shed light on these issues. The enclosed Witness Instruction Sheet provides information for witnesses appearing before the Committee.

In addition, as soon as possible, but no later than noon on Friday, September 9, 2016, please provide the Committee with any agreement between your client and the Department of Justice in order to assist the Committee with assessing the scope of any privileges your client may wish to assert. If you are unwilling to voluntarily produce this document, please advise the Committee, and I will authorize a subpoena. When producing documents to the Committee, please deliver production sets to the Majority staff in Room 2157 of the Rayburn House Office Building and the Minority staff in Room 2471 of the Rayburn House Office Building. The Committee prefers, if possible, to receive all documents in electronic format.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is the principal oversight committee of the House of Representatives and may at "any time" investigate "any matter" as set forth in House Rule X. An attachment to this letter provides additional information about responding to the Committee's request. Should you have any questions, please contact Tristan Leavitt of the Committee staff at (202) 225-5074.

Sincerely,  


Jason Chaffetz  
Chairman

Enclosures

cc: The Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Ranking Minority Member

**Witness Instruction Sheet**  
**Non-governmental Witnesses**

1. Witnesses should provide their testimony, biography, and “Truth in Testimony” disclosure and certification form via e-mail to Sharon Casey, Deputy Chief Clerk, [Sharon.Casey@mail.house.gov](mailto:Sharon.Casey@mail.house.gov), no later than noon two business days prior to the hearing.
  - a. Witnesses must complete the attached “Truth in Testimony” disclosure and certification. Additional pages may be attached to the form if needed. Witnesses must also include a biography, resume or curriculum vitae. This disclosure and biographical information is required by House Rules. (House Rule XI, clause 2(g)(5)).
2. Witnesses should also provide 60 copies of their written testimony, bio and “Truth in Testimony” delivered to 2157 Rayburn House Office Building, no later than 10:00 a.m. two business days prior to the hearing.

Please do not send copies by U.S. Mail, UPS, Federal Express, or other shippers. Such packages are processed through an offsite security facility and will arrive 7-10 days late.
3. Written testimony, biography and “Truth in Testimony” disclosure and certification form will be made publicly available and will be posted on the Committee’s website and U.S. House of Representatives Document Repository. It is therefore recommended that personally identifiable information such as addresses and phone numbers not be included in the biographical information.
4. At the hearing, each witness will be asked to summarize his or her written testimony in five minutes or less in order to maximize the time available for discussion and questions. Written testimony will be entered into the hearing record and may extend to any reasonable length.
5. The Committee does not provide financial reimbursement for witness travel or accommodations. Witnesses with extenuating circumstances; however, may submit a written request for such reimbursements to Robin Butler, Financial Administrator, 2157 Rayburn House Office Building, at least one week prior to the hearing. Reimbursements will not be made without prior approval.
6. Witnesses with disabilities should contact Committee staff to arrange any necessary accommodations.
7. Committee Rules governing this hearing are online at [www.oversight.house.gov](http://www.oversight.house.gov).

For inquiries regarding these rules and procedures, please contact the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform at (202) 225-5074.



**Committee on Oversight and Government Reform  
Witness Disclosure Requirement – “Truth in Testimony”  
Required by House Rule XI, Clause 2(g)(5)**

Name:

---

1. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) you have received since October 1, 2012. Include the source and amount of each grant or contract.

---

2. Please list any entity you are testifying on behalf of and briefly describe your relationship with these entities.

---

3. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) received since October 1, 2012, by the entity(ies) you listed above. Include the source and amount of each grant or contract.

---

*I certify that the above information is true and correct.*  
Signature:

Date:

---

**Responding to Committee Document Requests**

1. In complying with this request, you are required to produce all responsive documents that are in your possession, custody, or control, whether held by you or your past or present agents, employees, and representatives acting on your behalf. You should also produce documents that you have a legal right to obtain, that you have a right to copy or to which you have access, as well as documents that you have placed in the temporary possession, custody, or control of any third party. Requested records, documents, data or information should not be destroyed, modified, removed, transferred or otherwise made inaccessible to the Committee.
2. In the event that any entity, organization or individual denoted in this request has been, or is also known by any other name than that herein denoted, the request shall be read also to include that alternative identification.
3. The Committee's preference is to receive documents in electronic form (i.e., CD, memory stick, or thumb drive) in lieu of paper productions.
4. Documents produced in electronic format should also be organized, identified, and indexed electronically.
5. Electronic document productions should be prepared according to the following standards:
  - (a) The production should consist of single page Tagged Image File ("TIF"), files accompanied by a Concordance-format load file, an Opticon reference file, and a file defining the fields and character lengths of the load file.
  - (b) Document numbers in the load file should match document Bates numbers and TIF file names.
  - (c) If the production is completed through a series of multiple partial productions, field names and file order in all load files should match.
  - (d) All electronic documents produced to the Committee should include the following fields of metadata specific to each document;
 

BEGDOC, ENDDOC, TEXT, BEGATTACH, ENDATTACH,  
 PAGECOUNT,CUSTODIAN, RECORDTYPE, DATE, TIME, SENTDATE,  
 SENTTIME, BEGINDATE, BEGINTIME, ENDDATE, ENDTIME, AUTHOR, FROM,  
 CC, TO, BCC, SUBJECT, TITLE, FILENAME, FILEEXT, FILESIZE,  
 DATECREATED, TIMECREATED, DATELASTMOD, TIMELASTMOD,  
 INTMSGID, INTMSGHEADER, NATIVELINK, INTFILPATH, EXCEPTION,  
 BEGATTACH.
6. Documents produced to the Committee should include an index describing the contents of the production. To the extent more than one CD, hard drive, memory stick, thumb drive, box or folder is produced, each CD, hard drive, memory stick, thumb drive, box or folder should contain an index describing its contents.

7. Documents produced in response to this request shall be produced together with copies of file labels, dividers or identifying markers with which they were associated when the request was served.
8. When you produce documents, you should identify the paragraph in the Committee's schedule to which the documents respond.
9. It shall not be a basis for refusal to produce documents that any other person or entity also possesses non-identical or identical copies of the same documents.
10. If any of the requested information is only reasonably available in machine-readable form (such as on a computer server, hard drive, or computer backup tape), you should consult with the Committee staff to determine the appropriate format in which to produce the information.
11. If compliance with the request cannot be made in full by the specified return date, compliance shall be made to the extent possible by that date. An explanation of why full compliance is not possible shall be provided along with any partial production.
12. In the event that a document is withheld on the basis of privilege, provide a privilege log containing the following information concerning any such document: (a) the privilege asserted; (b) the type of document; (c) the general subject matter; (d) the date, author and addressee; and (e) the relationship of the author and addressee to each other.
13. If any document responsive to this request was, but no longer is, in your possession, custody, or control, identify the document (stating its date, author, subject and recipients) and explain the circumstances under which the document ceased to be in your possession, custody, or control.
14. If a date or other descriptive detail set forth in this request referring to a document is inaccurate, but the actual date or other descriptive detail is known to you or is otherwise apparent from the context of the request, you are required to produce all documents which would be responsive as if the date or other descriptive detail were correct.
15. Unless otherwise specified, the time period covered by this request is from January 1, 2009 to the present.
16. This request is continuing in nature and applies to any newly-discovered information. Any record, document, compilation of data or information, not produced because it has not been located or discovered by the return date, shall be produced immediately upon subsequent location or discovery.
17. All documents shall be Bates-stamped sequentially and produced sequentially.
18. Two sets of documents shall be delivered, one set to the Majority Staff and one set to the Minority Staff. When documents are produced to the Committee, production sets shall be delivered to the Majority Staff in Room 2157 of the Rayburn House Office Building and the Minority Staff in Room 2471 of the Rayburn House Office Building.

19. Upon completion of the document production, you should submit a written certification, signed by you or your counsel, stating that: (1) a diligent search has been completed of all documents in your possession, custody, or control which reasonably could contain responsive documents; and (2) all documents located during the search that are responsive have been produced to the Committee.

#### Definitions

1. The term "document" means any written, recorded, or graphic matter of any nature whatsoever, regardless of how recorded, and whether original or copy, including, but not limited to, the following: memoranda, reports, expense reports, books, manuals, instructions, financial reports, working papers, records, notes, letters, notices, confirmations, telegrams, receipts, appraisals, pamphlets, magazines, newspapers, prospectuses, inter-office and intra-office communications, electronic mail (e-mail), contracts, cables, notations of any type of conversation, telephone call, meeting or other communication, bulletins, printed matter, computer printouts, teletypes, invoices, transcripts, diaries, analyses, returns, summaries, minutes, bills, accounts, estimates, projections, comparisons, messages, correspondence, press releases, circulars, financial statements, reviews, opinions, offers, studies and investigations, questionnaires and surveys, and work sheets (and all drafts, preliminary versions, alterations, modifications, revisions, changes, and amendments of any of the foregoing, as well as any attachments or appendices thereto), and graphic or oral records or representations of any kind (including without limitation, photographs, charts, graphs, microfiche, microfilm, videotape, recordings and motion pictures), and electronic, mechanical, and electric records or representations of any kind (including, without limitation, tapes, cassettes, disks, and recordings) and other written, printed, typed, or other graphic or recorded matter of any kind or nature, however produced or reproduced, and whether preserved in writing, film, tape, disk, videotape or otherwise. A document bearing any notation not a part of the original text is to be considered a separate document. A draft or non-identical copy is a separate document within the meaning of this term.
2. The term "communication" means each manner or means of disclosure or exchange of information, regardless of means utilized, whether oral, electronic, by document or otherwise, and whether in a meeting, by telephone, facsimile, email (desktop or mobile device), text message, instant message, MMS or SMS message, regular mail, telexes, releases, or otherwise.
3. The terms "and" and "or" shall be construed broadly and either conjunctively or disjunctively to bring within the scope of this request any information which might otherwise be construed to be outside its scope. The singular includes plural number, and vice versa. The masculine includes the feminine and neuter genders.
4. The terms "person" or "persons" mean natural persons, firms, partnerships, associations, corporations, subsidiaries, divisions, departments, joint ventures, proprietorships, syndicates, or other legal, business or government entities, and all subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, departments, branches, or other units thereof.

5. The term “identify,” when used in a question about individuals, means to provide the following information: (a) the individual's complete name and title; and (b) the individual's business address and phone number.
6. The term “referring or relating,” with respect to any given subject, means anything that constitutes, contains, embodies, reflects, identifies, states, refers to, deals with or is pertinent to that subject in any manner whatsoever.
7. The term “employee” means agent, borrowed employee, casual employee, consultant, contractor, de facto employee, independent contractor, joint adventurer, loaned employee, part-time employee, permanent employee, provisional employee, subcontractor, or any other type of service provider.

**Akin Gump**  
STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

MARK J. MACDOUGALL  
+1 202.887.4510/fax: +1 202.887.4288  
mmacdougall@akingump.com

September 12, 2016

**VIA ELECTRONIC DELIVERY**

Hon. Jason Chaffetz  
Chairman  
The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform  
U.S. House of Representatives  
2157 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515-6143

Re: Subpoena issued on September 8, 2016 to Bryan Pagliano

Dear Chairman Chaffetz:

We write in response to the subpoena issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (the "Committee") to our client, Bryan Pagliano, on the evening of September 8, 2016. This subpoena calls for Mr. Pagliano to appear at a hearing before the Committee on Tuesday, September 13, 2016. The subpoena states that Mr. Pagliano will be questioned regarding federal recordkeeping and specifically the circumstances that "resulted in a failure to preserve federal records belonging to the State Department."

As an initial matter, we must object to the attempted service of a subpoena at 9:00 PM that seeks to compel a private citizen to appear before your Committee two business days later. In that regard, I was required to be in an evidentiary hearing in federal court all day on Friday, September 9, and so did not have the opportunity to consider your subpoena and consult with our client until the weekend.

As you are well aware, Mr. Pagliano appeared before the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi (the "Benghazi Committee") on September 10, 2015. At that deposition, Mr. Pagliano declined to answer all questions that were put to him in reliance on his rights under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution. Chairman Gowdy (who along with three other Members is also a Member of this Committee) arranged for that testimony to be taken privately. Chairman Gowdy then excused Mr. Pagliano after he asserted his rights and declined to answer any questions. On June 22, 2016, Mr. Pagliano likewise asserted his Fifth Amendment rights and declined to answer all questions that were put to him in a civil deposition ordered by U.S. District Judge Emmett Sullivan in the case styled Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Department of State (1:13-cv-01363-EGS) pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.


Hon. Jason Chaffetz  
September 12, 2016  
Page 2

We are authorized to inform you that Mr. Pagliano will continue to assert his rights under the Fifth Amendment and will decline to appear before your Committee on Tuesday, September 13, 2016. Mr. Pagliano is a private citizen who left his government job more than three years ago. As the Committee is well aware, Mr. Pagliano fully cooperated with the Department of Justice, subject to a limited grant of use immunity. Any effort to require Mr. Pagliano to publicly appear this week and again assert his Fifth Amendment rights before a committee of the same Congress, inquiring about the same matter as the Benghazi Committee, furthers no legislative purpose and is a transparent effort to publicly harass and humiliate our client for unvarnished political purposes.

The unreasonableness of the time constraint in the subpoena underscores the purely political motivations of this Committee.<sup>1</sup> We should also note that any lawyer associated with the Committee who seeks to force such an appearance is in violation of the Rules of Professional Responsibility. *See* D.C. Bar Ethics Opinion 31 (1977) (concluding that it is a violation of the D.C. Rules of Professional Conduct to summon a witness when “it is known in advance that no information will be obtained and the sole effect of the summons will be to pillory the witness.”).

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the Committee formally excuse Mr. Pagliano from personally appearing on September 13, 2016.

Sincerely,



Mark J. MacDougall  
Sean D'Arcy  
Constance D. O'Connor  
Connor Mullin  
Abigail Kohlman  
*Counsel for Bryan Pagliano*

cc: Hon. Elijah Cummings  
Ranking Member

---

<sup>1</sup> The Ranking Minority Member on the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Elijah Cummings, criticized Chairman Chaffetz in a letter stating that “this is the first time during my twenty years in Congress that I have witnessed the oversight power of this Committee used in such a transparently political manner to directly influence a presidential election...I can understand why some witnesses may want no part of this political circus.” Letter from United States Representative Elijah E. Cummings (D-MD) to United States Representative Jason E. Chaffetz (R-UT) (Sept. 9, 2016).

# Akin Gump

STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

MARK J. MACDOUGALL  
+1 202.887.4510/fax: +1 202.887.4288  
mmacdougall@akingump.com

September 12, 2016

**VIA ELECTRONIC DELIVERY**

Hon. Jason Chaffetz  
Chairman  
The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform  
U.S. House of Representatives  
2157 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515-6143


Re: Subpoena issued on September 9, 2016 to Bryan Pagliano

Dear Chairman Chaffetz:

We write in response to the subpoena that we received at 7:30 PM on Friday, September 9, 2016. That subpoena calls for the production of documents and communications “relating to any immunity or proffer agreement between you and the U.S. Department of Justice, including...any agreement referring or relating to testimony given to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.” The documents that the Committee is seeking pursuant to this subpoena are to be produced at 10:00 AM on Tuesday, September 13, 2016.

To the extent that Mr. Pagliano has any materials responsive to this subpoena, they are subject to substantial legal restrictions that we believe preclude their production to the Committee. These restrictions are in addition to protections afforded to Mr. Pagliano under the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product doctrine. Accordingly, we have no documents or other materials for production to your Committee in response to this subpoena.

Sincerely,



Mark J. MacDougall  
Sean D'Arcy  
Constance D. O'Connor  
Connor Mullin  
Abigail Kohlman  
*Counsel for Bryan Pagliano*

cc: Hon. Elijah Cummings  
Ranking Member



JASON CHAFFETZ, UTAH  
CHAIRMAN

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, MARYLAND  
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM  
2157 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6143

MAJORITY (202) 725-6074  
MINORITY (202) 522-6061  
<http://oversight.house.gov>

September 12, 2016

Mr. Mark J. MacDougall  
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP  
1333 New Hampshire Avenue NW  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Mr. MacDougall:

On September 7, 2016, the Committee invited your client, Brian Pagliano, to testify at a hearing on September 13, 2016, titled “Examining Preservation of State Department Federal Records.” As the invitation stated, the hearing will examine federal recordkeeping, including the circumstances that resulted in a failure to preserve federal records belonging to the State Department. Mr. Pagliano is one of five witnesses invited to appear at the hearing.<sup>1</sup>

You, however, were aware that Mr. Pagliano would be asked to testify even before the invitation was transmitted, and you advised the Committee that Mr. Pagliano would not appear voluntarily. You further advised that if he did appear, he would assert his rights under the Fifth Amendment and decline to answer questions related to the matters that are the subject of the hearing. In light of Mr. Pagliano’s unwillingness to appear voluntarily, a subpoena was issued to compel him to appear. You received the subpoena on September 8, 2016—five days before the hearing.

Today, on the eve of the hearing, you advised the Committee in a letter that Mr. Pagliano intends to assert his rights under the Fifth Amendment and will decline to appear.<sup>2</sup> The letter further stated that Mr. Pagliano was previously called to answer questions by the Select Committee on Benghazi (he declined and asserted his Fifth Amendment privilege) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (he fully cooperated subject to an immunity agreement).<sup>3</sup>

Mr. Pagliano’s prior experience makes two things clear with respect to the topic of tomorrow’s hearing: (1) Mr. Pagliano is uniquely qualified to answer questions that will assist the Committee’s investigation, which is why at least two other investigative entities sought his

<sup>1</sup> Letter from Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, to Mark J. MacDougall (Sept. 7, 2016).

<sup>2</sup> Letter from Mark J. MacDougall to Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, re: Subpoena issued on September 8, 2016 to Bryan Pagliano (Sept. 12, 2016).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* at 1.

Mr. Mark J. MacDougall  
September 12, 2016  
Page 2


testimony, and (2) Mr. Pagliano has in fact provided testimony under certain conditions, specifically, to the FBI pursuant to an immunity agreement.

It is therefore improper to assert, as you did, that Mr. Pagliano's appearance before the Committee "furthers no legislative purpose and is a transparent effort to publicly harass and humiliate our client for unvarnished political purposes."<sup>4</sup> The Committee invited Mr. Pagliano to appear with the expectation that his testimony will advance the Committee's investigation, which seeks information about former Secretary Hillary Clinton's use of a private, non-secure email server during her time at the Department of State. The Committee requires Mr. Pagliano's appearance because of, among other reasons, the possibility that he will waive or choose not to assert the privilege as to some or all questions, the possibility that the Committee will agree to hear his testimony in executive session, and the possibility that the Committee will immunize his testimony pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 6005.<sup>5</sup>

For those reasons, the subpoena for Mr. Pagliano remains in effect. The subpoena compels Mr. Pagliano to appear before the Committee on September 13, 2016, at 10:00 a.m.

In a separate letter, regarding the Committee's subpoena for Mr. Pagliano's immunity agreement(s) with the Department of Justice, you stated "we have no documents or other materials for production to your Committee in response to this subpoena."<sup>6</sup> The U.S. House of Representatives does not recognize the privileges your letter refers to as the basis for that position, as the subpoena itself states.<sup>7</sup> The subpoena remains in effect. The subpoena requires Mr. Pagliano to produce the covered materials at or before 10:00 a.m. on September 13, 2016.

Please contact the Committee staff at (202) 225-5074 with any additional questions.

Sincerely,  
  
Jason Chaffetz  
Chairman

cc: The Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Ranking Minority Member

---

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 2.

<sup>5</sup> D.C. Bar Legal Ethics Opinion 358 (2011), while inapposite for a number of reasons, recognizes that there are legitimate reasons for a congressional committee to summon a witness who expresses an intention to assert his or her privilege against self-incrimination.

<sup>6</sup> Letter from Mark J. MacDougall to Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, re: Subpoena issued on September 9, 2016 to Bryan Pagliano (Sept. 12, 2016).

<sup>7</sup> Subpoena Instruction 14 states, in pertinent part: "In complying with the subpoena, be apprised that the U.S. House of Representatives and the Committee do not recognize: any purported non-disclosure privileges associated with the common law including, but not limited to, the deliberative process privilege, the attorney-client privilege, and attorney work product protections . . . ."

# Akin Gump

STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

MARK J. MACDOUGALL  
+1 202.887.4510/fax: +1 202.887.4288  
mmacdougall@akingump.com

September 13, 2016

**VIA ELECTRONIC DELIVERY**

Hon. Jason Chaffetz  
Chairman  
The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform  
U.S. House of Representatives  
2157 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515-6143

Re: Subpoena issued on September 8, 2016 to Bryan Pagliano

Dear Chairman Chaffetz:

I am writing in reply to your letter that was received after 8:00 PM last evening. In the interest of time, I will not seek to address the inaccurate assertions of fact or characterizations of law conveyed in that letter.

You did, however, suggest three reasons that Bryan Pagliano should yet again be required to personally appear and assert his rights under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution. As recited in your letter, these are (a) the possibility that he will waive or choose not to assert the privilege [sic] as to some or all questions, (b) the possibility that the Committee will agree to hear his testimony in executive session, and (c) the possibility that the Committee will immunize his testimony pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §6005. While Mr. Pagliano will continue to assert his constitutional right not to testify, let me address the reasons you contend that he must again appear in a public hearing.

With regard to the first reason, for more than a year and on multiple occasions Mr. Pagliano has uniformly and without exception asserted his rights under the Fifth Amendment. He has never made any statement or taken any action that could constitute a waiver of his constitutional rights and there is no reason for anyone to believe that he might suddenly depart from that position.

Your second stated reason is that the Committee might vote to hear Mr. Pagliano's testimony in executive session. As you know well, a similar approach was taken by Chairman Gowdy in September of 2015 when Mr. Pagliano appeared before the Benghazi Committee and asserted his Fifth Amendment rights under oath and on the record. We are confident that requiring a witness to assert his constitutional rights in hearings before multiple committees of the same Congress, investigating the same subject matter, is not a proper legislative purpose. In the event the Committee votes to proceed in executive session on September 13, 2016, however,


Hon. Jason Chaffetz  
September 13, 2016  
Page 2

we believe that Mr. Pagliano would agree to appear on short notice in order to formally decline to answer all questions in reliance on the Fifth Amendment. If the Committee actually wants Mr. Pagliano to personally appear and invoke his constitutional rights, then this offers a simple and direct path toward that objective. If you decline to pursue this avenue, then there can be no doubt that the Committee is seeking only to promote the public spectacle of a private citizen repeatedly asserting his Fifth Amendment rights for no legitimate legislative purpose.

Finally, with regard to the prospect that the "Committee will immunize [Mr. Pagliano's] testimony pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §6005," I am sure that you understand that only a U.S. District Court may confer statutory immunity on a witness. That process may begin with a committee vote but then must proceed through a series of procedural steps -- none of which requires the presence of the witness. If you believe that a formal assertion of the Fifth Amendment is a necessary prerequisite to proceeding under Section 6005 of Title 18 of the U.S. Code, however, then that step may also be taken in executive session.

Please let us know if the Committee would like to take advantage of any of these readily available mechanisms to resolve this matter. We should be clear, however, that nothing in this letter is intended to waive or release any right, remedy or privilege that may be available to our client.

Sincerely,



Mark J. MacDougall  
Sean D'Arcy  
Constance D. O'Connor  
Connor Mullin  
Abigail Kohlman  
*Counsel for Bryan Pagliano*

cc: Hon. Elijah Cummings  
Ranking Member

JASON CHAFFETZ, UTAH  
CHAIRMAN

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, MARYLAND  
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

2157 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6143

Minority (202) 225-6074  
Members (202) 225-6051  
<http://oversight.house.gov>

September 15, 2016

Mr. Mark J. MacDougall  
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP  
1333 New Hampshire Avenue NW  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Mr. MacDougall:

Your client, Bryan Pagliano, failed to appear before the Committee's September 13, 2016, hearing, "Examining Preservation of State Department Federal Records," as required by a testimonial subpoena that the Committee issued to him after Mr. Pagliano refused to appear voluntarily. Mr. Pagliano also failed to produce documents related to his immunity agreement with the Department of Justice, which were compelled to be produced at the hearing pursuant to a separate Committee subpoena issued on September 9, 2016.

Mr. Pagliano's refusal to comply with two duly issued congressional subpoenas exposes him to the possibility of being held in contempt and potential criminal liability pursuant to 2 U.S.C. §§ 192 and 194, as well as possible civil litigation to enforce the Committee's subpoenas.

The Subpoena for Mr. Pagliano's Testimony

With respect to your client's failure to appear, your position seems to be based on the notion that compelling his presence does not serve a "legitimate legislative purpose."<sup>1</sup> Nothing could be further from the truth. Mr. Pagliano is a – perhaps the – crucial witness to the Committee's ongoing investigation of Secretary Hillary Clinton's use of a private email server to conduct official State Department business. The Committee has legislative jurisdiction over federal recordkeeping, transparency, and ethics laws, and the Committee's investigatory activities—such as taking testimony from witnesses in an open hearing—are inherent to the Committee's legislative function.

The "legitimate legislative purpose" for requiring witnesses to appear before the Committee has been answered by the Supreme Court, which held that Congress's power "to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process. That power is broad. It

<sup>1</sup> Letter from Mark J. MacDougall to Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, Re: Subpoena issued on September 8, 2016 to Bryan Pagliano (Sept. 13, 2016).

Mr. Mark J. MacDougall  
September 15, 2016  
Page 2

encompasses inquiries concerning the administration of existing laws as well as proposed or possibly needed statutes.”<sup>2</sup>

The Committee’s long-standing practice is to require witnesses to appear and assert their Fifth Amendment rights in person during open session. The stated rationale for your client’s non-appearance—that there is no reason to believe Mr. Pagliano “might suddenly depart” from asserting his Fifth Amendment rights in response to the Committee’s questions—incorrectly assumes that the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination would apply to all the Committee’s questions. As you know, the Fifth Amendment may be asserted only when there is reasonable apprehension on the part of the witness that his answer would furnish some evidence upon which he could be convicted of a criminal offense.<sup>3</sup> In light of FBI Director Comey’s assertions with respect to the FBI’s investigation, as well as Mr. Pagliano’s immunity agreement with the Department of Justice, the Committee has many questions that Mr. Pagliano will be able to answer without reasonable apprehension of criminal liability.

Your proposed alternative to compliance with the subpoena—whereby Mr. Pagliano would appear on the condition that the Committee moved to executive session<sup>4</sup>—failed to account for House and Committee rules, procedures, and practice.

From a procedural perspective, Mr. Pagliano foreclosed the possibility that the Committee would move into executive session (which requires a vote of the majority of the full Committee) when he willfully failed to appear as legally obligated. In light of his absence from the hearing room, there was no reason to vote on moving to executive session. Moreover, Mr. Pagliano’s contumacious conduct was an affront to the Committee and severely damaged the prospect for a successful vote to move to executive session when the hearing resumes.

From a legal and practical perspective, witnesses subpoenaed by congressional committees may not demand conditions to guarantee their appearance.<sup>5</sup> If Mr. Pagliano wishes to maintain the possibility that the Committee will agree to immunize his testimony, he must appear before the Committee, take questions, and invoke a valid privilege.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> *Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178, 187 (1957).

<sup>3</sup> *United States v. Jaffee*, 98 F. Supp. 191, 193-94 (D.D.C. 1951); see also *Simpson v. United States*, 241 F.2d 222 (9th Cir. 1957) (privilege inapplicable to questions seeking basic identifying information, such as the witness’s name and address).

<sup>4</sup> Letter from Mark J. MacDougall to Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov’t Reform, re: Subpoena issued on September 8, 2016 to Bryan Pagliano (Sept. 13, 2016). (“In the event the Committee votes to proceed in executive session on September 13, 2016, however, we believe that Mr. Pagliano would agree to appear on short notice in order to formally decline to answer all questions in reliance on the Fifth Amendment.”).

<sup>5</sup> See *United States v. Orman*, 207 F.2d 148 (3rd Cir. 1953) (“[A] court will not enforce a condition imposed upon committee procedure by a witness, at least where no circumstances appear which might affect the ability of the witness to give clear and truthful testimony.”)

<sup>6</sup> See *In re McElreath*, 248 F.2d 612 (D.C. Cir. 1957) (en banc).

Mr. Mark J. MacDougall  
 September 15, 2016  
 Page 3

The Subpoena for Mr. Pagliano's Immunity Agreement

In light of Mr. Pagliano's experiences in other proceedings related to Secretary Clinton's private server,<sup>7</sup> it should come as no surprise that the Committee compelled him to produce his immunity agreement with the Department of Justice after you advised that he would assert his Fifth Amendment privilege. The Committee issued a subpoena for Mr. Pagliano's immunity agreement, and related documents that would help the Committee understand the scope of the agreement, to determine how and whether the agreement affects his ability to testify before the Committee, and assess the legitimacy of any reliance on the Fifth Amendment to avoid answering questions.

Your letter cited several common law privileges as a basis for refusing to produce the immunity agreement.<sup>8</sup> None, however, is applicable here, a fact made clear by the subpoena's instructions.<sup>9</sup> Your letter also states that any responsive materials "are subject to substantial legal restrictions that we believe preclude their production to the Committee."<sup>10</sup> Absent greater detail, and you offered none, about those restrictions—specifically, who imposed them, what they prohibit and permit, and whether they are part of the agreement itself—the Committee is not in a position to assess whether Mr. Pagliano's reasons for withholding the documents are compelling.

The Hearing Will Resume on September 22, 2016

In light of the foregoing, I urge your client to reconsider his decision. The Committee will permit him the opportunity to cure his failure to comply by agreeing to appear and produce his immunity agreement when the Committee's hearing resumes on September 22, 2016. The Committee remains interested in his testimony, but also has a substantial interest in holding Mr. Pagliano accountable for his knowing and intentional failure to appear. Neither this Committee, nor the House, can countenance witnesses blatantly ignoring validly issued subpoenas for testimony and documents.

If your client again fails to appear and produce documents, the Committee will take all necessary steps to protect its institutional interests regarding subpoena compliance, as failure to do so will result in Committee investigations "grind[ing] to a halt" whenever witnesses refuse to

<sup>7</sup> *Judicial Watch v. U.S. Department of State* (D.D.C.) (No. 1:13-cv-01363). Judge Sullivan ordered Mr. Pagliano to produce his agreement with the Department of Justice so the court could "assess the legitimacy of his intent to assert his Fifth Amendment rights in this civil proceeding."

<sup>8</sup> Letter from Mark J. MacDougall to Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, re: Subpoena issued on September 9, 2016 to Bryan Pagliano (Sept. 13, 2016). ("These restrictions are in addition to protections afforded to Mr. Pagliano under the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product doctrine.")


<sup>9</sup> Subpoena Instruction 14 states, in pertinent part: "In complying with the subpoena, be apprised that the U.S. House of Representatives and the Committee do not recognize: any purported non-disclosure privileges associated with the common law including, but not limited to, the deliberative process privilege, the attorney-client privilege, and attorney work product protections . . ."

<sup>10</sup> Letter from Mark J. MacDougall to Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, re: Subpoena issued on September 9, 2016 to Bryan Pagliano (Sept. 13, 2016).

Mr. Mark J. MacDougall  
September 15, 2016  
Page 4

provide subpoenaed testimony or documents.<sup>11</sup> Accordingly, Mr. Pagliano's choice is clear: appear or face criminal contempt proceedings as well as possible civil litigation to enforce the subpoenas.

Please contact the Committee staff at (202) 225-5074 with any additional questions.

Sincerely,  
  
Jason Chaffetz  
Chairman

cc: The Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Ranking Minority Member

---

<sup>11</sup> *Hutchison v. United States*, 369 U.S. 599, 617 (1962); see also *United States v. Bryan*, 339 U.S. 323 (1950).



**Akin Gump**  
STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLPMARK J. MACDOUGALL  
+1 202.887.4510/fax: +1 202.887.4288  
mmacdougall@akingump.com

September 21, 2016

**VIA ELECTRONIC DELIVERY**

Hon. Jason Chaffetz  
Chairman  
The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform  
U.S. House of Representatives  
2157 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515-6143

Re: Subpoena ad testificandum issued on September 16, 2016 to Bryan Pagliano

Dear Chairman Chaffetz:

We are writing in response to the subpoena that you caused to be served on our client Bryan Pagliano at his place of employment on September 16, 2016, seeking his appearance and testimony before the Committee on Thursday, September 22, 2016 at 10:00 AM. We are likewise responding to your letter of September 15, 2016 (the "September 15 Letter") as it relates to that subpoena.

We have corresponded extensively with you and the Committee's attorneys over the past two weeks on this subject. The facts have not changed. Mr. Pagliano previously appeared before the Benghazi Committee – in this same Congress – in response to a subpoena seeking the same testimony. Mr. Pagliano declined to answer all questions asked of him by the Benghazi Committee in reliance on his rights under the Fifth Amendment and was excused by Chairman Gowdy (who is also a Member of this Committee). You and the Committee have been told from the beginning that Mr. Pagliano will continue to assert his Fifth Amendment rights and will decline to answer any questions put to him by your Committee. In an effort to resolve this matter, Mr. Pagliano has offered to assert his rights on the record before this Committee in Executive Session. You have flatly refused that offer and continue to insist that Mr. Pagliano appear in a public session where his further and repeated assertion of his constitutional right not to testify can be videotaped and broadcast.

In the September 15 Letter you insist that the limited use immunity agreement between Mr. Pagliano and the Department of Justice – whatever its terms – will somehow permit the Committee to interrogate our client and demand that he answer despite the assertion of his Fifth Amendment rights. Your stated position betrays a fundamental misunderstanding of the law.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "Use" immunity does not provide blanket immunity from prosecution: "The only benefit as far as the witness is concerned is that . . . any information directly or indirectly derived from such testimony may not be used

Hon. Jason Chaffetz  
September 21, 2016  
Page 2

Mr. Pagliano has not waived his constitutional rights and he is free to continue to assert those rights before your Committee and all the other congressional bodies that demand his appearance.

A subpoena issued by a congressional committee is required by law to serve a valid legislative purpose – and there is none here. Your demand under the present circumstances, that Mr. Pagliano again assert his constitutional rights in front of video cameras six weeks before the presidential election, betrays a naked political agenda and furthers no valid legislative aim. The Committee lawyers who may be participating in this effort should give serious consideration to the consequences of their conduct.<sup>2</sup> In the event the Committee carries out your threat of a contempt citation and a referral to the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, Mr. Pagliano will rely on his constitutional rights to vigorously defend himself in any such action. He will exercise the right to obtain discovery from the Committee and all those involved in this episode and to summon and confront witnesses to appear in federal court for examination.

---


against him in a subsequent criminal prosecution.” *In re Corrugated Container Antitrust Litig.*, 662 F.2d 875, 887 (D.C. Cir. 1981). In other words, a grant of “use” immunity does not prevent the government from prosecuting; it merely limits the government’s sources of evidence. The Supreme Court has squarely held that a nonparty deponent retains the right, despite a grant of “use” immunity by the DOJ under 18 U.S.C. § 6002, to rely on the Fifth Amendment in declining to testify. See *Pillsbury Co. v. Conboy*, 459 U.S. 248, 263-64 (1983). In *Conboy*, a district court held a nonparty deponent in contempt for asserting the Fifth Amendment privilege in response to a series of deposition questions that were identical to those asked during his grand jury testimony, which testimony was subject to a separate grant of “use” immunity under Section 6002. *Id.* at 250. The Supreme Court agreed that the contempt order was improper because the deponent was entitled to the protection of the Fifth Amendment. *Id.* The Court held that a nonparty “deponent’s civil deposition testimony,” even where it “closely track[s] his prior immunized testimony, is not, without duly authorized assurance of immunity at the time, immunized testimony within the meaning of § 6002.” *Id.* at 263-64. For example, the witness’s answers that merely repeated prior immunized testimony verbatim might reflect his “current, independent memory of events” and might be used in a future prosecution. *Id.* at 255 (describing petitioner’s argument). The Court thus held that “District Courts are without power to compel a civil deponent to testify over a valid assertion of his Fifth Amendment right, absent a separate grant of immunity pursuant to § 6002.” *Id.* at 257 n.13.

<sup>2</sup> The Committee lawyers enjoy no immunity for ethical misconduct and proceed in this matter at their professional peril. See D.C. Bar Ethics Opinion 31 (1977) (concluding that it is a violation of the D.C. Rules of Professional Conduct to summon a witness when “it is known in advance that no information will be obtained and the sole effect of the summons will be to pillory the witness.”).

Hon. Jason Chaffetz  
September 21, 2016  
Page 3

Mr. Pagliano is defending a critical principal of individual liberty and the constitutional right of a private citizen to resist partisan political forces masquerading as proper government functions. We earnestly hope that the Committee will further reflect on this matter, and recognize the needless expense and institutional harm that will follow from continued pursuit of the course of action that you have threatened.

Sincerely,



Mark J. MacDougall  
Stanley M. Brand  
Sean D'Arcy  
Constance D. O'Connor  
Connor Mullin  
Abigail Kohlman  
*Counsel for Bryan Pagliano*

cc: Hon. Elijah Cummings  
Ranking Member

**Akin Gump**  
STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

MARK J. MACDOUGALL  
+1 202.887.4510/fax; +1 202.887.4288  
mmacdougal@akingump.com

September 21, 2016

**VIA ELECTRONIC DELIVERY**

Hon. Jason Chaffetz  
Chairman  
The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform  
U.S. House of Representatives  
2157 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515-6143

Re: Subpoena duces tecum issued September 9, 2016 to Bryan Pagliano

Dear Chairman Chaffetz:

We are writing in response to the subpoena that you caused to be served on our client Bryan Pagliano at his place of employment on September 16, 2016, calling for production of “any immunity or proffer agreement between [Mr. Pagliano] and the U.S. Department of Justice.” We are likewise responding to your letter of September 15, 2016 (the “September 15 Letter”) as it relates to that subpoena.

As you know, this is the second time that that you have served a subpoena on Mr. Pagliano seeking production of the same “immunity or proffer agreement” with the Department of Justice (“DOJ”). In our letter to you dated September 9, 2016 – written in response to the previous service of that subpoena seeking the same documentation – we made clear to you that substantial legal restrictions preclude production of any immunity or proffer agreements to the Committee. That remains true and Mr. Pagliano will respectfully decline to produce any documentation in response to the Committee’s subpoena.

In the September 15 Letter you express bewilderment at the nature of those legal restrictions and demand production by Mr. Pagliano of his immunity documentation under direct threat of criminal contempt proceedings. While we understand that you are not a lawyer, the Committee employs numerous lawyers who we must presume are advising you in this matter. Those lawyers are well aware of the civil case pending in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia styled *Judicial Watch v. U.S. Department of State* (D.D.C.) (No. 1:13 cv-01363). We know that, because that case is specifically cited in the September 15 Letter.

What is not clear to us is why those lawyers have not apprised you of the Order entered by U.S. District Judge Emmet Sullivan, on June 14, 2016, placing Mr. Pagliano’s immunity agreement under seal. A copy of that Order can be found in the docket of the U.S. District Court


Hon. Jason Chaffetz  
September 21, 2016  
Page 2

and, so long as it remains in effect, the documents remain under seal and we are precluded from producing them to the Committee in response to your subpoena.

To the extent Mr. Pagliano may have other “documents and communications referring or relating to any immunity or proffer agreement,” such materials constitute privileged communications between attorney and client prepared in anticipation of litigation. In your September 15 Letter, you suggest that the Committee may unilaterally strip Mr. Pagliano of the attorney-client privilege and demand that he turn over to you his communications with his lawyers. We certainly hope that you do not believe that you exercise that kind of extraordinary power over private citizens. We also earnestly hope that, upon further reflection, you and the Committee’s counsel will understand that such efforts to invade the attorney-client privilege are ill-conceived and without any basis in law.

We hope that this letter answers all of your questions regarding the subpoena seeking production of documents that was served on Mr. Pagliano on September 16, 2016 and the associated questions that you asked in the September 15 Letter.

Sincerely,



Mark J. MacDougall  
Stanley M. Brand  
Sean D’Arcy  
Constance D. O’Connor  
Connor Mullin  
Abigail Kohlman  
*Counsel for Bryan Pagliano*

cc: Hon. Elijah Cummings  
Ranking Member

JASON CHAFFETZ, UTAH  
CHAIRMAN

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, MARYLAND  
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM  
2157 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6143

MARKS: (202) 225-5074  
MORFITT: (202) 225-5051  
<http://oversight.house.gov>

September 22, 2016

Mr. Mark J. MacDougall  
Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP  
1333 New Hampshire Avenue NW  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Messrs. MacDougall, Brand, D'Arcy, Mullin, and Mses. O'Connor and Kohlman:

Late yesterday, you transmitted a pair of letters regarding the refusal of your client, Bryan Pagliano, to comply with subpoenas compelling him to appear before the Committee and to produce any immunity or proffer agreement between himself and the Department of Justice. Aside from arriving just hours before your client is scheduled to testify, and being delivered to the media first, the letters share numerous commonalities with your prior correspondence in this matter.

As was the case with your first two letters on this topic (which were similarly delivered on the eve of a hearing, but with fewer signatures), and your third letter (which arrived less than one hour before the hearing started), yesterday's letters continue to (i) improperly conflate the several investigations to which Mr. Pagliano's testimony is relevant; (ii) wrongly presume that Mr. Pagliano can validly invoke the Fifth Amendment on a blanket basis as to all of the proceedings in which his testimony may be compelled, regardless of the content of the potential questions; and (iii) misrepresent House and Committee rules, practice, and procedure.

Put simply, the Committee intends to ask questions that other committees and litigants have not asked, on topics unrelated to other committees' investigations. The Committee may also question the circumstances surrounding Mr. Pagliano's grant of immunity. Accordingly, Mr. Pagliano must appear and take those questions, or face contempt proceedings.<sup>1</sup>

***Subpoena ad testificandum* issued on September 16, 2016 to Bryan Pagliano.**

Regarding the need for your client to appear and respond to the Committee's questions, you have repeatedly cited the fact that Mr. Pagliano invoked his Fifth Amendment privilege when he was called before the Select Committee on Benghazi. Setting aside the fact that Mr. Pagliano's behavior before one committee has absolutely no bearing on whether he must comply

<sup>1</sup> See *United States v. Bryan*, 339 U.S. 323 (1950); *Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives v. Miers*, 558 F.Supp.2d 53 (D.D.C. 2008).

Mr. Mark J. MacDougall  
 September 22, 2016  
 Page 2

with a subpoena from another, Mr. Pagliano's testimony to the Select Committee is not a compelling reason to excuse him from appearing, for several reasons.

*First*, the Select Committee's jurisdiction, and the scope of its investigation, is markedly different from this Committee's. The Select Committee was established for the limited purpose of investigating the events surrounding the 2012 terrorist attack in Benghazi, Libya.<sup>2</sup> This Committee, on the other hand, has broad jurisdiction, including over federal recordkeeping, data security, transparency, and ethics laws, among other things. The Committee's ongoing investigation of the implications of former Secretary Hillary Clinton's use of a private email server, a server built by Mr. Pagliano, for official State Department business is squarely within the Committee's jurisdiction as established by the Rules of the House of Representatives.<sup>3</sup> Although your letters belie this point, I suspect you know Mr. Pagliano's testimony will assist our investigation.

*Second*, your contention that "Mr. Pagliano will continue to assert his Fifth Amendment rights and will decline to answer any questions put to him by your Committee"<sup>4</sup> mistakenly presupposes that you can predict with certainty all of the Committee's questions for your client. As we have previously informed you, many of the Committee's questions will not raise a reasonable apprehension that his answer would furnish some evidence upon which he could be convicted of a criminal offense.<sup>5</sup>

For instance, Members of the Committee may ask about the dates of his employment at the State Department, whether he is currently being paid with federal funds, and who is paying his legal fees, among other questions that could not possibly form the basis of a criminal prosecution (especially considering that Attorney General Loretta Lynch announced the government's investigation of the matter is closed "and that no charges be brought against any individuals within the scope of the investigation").<sup>6</sup> Against that backdrop, it is unclear whether Mr. Pagliano can validly invoke the Fifth Amendment as to some questions, and certainly he cannot do so to all questions, as you have apparently counseled him to do. Moreover, the Committee has obtained documents and testimony that raise questions only Mr. Pagliano can answer – including the information contained in the FBI files provided to the Committee. Those materials were not previously available to other congressional committees who sought to interview Mr. Pagliano.

<sup>2</sup> On May 8, 2014, the House of Representatives adopted H. Res. 567, "Providing for the Establishment of the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi, Libya." The Select Committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study and issue a final report of its findings to the House regarding nine specific areas of inquiry, none of which are covered by the Committee's ongoing investigation to which Mr. Pagliano is a witness.

<sup>3</sup> House Rule X.

<sup>4</sup> Letter from Mark J. MacDougall *et al.* to Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, Re: *Subpoena ad testificandum* issued on September 16, 2016 to Bryan Pagliano (Sept. 21, 2016) at 1.

<sup>5</sup> *United States v. Jaffee*, 98 F. Supp. 191, 193-94 (D.D.C. 1951); *see also Simpson v. United States*, 241 F.2d 222 (9th Cir. 1957) (the Fifth Amendment privilege is inapplicable to questions seeking basic identifying information, such as the witness's name and address).

<sup>6</sup> Eric Bradner, *AG Loretta Lynch declines to press charges against Clinton*, CNN, July 6, 2016.

Mr. Mark J. MacDougall  
September 22, 2016  
Page 3

Mr. Pagliano is being treated no differently than any other witness who advises the Committee that he intends to invoke the Fifth Amendment. He has been extended every courtesy to make the process routine, as it was for two other witnesses who were invited to testify alongside Mr. Pagliano in this case. In fact, the only difference between this case and the others is your argumentative posture with respect to the Committee's investigation. Your hostility is unnecessary. In fact, you required the U.S. Marshals Service to serve a subpoena on your client simply because you were not willing to confirm that you accepted service by email. Despite your hostility, we have aimed to keep the lines of communication open. We have also extended professional courtesies where we are able to.

Furthermore, you have lodged a series of threats against the Committee staff in an apparent effort to alter the Committee's course of action through intimidation. Aside from being baseless and futile, those tactics themselves may run afoul of the Rules of Professional Conduct for the District of Columbia, wherein threatening to file a bar complaint to gain an advantage in a disputed matter is itself a violation of Rule 8.4(g).<sup>7</sup>

***Subpoena duces tecum* issued on September 9, 2016 to Bryan Pagliano.**

With respect to the subpoena that covers Mr. Pagliano's immunity or proffer agreements with the Department of Justice, you stated that your client will decline to produce those documents because of what you mischaracterized as "substantial legal restrictions."<sup>8</sup> However, the specific restriction you cited – from U.S. District Court Judge Emmet Sullivan's Order in *Judicial Watch v. U.S. Department of State* – does not apply to Mr. Pagliano's legal obligations under the subpoena issued on September 9, 2016. Judge Sullivan's Order does not purport to preclude Mr. Pagliano from giving the documents in question to Congress pursuant to a subpoena; rather, it simply means the copy of the document your client chose to file with the district court is not to be included on the publicly available court docket.

Even assuming Judge Sullivan's Order prevented you from disclosing copies of the agreement to the public (which it plainly does not), disclosure of such information to Congress is not considered to be a public disclosure. The D.C. Circuit has repeatedly held that disclosure of information to a congressional committee is not a "public disclosure."<sup>9</sup> Indeed, courts have presumed just the opposite is true – that "[o]nce documents are in congressional hands, . . . 'the committees of Congress will exercise their powers responsibly and with due regard for the rights

---

<sup>7</sup> Threats to file disciplinary charges, either against an attorney with Bar Counsel or against a non-attorney with a relevant professional board, for the sole purpose of gaining advantage in a civil matter are a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct. See D.C. Bar Ethics Opinion 220 (1991).

<sup>8</sup> Letter from Mark J. MacDougall *et al.* to Jason Chaffetz, Chairman, H. Comm. on Oversight and Gov't Reform, Re: *Subpoena duces tecum* issued on September 9, 2016 to Bryan Pagliano (Sept. 21, 2016) at 1.

<sup>9</sup> See, e.g., *F.T.C. v. Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corp.*, 626 F.2d 966, 970 (D.C. Cir. 1980) (holding that executive agency "may not deny Congress access to confidential documents, including those that contain trade secrets," because "[r]elease to a congressional requestor is not a public disclosure forbidden by section 6(f) of the [Federal Trade Commission] Act"); *Exxon Corp. v. F.T.C.*, 589 F.2d 582, 585-86 (D.C. Cir. 1978) (similar); *Ashland Oil, Inc. v. F.T.C.*, 548 F.2d 977, 979 (D.C. Cir. 1976) (per curiam) (similar).



Mr. Mark J. MacDougall  
 September 22, 2016  
 Page 4

of affected parties.”<sup>10</sup> This presumption reflects the general deference due to a coordinate branch of government, as well as the specific concern that “the judiciary must refrain from slowing or otherwise interfering with the legitimate investigatory functions of Congress.”<sup>11</sup>

Moreover, judicial sealing of orders does not override the Committee’s subpoena power and authority. The congressional power to investigate and issue subpoenas flows directly from the Constitution. As a result, a judicial order of the sort at issue here should not be construed to bar disclosure to Congress. The Supreme Court addressed this in its decision in *Eastland v. United States Servicemen’s Fund*.<sup>12</sup>

The Supreme Court held that the Speech or Debate Clause of the Constitution, art. I, § 6, cl. 1, serves as “an absolute bar to interference” with a congressional subpoena.<sup>13</sup> The Court ruled that, once it was determined the issuance of the subpoena fell within the “sphere of legitimate legislative activity,” judicial inquiry is at an end because the Speech or Debate Clause “forbid[s] invocation of judicial power to challenge the wisdom of Congress’ use of its investigative authority.”<sup>14</sup> USSF’s allegation the subpoena directed to the bank would result in a violation of its First Amendment rights without an opportunity for judicial review was therefore irrelevant because “[c]ollateral harm which may occur in the course of a legitimate legislative inquiry does not allow [courts] to force the inquiry to ‘grind to a halt.’”<sup>15</sup>

Both Judge Sullivan and the Supreme Court have made clear the “substantial legal restrictions” to which you referred in your letter are not restrictions at all in this case. Furthermore, it seems contradictory to cite the limited nature of Mr. Pagliano’s agreement with the Justice Department as one of the reasons that he cannot answer the Committee’s questions without fear of prosecution while simultaneously refusing to show it to the Committee.

<sup>10</sup> *Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corp.*, 626 F.2d at 970 (quoting *Exxon Corp.*, 589 F.2d at 589); see also, e.g., *Jaymar-Ruby, Inc. v. F.T.C.*, 496 F. Supp. 838, 845 (N.D. Ind. 1980) (“[W]hile Courts have held that as a matter of law, it cannot be presumed that private persons will honor commitments not to disclose information, Courts do presume that government officials will honor similar commitments.” (internal citation omitted)).

<sup>11</sup> *Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corp.*, 626 F.2d at 970; see also *Exxon Corp.*, 589 F.2d at 588-89.

<sup>12</sup> 421 U.S. at 494. *Eastland* involved a congressional subpoena issued to a bank for records of USSF, a servicemen’s organization. That organization brought suit for declaratory and injunctive relief to prevent the enforcement of the subpoena, alleging that the subpoena sought information protected by the First Amendment and had been “issued to the bank rather than to USSF and its members . . . in order to deprive (them) of their rights to protect their private records, such as the source of their contributions, as they would be entitled to do if the subpoenas had been issued against them directly.”

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* at 503, 505.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at 511.


<sup>15</sup> *Id.* at 509 n.16.

Mr. Mark J. MacDougall  
September 22, 2016  
Page 5

**The Committee will consider whether to hold Mr. Pagliano in contempt if he fails to appear.**

The Committee intends to immediately initiate contempt proceedings against Mr. Pagliano if he fails to appear at 10:00 a.m. As I stated before, there are several reason why he must appear, including the possibility that the Committee will immunize his testimony. Mr. Pagliano, however, must appear and make a valid Fifth Amendment assertion for the Committee to consider whether to immunize his testimony, or to proceed some other way.

Sincerely,



Jason Chaffetz  
Chairman

cc: The Honorable Elijah E. Cummings, Ranking Minority Member