U.S. Department of Justice

Federal Bureau of Investigation
Washington, D.C. 20535

November 30, 2017

MR. MICHAEL BEKESHA
MR. SEAN A. DUNAGAN
JUDICIAL WATCH, INC.
425 THIRD STREET, SW
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20024

FOIPA Request No.: 1354040-001
Subject: Meeting between Attorney General Loretta Lynch and President Bill Clinton (June 27, 2016)

Judicial Watch, Inc. v. U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Action No. 1:16-cv-02046

Dear Mr. Bekesha and Mr. Dunagan:

The enclosed documents were reviewed under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), Title 5, United States Code, Section 552. Deletions have been made to protect information which is exempt from disclosure, with the appropriate exemptions noted on the page next to the excision. The exemptions used to withhold information are marked below and explained on the enclosed Explanation of Exemptions:

Section 552		Section 552a
☐ (b)(1)	☐ (b)(7)(A)	☐ (d)(5)
☐ (b)(2)	☐ (b)(7)(B)	☐ (j)(2)
☐ (b)(3)	☑ (b)(7)(C)	☐ (k)(1)
_____	☐ (b)(7)(D)	☐ (k)(2)
_____	☐ (b)(7)(E)	☐ (k)(3)
_____	☐ (b)(7)(F)	☐ (k)(4)
☐ (b)(4)	☐ (b)(8)	☐ (k)(5)
☑ (b)(5)	☐ (b)(9)	☐ (k)(6)
☑ (b)(6)		☐ (k)(7)

29 pages were reviewed and 29 pages are being released.

☑ Deletions were made by the Department of Justice, Office of Information Policy (OIP). To appeal those denials, please write directly to that agency at the following address.

Office of Information Policy
U.S. Department of Justice
Suite 11050
1425 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

☐ In accordance with standard FBI practice and pursuant to FOIA exemption (b)(7)(E) and Privacy Act exemption (j)(2) [5 U.S.C. § 552/552a (b)(7)(E)/(j)(2)], this response neither confirms nor denies the existence of your subject's name on any watch lists.

For your information, Congress excluded three discrete categories of law enforcement and national security records from the requirements of the FOIA. See 5 U.S. C. § 552(c) (2006 & Supp. IV (2010). This response is limited to those records that are subject to the requirements of the FOIA. This is a standard notification that is given to all our requesters and should not be taken as an indication that excluded records do, or do not, exist. Enclosed for your information is a copy of the Explanation of Exemptions.

Although your request is in litigation, we are required by 5 USC § 552 (a)(6)(A) to provide you the following information concerning your right to appeal. You may file an appeal by writing to the Director, Office of Information Policy (OIP), United States Department of Justice, Suite 11050, 1425 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20530-0001, or you may submit an appeal through OIP's FOIAonline portal by creating an account on the following web site: https://foiaonline.regulations.gov/foia/action/public/home. Your appeal must be postmarked or electronically transmitted within ninety (90) days from the date of this letter in order to be considered timely. If you submit your appeal by mail, both the letter and the envelope should be clearly marked "Freedom of Information Act Appeal." Please cite the FOIPA Request Number assigned to your request so that it may be easily identified.

☐ The enclosed material is from the main investigative file(s) in which the subject(s) of your request was the focus of the investigation. Our search located additional references, in files relating to other individuals, or matters, which may or may not be about your subject(s). Our experience has shown when ident, references usually contain information similar to the information processed in the main file(s). Because of our significant backlog, we have given priority to processing only the main investigative file(s). If you want the references, you must submit a separate request for them in writing, and they will be reviewed at a later date, as time and resources permit.

☑ See additional information which follows.

Sincerely,

David M. Hardy
Section Chief
Record/Information
Dissemination Section
Records Management Division

Enclosure(s)

The enclosed documents represent the final release of information responsive to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request.

This material is being provided to you at no charge. Accordingly, it is unnecessary to adjudicate your request for a fee waiver as no fees are being assessed.

EXPLANATION OF EXEMPTIONS

SUBSECTIONS OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 552

(b)(1) (A) specifically authorized under criteria established by an Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or foreign policy and (B) are in fact properly classified to such Executive order;

(b)(2) related solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of an agency;

(b)(3) specifically exempted from disclosure by statute (other than section 552b of this title), provided that such statute (A) requires that the matters be withheld from the public in such a manner as to leave no discretion on issue, or (B) establishes particular criteria for withholding or refers to particular types of matters to be withheld;

(b)(4) trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential;

(b)(5) inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency;

(b)(6) personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy;

(b)(7) records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes, but only to the extent that the production of such law enforcement records or information (A) could reasonably be expected to interfere with enforcement proceedings, (B) would deprive a person of a right to a fair trial or an impartial adjudication, (C) could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, (D) could reasonably be expected to disclose the identity of confidential source, including a State, local, or foreign agency or authority or any private institution which furnished information on a confidential basis, and, in the case of record or information compiled by a criminal law enforcement authority in the course of a criminal investigation, or by an agency conducting a lawful national security intelligence investigation, information furnished by a confidential source, (E) would disclose techniques and procedures for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions, or would disclose guidelines for law enforcement investigations or prosecutions if such disclosure could reasonably be expected to risk circumvention of the law, or (F) could reasonably be expected to endanger the life or physical safety of any individual;

(b)(8) contained in or related to examination, operating, or condition reports prepared by, on behalf of, or for the use of an agency responsible for the regulation or supervision of financial institutions; or

(b)(9) geological and geophysical information and data, including maps, concerning wells.

SUBSECTIONS OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 552a

(d)(5) information compiled in reasonable anticipation of a civil action proceeding;

(j)(2) material reporting investigative efforts pertaining to the enforcement of criminal law including efforts to prevent, control, or reduce crime or apprehend criminals;

(k)(1) information which is currently and properly classified pursuant to an Executive order in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy, for example, information involving intelligence sources or methods;

(k)(2) investigatory material compiled for law enforcement purposes, other than criminal, which did not result in loss of a right, benefit or privilege under Federal programs, or which would identify a source who furnished information pursuant to a promise that his/her identity would be held in confidence;

(k)(3) material maintained in connection with providing protective services to the President of the United States or any other individual pursuant to the authority of Title 18, United States Code, Section 3056;

(k)(4) required by statute to be maintained and used solely as statistical records;

(k)(5) investigatory material compiled solely for the purpose of determining suitability, eligibility, or qualifications for Federal civilian employment or for access to classified information, the disclosure of which would reveal the identity of the person who furnished information pursuant to a promise that his/her identity would be held in confidence;

(k)(6) testing or examination material used to determine individual qualifications for appointment or promotion in Federal Government service he release of which would compromise the testing or examination process;

(k)(7) material used to determine potential for promotion in the armed services, the disclosure of which would reveal the identity of the person who furnished the material pursuant to a promise that his/her identity would be held in confidence.

FBI/DOJ

Bowdich, David L. (DO) (FBI)

From: Bowdich, David L. (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2016 4:07 PM
To: James B. Comey
Subject: RE: FYI only

Got it, thanks sir.

Dave

From: James B. Comey
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2016 4:04 PM
To: Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI) [redacted] Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI) [redacted] Mccabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI) [redacted] Bowdich, David L. (DO) (FBI) [redacted] b6 -1
Subject: FYI only

--

http://nation.foxnews.com/2016/06/29/why-did-bill-clinton-and-loretta-lynch-meet-her-airplane-phoenix-week

Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI)

From:	Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI)
Sent:	Wednesday, June 29, 2016 4:42 PM
To:	Mccabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI); Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI); Bowdich, David L. (DO) (FBI)
Cc:	James B. Comey
Subject:	From DOJ....

From: Newman, Melanie (OPA) [mailto:Melanie.Newman@usdoj.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2016 4:39 PM
To: Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI) [redacted] Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI) b6 -1
[redacted]
Cc: Lewis, Kevin S. (OPA) (JMD) <Kevin.S.Lewis@usdoj.gov>
Subject: FLAG

I want to flag a story that is gaining some traction tonight. Daily Caller, The Hill and FOX News have picked up a local Phoenix news report about a casual, unscheduled meeting between former president Bill Clinton and the AG. It happened on Monday night. Our talkers on this are below, along with the transcript from the AG's Phoenix presser, where she was asked about this. Happy to discuss further by phone. Please let me know if you get any questions about this. Thanks.

TRANSCRIPT

REPORTER: Sources say that you met last night with former president Bill Clinton. Did the topic of Benghazi come up at all, or can you tell us what was discussed?

ATTORNEY GENERAL LYNCH: No. Actually, while I was landing at the airport, I did see President Clinton at the Phoenix airport as I was leaving, and he spoke to myself and my husband on the plane. Our conversation was a great deal about his grandchildren. It was primary social and about our travels. He mentioned the golf he played in Phoenix, and he mentioned travels he'd had in West Virginia. We talked about former Attorney General Janet Reno, for example, whom we both know, but there was no discussion of any matter pending before the department or any matter pending before any other body. There was no discussion of Benghazi, no discussion of the state department emails, by way of example. I would say the current news of the day was the Brexit decision, and what that might mean. And again, the department's not involved in that or implicated in that.

b5 per OIP

[redacted]

b5 per OIP

[redacted]

Melanie R. Newman
Director, Office of Public Affairs
U.S. Department of Justice
Direct: 202-305-1920
Cell: [redacted] b6 per OIP
@MelanieDOJ

Mccabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI)

From:	Mccabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI)
Sent:	Friday, July 01, 2016 6:10 AM
To:	James B. Comey; Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI); Bowdich, David L. (DO) (FBI)
Subject:	Fwd: Lynch to Remove Herself From Decision Over Clinton Emails, Official Says - NYTimes.com
Importance:	High

Fyi

Andrew G. McCabe
Deputy Director
Federal Bureau of Investigation
[redacted] b6 -1

------ Original message ------
From: "Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/01/2016 5:53 AM (GMT-05:00) b6 -1
To: "Steinbach, Michael B. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted] "Mccabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Fwd: Lynch to Remove Herself From Decision Over Clinton Emails, Official Says - NYTimes.com

------ Original message ------
From: "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/01/2016 5:36 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [redacted] "Mains, Richard A. (RO) (FBI)" [redacted] b6 -1
Subject: Fwd: Lynch to Remove Herself From Decision Over Clinton Emails, Official Says - NYTimes.com

http://mobile.nytimes.com/2016/07/02/us/politics/loretta-lynch-hillary-clinton-email-server.html?_r=0&referer=https://www.google.com/

Lynch to Remove Herself From Decision Over Clinton Emails, Official Says

Attorney General Loretta E. Lynch plans to announce on Friday that she will accept whatever recommendation career prosecutors and the F.B.I. director make about whether to bring charges related to Hillary Clinton's personal email server, a Justice Department official said. Her decision removes the possibility that a political appointee will overrule investigators in the case.

The Justice Department had been moving toward such an arrangement for months — officials said in April that it was being considered — but a private meeting between Ms. Lynch and former President Bill Clinton this week set off a political furor and made the decision all but inevitable.

Republicans said the meeting, which took place at the Phoenix airport, had compromised the independence of the investigation as the F.B.I. was winding it down. Some called for Ms. Lynch to recuse herself, but she did not take herself off the case — one that could influence a presidential election.

Ms. Lynch plans to discuss the matter at a conference in Aspen, Colo., on Friday. The Justice Department declined to comment. The official who confirmed the discussion did so on the condition of anonymity because the internal decision-making process is normally kept confidential.

The F.B.I. is investigating whether Mrs. Clinton, her aides or anyone else broke the law by setting up a private email server for her to use as secretary of state. Internal investigators have concluded that the server was used to send classified information, and Republicans have seized on the matter to question Mrs. Clinton's judgment.

For the Justice Department, the central question is whether the conduct met the legal standard for the crime of mishandling classified information.

Ms. Lynch said that the meeting with Mr. Clinton was unplanned, largely social and did not touch on the email investigation. She suggested that he walked uninvited from his plane to her government plane, both of which were parked on a tarmac at Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport.

"He did come over and say hello, and speak to my husband and myself, and talk about his grandchildren and his travels and things like that," Ms. Lynch said at a news conference in Los Angeles on Wednesday, where she was promoting community policing. "That was the extent of that. And no discussions were held into any cases or things like that."

That did not mollify Republican lawmakers, who said the meeting raised questions about the integrity of the government's investigation.

"In light of the apparent conflicts of interest, I have called repeatedly on Attorney General Lynch to appoint a special counsel to ensure the investigation is as far from politics as possible," Senator John Cornyn, Republican of Texas and a member of the Judiciary Committee, said in a statement on Thursday.

The meeting created an awkward situation for Ms. Lynch, a veteran prosecutor who was nominated from outside Washington's normal political circles. In her confirmation, her allies repeatedly sought to

contrast her with her predecessor, Eric H. Holder Jr., an outspoken liberal voice in the administration who clashed frequently with Republicans who accused him of politicizing the office.

Ms. Lynch has said she wants to handle the Clinton investigation

Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI)

From:	Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI)
Sent:	Friday, July 01, 2016 5:11 PM
To:	Mccabe, Andrew G. (DO) (FBI); Bowdich, David L. (DO) (FBI); Rybicki, James E. (DO) (FBI); Kelly, Stephen D. (DO) (FBI); Steinbach, Michael B. (DO) (FBI); Priestap, E W. (CD) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Cc:	James B. Comey
Subject:	AG transcript, Aspen Ideas festival, Fri 1 July

b6 -1

JONATHAN CAPEHART: Thank you all for being here this morning.

Attorney General, thank you very much for being here.

ATTORNEY GENERAL LORETTA LYNCH: Thank you for having me.

CAPEHART: So as Walter said, you have a reputation of having the highest integrity, utmost solid judgment. So when people heard what went down in Phoenix, a lot of people were like -- I mean, friends, supporters, backers were saying, what on Earth was she thinking talking to Bill Clinton?

So what on Earth were you thinking?

(LAUGHTER)

What happened?

LYNCH: Well, I think that's the question of the day, isn't it?

CAPEHART: Yes.

LYNCH: And I think that's a perfectly reasonable question. I think that's the question that is called, you know, by what happened in Phoenix because people have also wondered and raised questions about my role in the ultimate resolution of matters involving the investigation into the State Department e-mails.

And to the extent that people have questions about that, about my role in that, certainly my meeting with him raises questions and concerns. And so believe me, I completely yet that question. And I think it is the question of the day.

But I think the issue is, again, what is my role in how that matter is going to be resolved? And so let me be clear on how that is going to be resolved. I've gotten that question a lot also over time and we usually don't go into those deliberations, but I do think it's important that people see what that process is like.

As I have always indicated, the matter is being handled by career agents and investigators with the Department of Justice. They've had it since the beginning. They are independent...

CAPEHART: Which predates your tenure as attorney general.

LYNCH: It predates my tenure as attorney general. It is the same team and they are acting

independently. They follow the law, they follow the facts. That team will make findings. That is to say they will come up with a chronology of what happened, the factual scenario.

They will make recommendations as to how to resolve what those facts lead to. Those -- the recommendations will be reviewed by career supervisors in the Department of Justice and in the FBI and by the FBI director. And then, as is the common process, they present it to me and I fully expect to accept their recommendations.

CAPEHART: Now, what's interesting here is you say you fully expect to accept the recommendations. One thing people were saying this morning when the news -- when the news broke was that you were, quote, "recusing yourself" from having any kind of role in the final determination. Is that the case? Is that what you're saying?

LYNCH: Well, a recusal would mean that I wouldn't even be briefed on what the findings were or what the actions going forward would be. And while I don't have a role in those findings and coming up with those findings or making those recommendations as to how to go forward, I'll be briefed on it and I will be accepting their recommendations.

CAPEHART: And when you say -- again, this must be the journalist in me and linguist in me -- accepting to me means here, Madam Attorney General, here are our findings, and you completely accept them wholeheartedly and then issue them to the public, or you accept them, look them over and then make your own determination as to what the final determinations will be?

LYNCH: No. The final determination as to how to proceed will be contained within the recommendations in the report in whatever format the team puts it together, that has not been resolved, whatever report they provide to me. There will be a review of their investigation, there will be a review of what they have found and determined to have happened and occurred, and there'll (ph) be their determinations as to how they feel that the case should proceed.

CAPEHART: And when you say there will be a review, this -- you mean the review will be done by you once you accept the recommendations and determinations...

(LAUGHTER)

LYNCH: No, I understand.

CAPEHART: ... or you're talking about the process of the review...

LYNCH: I'm talking about the initial...

CAPEHART: ... getting to that point?

LYNCH: ... process...

CAPEHART: Got it.

LYNCH: ... of how this case will be resolved. This case will be resolved by the team that's been working on it from the beginning. Supervisors always review matters. In this case, that review will be career people in the Department of Justice, and also the FBI will review it, up to and including the FBI director, and that will be the finalization of not just the factual findings, but the next steps in this matter.

CAPEHART: And I find it interesting, several times now you have made a point of saying career prosecutors, career officials within the Justice Department. Why -- why are you making that very hard distinction, that description?

LYNCH: I think a lot of the questions that I've gotten over the -- over the past several months, frankly,

about my role in this investigation and what it would likely be was a question or concern about whether someone who was a political appointee would be involved in deciding how to investigate a matter or what something meant or how should the case proceed going forward.

As I have always said, this matter would be handled by the career people who are independent. They live from administration to administration. Their role is to follow the facts and follow the law and make a determination as to what happened and what those next steps should be.

But you know, in my role as attorney general, there are cases that come up to me. I am informed of them from time to time. This case, as you know, has generated a lot of attention. I'll be informed of those findings as opposed to never reading them or never seeing them. But I will be accepting their recommendations and their plan for going forward.

CAPEHART: So The New York Times reported this morning that the Justice Department -- Justice Department officials said back in April that what you're talking about right now was already being considered. And so the question is, before President Clinton boarded your plane in Arizona, had you already made the determination that what you're announcing today was indeed what you were going to do?

LYNCH: Yes, I had already determined that that would be the process. And in large part, it's because, as you -- as I'm sure you know, as a journalist, I do get this question a lot. And as I've set on occasions as to why we don't talk about ongoing investigations in terms of what's being discussed and who's being interviewed, is to preserve the integrity of that investigation. We also typically don't talk about the process by which we make decisions, and I have provided that response too.

But in this situation, you know, because I did have that meeting, it has raised concerns, I feel, and I feel that while I can certainly say this matter's going to be handled like any other, as it has always been, it's going to be resolved like any other, as it was always going to be. I think people need the information about exactly how that resolution will come about in order to know what that means and really accept that and have faith in the ultimate decision of the Department of Justice.

CAPEHART: So back to my first question, the what were you thinking question.

(LAUGHTER)

But let me put a different spin on it and ask, when you're -- you're on your plane -- from what I have been -- been in Washington a while and knowing how the protocol works, you land, folks get off, you get off, for all sorts of reasons but it's very fast. You're on your plane, and in walks the former president of the United States. What were you thinking at that moment?

(LAUGHTER)

LYNCH: Well, as I've said, you know, he said hello and we basically said hello, and I congratulated him on his grandchildren, as people tend to do. And that led to a conversation about those grandchildren, who do sound great.

(LAUGHTER)

And that led to a conversation about his travels, and he told me what he had been doing in Phoenix and various things. And then we spoke about, you know, former Attorney General Janet Reno. But it really was a social meeting, and it was -- it was -- it really was in that regard.

He spoke to me, spoke to my husband for some time on the plane, and then we moved on. As I have said before, though, I do think that no matter how I viewed it, understand how people view it. And I think because of that, and because of the fact that it has now cast a shadow over how this case may perceived, no matter how it's resolved, it is important to talk about how it will be resolved.

It's important to make it clear that that meeting with President Clinton does not have a bearing on how this matter will be reviewed, resolved and accepted by me. Because that is the question that it raises.

So, again, no matter how I viewed it -- how I viewed the meeting, I think what is important to me is, how do people viewed the Department of Justice because of that meeting? How do people view the team that is working on this case and has from the beginning, because of that meeting? How do people viewed the work that we do every day on behalf of the American people, which we strive to do with integrity and independence?

So, that is the question for me, and that is why I felt it was important to talk about what impact that meeting would have on the case, which it won't, but in order to explain that, we have to talk about how it will be resolved.

CAPEHART: Now, you've known president Clinton for a long time. He is the one who nominated you and appointed you to U.S. attorney for the Eastern District in 1999. So, I am wondering, do you have -- so, you have -- you have a relationship, is what I am trying to get at in terms of just long -- long-standing professional relationship.

So, you would be well within your right to say, get off my plane. What are you doing here?

(LAUGHTER)

Do you -- do you -- do you regret not telling the former president of the United States to leave the premises?

LYNCH: So, well, as I've said, you know, just -- I may have viewed it in a certain light, but the issue is how does it impact the work that I do and work that the Department of Justice does. And I -- I certainly would not do it again.

(LAUGHTER)

And -- you know, because it has cast a shadow over it should not, over what it will not touch. And that is why, as I've said, I think it is important to talk about how this matter will be resolved, and how the review and how the determinations and decisions will be made. You know, I can say, as I have said, it's going to be handled by career people, and then we can make announcement as to what it is, but unless people have insight into the process, you know, it's -- they're not going to be able to evaluate that.

And the most important thing for me, as the attorney general, is the integrity of this Department of Justice. And the fact that the meeting that I had is now casting a shadow over how people are going to view that work, is something that I take seriously, and deeply and painfully.

And so, I think it's important to provide as much information as we can, so that people can have a full view of how we do our work, and why we do our work, and how this -- how this case is going to be resolved, as well as how all the cases that we look at are going to be resolved.

CAPEHART: And so, of course, what has happened as a result of this are people out there in the world who are saying, see, this is an example of the system that is rigged against the rest of us.

And you just said that -- that this whole incident has been painful, is one of the -- one of the words -- one of the words you used. What would you say to the American people who might -- who believe that yes, indeed, this is an example of Washington rigged against them?

LYNCH: You know, I think that people have a whole host of reasons to have questions about how we in government do our business, and how we handle business and how we handle matters.

And I think that, again, I understand that my meeting on the plane with former President Clinton could give them another reason to have questions and concerns also. And that is something that -- and that's where I thought -- that's why I said it's painful to me, because the integrity of the Department of Justice is important.

And what I would say to people is to look at the world that we do; look at the matters that we work on every day, whether they involve a high profile matter or a matter where you've never heard of the person.

Look at the victims that we deal with every day. Look at the people that we protect every day, because that's our mission. And to the extent that this issue has overshadowed that mission, yes, that's painful to me.

And so, I think it's important that we provide as much information as we can, so people can have faith and confidence in the work of the department and the work of the people who carry on this work every day.

CAPEHART: And last question on this. So, when might we expect your acceptance of these findings and determination?

(LAUGHTER)

Are we looking at weeks, months, days?

LYNCH: Well -- so, in terms of timing, I actually don't know that, because again, I don't have that insight into -- into this, I'd say the nuts and bolts of the investigation at this point in time.

They're working on it; they're working on it very hard. They're working on it to make sure that they're as thorough as they can be, that they've covered every angle, that they've looked at every issue. They're doing the work that the people in the Department of Justice do every single day.

And I could not be more proud of that work. And I could not be more proud to present that work to the American people, when this matter is resolved. And we can let people know the conclusions of this investigation.

CAPEHART: Moving on...
(end of relevant comments)

Franklin, Shirlethia (OAG)

From: Franklin, Shirlethia (OAG)
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2016 1:22 PM
To: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI); [redacted] (SECD) (FBI); [redacted] (LV) (FBI) b6 -1 b7C -1
Subject: Fwd: Bill Clinton meeting?

FYI - stepping out to deal with this.

Shirlethia

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Lewis, Kevin S. (OPA)" <kslewis@jmd.usdoj.gov<mailto:kslewis@jmd.usdoj.gov>>
Date: June 28, 2016 at 10:18:08 AM MST
To: "Pokorny, Carolyn (OAG)" <cpokorny@jmd.usdoj.gov<mailto:cpokorny@jmd.usdoj.gov>>
Cc: "Newman, Melanie (OPA)" <mnewman@jmd.usdoj.gov<mailto:mnewman@jmd.usdoj.gov>>, "Axelrod, Matthew (ODAG)" <maaxelrod@jmd.usdoj.gov<mailto:maaxelrod@jmd.usdoj.gov>>, "Franklin, Shirlethia (OAG)" <shfranklin@jmd.usdoj.gov<mailto:shfranklin@jmd.usdoj.gov>>, "Amuluru, Uma (OAG)" <uamuluru@jmd.usdoj.gov<mailto:uamuluru@jmd.usdoj.gov>>
Subject: Re: Bill Clinton meeting?

+ SF and Uma

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 28, 2016, at 10:15 AM, Pokorny, Carolyn (OAG) <cpokorny@jmd.usdoj.gov<mailto:cpokorny@jmd.usdoj.gov>> wrote:

+Matt.
I'm free.
I will get a conference call line.

Carolyn Pokorny
Office of the Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
Email: carolyn.pokorny@usdoj.gov<mailto:carolyn.pokorny@usdoj.gov> Office: (202) 616-2372 Cell: [redacted] b6 per OIP

From: Newman, Melanie (OPA)
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2016 1:15 PM
To: Pokorny, Carolyn (OAG); Lewis, Kevin S. (OPA)
Subject: Fwd: Bill Clinton meeting?

We need to talk. I'm on call [redacted] b6 per OIP

We need to talk. I'm on cell [redacted] b6 per OIP

Begin forwarded message:
From: "Levine, Mike" [redacted] b6 per OIP
Date: June 28, 2016 at 1:14:13 PM EDT
To: Melanie Newman <Melanie.Newman@usdoj.gov<mailto:Melanie.Newman@usdoj.gov>>, Kevin Lewis <Kevin.S.Lewis@usdoj.gov<mailto:Kevin.S.Lewis@usdoj.gov>>
Subject: Bill Clinton meeting?
Hey guys, wanted to address something ASAP... Apparently our affiliate in Phoenix is hearing that the AG met with Bill Clinton on a plane last night for close to an hour. They seem to think it's somehow connected to the Benghazi report released today (I'm not sure what the connection would be). But hoping I can provide them some guidance ASAP. Thanks

--Mike

[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)

From: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)
Sent: Saturday, July 02, 2016 2:28 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: Re: EXCLUSIVE: Security Source Details Bill Clinton Maneuver to Meet Loretta Lynch – Observer

b6 -1,2
b7C -1,2

Thank you Sir, I appreciate that.

----- Original Message -----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, July 02, 2016 02:19 PM
To: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)
Subject: Re: EXCLUSIVE: Security Source Details Bill Clinton Maneuver to Meet Loretta Lynch - Observer

b6 -1,2
b7C -1,2

[redacted]

Thank you for the response. I'd like to think I learned a little about security, watching the high level of professionalism of your team.

[redacted]

> On Jul 2, 2016, at 1:47 PM, [redacted] (SECD) (FBI) [redacted] wrote:
>
> Sir,
>
> Thank you for the article.
>
> I agree with your assessment about the source, which in reading the article, I believe was one of the local PD officer assisting with one of the two motorcade there on the Tarmac. Either way, they should have never offered any type of opinion or details of what did or didn't happen, as this is the most principle and basic tenant of executive protection.
>
> Unfortunately, this article is a breach in security protocol and I am addressing it with the Phoenix division to make certain that they pursuit this and identify the source of the breach.
>
> The fortunate piece of this article is that the majority of the tactics and logistics that the article mentions are textbook procedures and industry standard for most executive protection details.
>
> Let me know if have any other questions or concerns.
>
> Thank you,
>
> [redacted]
>

b6 -1,2
b7C -1,2

b6 -1
b7C -1

>
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: [redacted]
> Sent: Saturday, July 02, 2016 12:09 PM
> To: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)
> Subject: EXCLUSIVE: Security Source Details Bill Clinton Maneuver to Meet Loretta Lynch - Observer
>
>
> https://www.google.com/amp/observer.com/2016/07/exclusive-security-source-details-bill-clinton-maneuver-to-meet-loretta-lynch/amp/?client=safari#
>
> Good morning, sir
>
> I've attached a news article that I thought you might be interested in. The so called "informant" talks about what happened on the tarmac at the airport, which sounds somewhat accurate. But, what I found most disturbing was the mentioning of security procedures by FBI and/or Secret Service.
> Hey, I'm just a layman, but this person sounds like a security threat to me. Please read the article (if you haven't already) because I'd love to get your opinion on this. Feel free to call me on my cell, if that's easier than emailing.
>
> Thanks,
> [redacted]

b6 -1,2
b7C -1,2

b6 -2
b7C -2

[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)

b6 -1
b7C -1

From: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)

Sent: Sunday, July 03, 2016 2:06 PM

To: [redacted] (LV) (FBI); [redacted] (SECD) (FBI); [redacted] (SECD) (FBI); [redacted] (SECD) (FBI); [redacted] (SECD) (FBI); [redacted] (NY) (FBI); [redacted] (SECD) (FBI); [redacted] (NY) (FBI); [redacted] (HO) (FBI); [redacted] (HO) (FBI); [redacted] (SECD (FBI); [redacted] (SECD) (FBI); [redacted] (CG) (FBI); [redacted] (SECD) (FBI); [redacted] (SECD) (FBI); [redacted] (SECD) (FBI); [redacted] (WF) (FBI); [redacted] (SECD) (FBI); [redacted] (SECD (FBI); [redacted] (SECD) (FBI); [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)

b6 -1
b7C -1

Cc: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)

Subject: Must Read Security Article

All,

Please read the attached article, regarding the AG's meeting with Clinton. I believe that the source quoted in this article is one of the local Phoenix LEO's. Needless to say that I have contacted the Phoenix office and will contact the local's who assisted in an attempt to stem any further damage. This is exactly why our Discretion and Judgement are the foundation of the AG's trust in our team, which is why we can never violate that trust, like the source did in this article.

http://observer.com/2016/07/exclusive-security-source-details-bill-clinton-maneuver-to-meet-loretta-lynch/

Thank you,

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

[redacted](SECD) (FBI)

From: [redacted](SECD) (FBI) b6 -1 b7C -1
Sent: Sunday, July 03, 2016 2:18 PM
To: [redacted](SECD) (FBI)
Subject: Re: Must Read Security Article

Absolutely!

From: [redacted](SECD) (FBI)
Sent: Sunday, July 03, 2016 02:16 PM
To: [redacted](SECD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Must Read Security Article b6 -1 b7C -1

This article is infuriating

------- Original message -------
From: [redacted](SECD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/03/2016 2:05 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted](LV) (FBI)" [redacted](SECD) (FBI)" [redacted](SECD) (FBI)" [redacted](SECD) (FBI)" [redacted](SECD) (FBI)" [redacted](NY) (FBI)" [redacted](SECD) (FBI)" [redacted](NY) (FBI)" [redacted](HO) (FBI)" [redacted](HO) (FBI)" [redacted](SECD (FBI)" [redacted](SECD) (FBI)" [redacted](CG) (FBI)" [redacted](SECD) (FBI)" [redacted](SECD) (FBI)" [redacted](SECD) (FBI)" [redacted](WF) (FBI)" [redacted](SECD) (FBI)" [redacted](SECD (FBI)" [redacted](SECD) (FBI)" [redacted](SECD) (FBI)" [redacted] b6 -1 b7C -1 b6 -1 b7C -1
Cc: [redacted](SECD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Must Read Security Article

All,

Please read the attached article, regarding the AG's meeting with Clinton. I believe that the source quoted in this article is one of the local Phoenix LEO's. Needless to say that I have contacted the Phoenix office and will contact the local's who assisted in an attempt to stem any further damage. This is exactly why our Discretion and Judgement are the foundation of the AG's trust in our team, which is why we can never violate that trust, like the source did in this article.

http://observer.com/2016/07/exclusive-security-source-details-bill-clinton-maneuver-to-meet-loretta-lynch/

Thank you,

[redacted] b6 -1 b7C -1

[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)

From: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI) b6 -1 b7C -1
Sent: Sunday, July 03, 2016 2:53 PM
To: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)
Subject: Re: Must Read Security Article

That might not be a bad idea, given the circumstances.

From: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)
Sent: Sunday, July 03, 2016 02:45 PM b6 -1 b7C -1
To: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Must Read Security Article

You think there will be a need for non-disclosure agreements in the future?

SA [redacted]
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Attorney General's Protection Detail b6 -1 b7C -1
[redacted] (cell)
[redacted] (office)

---------- Original message ----------
From: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/03/2016 2:05 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (LV) (FBI)" [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" [redacted]
[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (NY) (FBI)" b6 -1 b7C -1
[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (NY) (FBI)"
[redacted] (HO) (FBI)" [redacted]
(HO) (FBI)" [redacted] (SECD (FBI)"
[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" [redacted]
[redacted] (CG) (FBI)" [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (WF) (FBI)" [redacted]
(SECD) (FBI)" [redacted] (SECD (FBI)"
[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" b6 -1 b7C -1
[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Must Read Security Article

All,

Please read the attached article, regarding the AG's meeting with Clinton. I believe that the source quoted in this article is one of the local Phoenix LEO's. Needless to say that I have contacted the Phoenix office and will contact the local's who

assisted in an attempt to stem any further damage. This is exactly why our Discretion and Judgement are the foundation of the AG's trust in our team, which is why we can never violate that trust, like the source did in this article.

http://observer.com/2016/07/exclusive-security-source-details-bill-clinton-maneuver-to-meet-loretta-lynch/

Thank you,

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)

From: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)
Sent: Sunday, July 03, 2016 5:18 PM
To: [redacted] (CG) (FBI)
Subject: Re: Must Read Security Article

b6 -1
b7C -1

No I think it was one the PX PD officers helping both motorcades.

From: [redacted] (CG) (FBI)
Sent: Sunday, July 03, 2016 05:12 PM
To: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Must Read Security Article

b6 -1
b7C -1

Do you think it was a swat guy?

--

-------- Original message --------
From: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/03/2016 5:12 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (CG) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Re: Must Read Security Article

b6 -1
b7C -1

I'm trying to find out thru the PX STL. Hopefully, we will find out and at the very minimum, make sure he never works on any detail.

From: [redacted] (CG) (FBI)
Sent: Sunday, July 03, 2016 05:09 PM
To: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Must Read Security Article

b6 -1
b7C -1

We need to find that guy and bring him or her before a supervisor and opr

--

-------- Original message --------
From: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/03/2016 2:05 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (LV) (FBI)" [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" [redacted] (NY) (FBI)"

b6 -1
b7C -1

[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" b6 -1
[redacted] (NY) (FBI)" b7C -1
[redacted] (HO) (FBI)" [redacted]
(HO) (FBI)" [redacted] (SECD (FBI)"
[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" [redacted]
[redacted] (CG) (FBI)" [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (WF) (FBI)" [redacted]
(SECD) (FBI)" [redacted] (SECD (FBI)"
[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)"
[redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" [redacted] b6 -1
b7C -1
Cc: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" [redacted]
Subject: Must Read Security Article

All,

Please read the attached article, regarding the AG's meeting with Clinton. I believe that the source quoted in this article is one of the local Phoenix LEO's. Needless to say that I have contacted the Phoenix office and will contact the local's who assisted in an attempt to stem any further damage. This is exactly why our Discretion and Judgement are the foundation of the AG's trust in our team, which is why we can never violate that trust, like the source did in this article.

http://observer.com/2016/07/exclusive-security-source-details-bill-clinton-maneuver-to-meet-loretta-lynch/

Thank you,

[redacted] b6 -1
b7C -1

NPO

From: NPO
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2016 2:38 PM
To: Press (JMD)
Cc: Carr, Peter (OPA) (JMD)
Subject: FW: security details coordinate between Loretta Lynch/Bill Clinton?

Susan McKee
Unit Chief
National Press Office
FBI Office of Public Affairs

[redacted] office
mobile

b6 -1

From: Zapotosky, Matt [mailto:matt.zapotosky@washpost.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2016 12:44 PM
To: NPO
Subject: security details coordinate between Loretta Lynch/Bill Clinton?

Hi—

Weird question, but I'm trying to confirm that the reason former president Bill Clinton knew Attorney General Loretta Lynch was at an airport in Phoenix this week is that the agents working their respective security details (FBI in the case of the Attorney General) were coordinating during the time they were both on the tarmac. Is anyone able to shed light on that question of how the former president knew the Attorney General had just landed and how a meeting between the two of them happened?

Many thanks,

Matt Zapotosky | The Washington Post
[redacted] (cell)
(202) 334-5873 (office)

b6 -2

Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI)

From:	Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI)
Sent:	Wednesday, June 29, 2016 4:55 PM
To:	Newman, Melanie (OPA) (JMD); Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI)
Cc:	Lewis, Kevin S. (OPA) (JMD)
Subject:	RE: FLAG

Copy/thanks Melanie.

Richard P. Quinn
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Media/Investigative Publicity
[redacted]o)
[redacted]m)

b6 -1

-------- Original message --------
From: "Newman, Melanie (OPA)" <Melanie.Newman@usdoj.gov>
Date: 06/29/2016 4:39 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted] "Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]

b6 -1

Cc: "Lewis, Kevin S. (OPA) (JMD)" <Kevin.S.Lewis@usdoj.gov>
Subject: FLAG

I want to flag a story that is gaining some traction tonight. Daily Caller, The Hill and FOX News have picked up a local Phoenix news report about a casual, unscheduled meeting between former president Bill Clinton and the AG. It happened on Monday night. Our talkers on this are below, along with the transcript from the AG's Phoenix presser, where she was asked about this. Happy to discuss further by phone. Please let me know if you get any questions about this. Thanks.

TRANSCRIPT

REPORTER: Sources say that you met last night with former president Bill Clinton. Did the topic of Benghazi come up at all, or can you tell us what was discussed?

ATTORNEY GENERAL LYNCH: No. Actually, while I was landing at the airport, I did see President Clinton at the Phoenix airport as I was leaving, and he spoke to myself and my husband on the plane. Our conversation was a great deal about his grandchildren. It was primary social and about our travels. He mentioned the golf he played in Phoenix, and he mentioned travels he'd had in West Virginia. We talked about former Attorney General Janet Reno, for example, whom we both know, but there was no discussion of any matter pending before the department or any matter pending before any other body. There was no discussion of Benghazi, no discussion of the state department emails, by way of example. I would say the current news of the day was the Brexit decision, and what that might mean. And again, the department's not involved in that or implicated in that.

b5 per OIP

[redacted]

b5 per OIP

[redacted]

Melanie R. Newman
Director, Office of Public Affairs
U.S. Department of Justice
Direct: 202-305-1920
Cell: [redacted] b6 per OIP
@MelanieDOJ

[redacted] (DO) (FBI)

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI) b6 -1
Sent: Friday, July 01, 2016 12:27 PM
To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI); OPA-NPO
Subject: RE: FBI agents-no photos story

Was it perhaps her security detail? They are FBI agents..

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 01, 2016 12:24 PM b6 -1
To: Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI); OPA-NPO
Subject: FBI agents-no photos story

FYSA,
ABC's Jack Date called to ask about this claim and we hadn't heard about it prior to his call. He's going to call DOJ to ask.

Reporter: FBI ordered 'no photos, no pictures, no cell phones' during Clinton/Lynch meeting

posted at 7:21 am on July 1, 2016 by Larry O'Connor

Reporter Christopher Sign of ABC 15 in Phoenix, AZ appeared on The O'Reilly Factor Thursday night to talk about his scoop involving that secret meeting between former President Bill Clinton and Attorney General Loretta Lynch.

"The former president steps into her plane. They then speak for 30 minutes privately. The FBI there on the tarmac instructing everybody around 'no photos, no pictures, no cell phones.'"

Interesting.

First of all, it isn't the FBI's job to tell journalists or private citizens they can't take photographs of a former president and the Attorney General. What were the agents going to do, arrest people for taking a picture or video?

Also, if there was nothing wrong with the meeting and it was totally innocent, why were federal agents instructed to demand no one take a picture?

Finally, let's stop focusing on the fact that this meeting was inappropriate because Clinton's *wife* is under investigation by Lynch's Justice Department. I mean, that's bad, but it's actually letting Lynch and Clinton off the hook a bit. By focusing on the appearance of conflict because *Hillary Clinton* is being investigated, we are willfully overlooking the very real conflict in the fact that *Clinton himself* is under investigation, as the Grand Poo-bah at the Clinton Foundation. (Fox News)

The FBI investigation into Hillary Clinton's use of private email as secretary of state has expanded to look at

The FBI investigation into Hillary Clinton's use of private email as secretary of state has expanded to look at whether the possible "intersection" of Clinton Foundation work and State Department business may have violated public corruption laws, three intelligence sources not authorized to speak on the record told Fox News.

This new investigative track is in addition to the focus on classified material found on Clinton's personal server.

"The agents are investigating the possible intersection of Clinton Foundation donations, the dispensation of State Department contracts and whether regular processes were followed," one source said.

Yes, the investigation into the intersection of Clinton Foundation donations and the State Department slimes Hillary Clinton since it happened during her tenure as Secretary of State, but what about Bill Clinton? If the State Department and Hillary Clinton acted improperly or illegally by commingling staff and by granting favors to Clinton Foundation donors, isn't the Clinton Foundation, and Bill Clinton equally guilty of wrongdoing?

This may explain why the day after the surreptitious meeting in Phoenix, Lynch's Justice Department informed a judge they were going to drag their feet on the release of emails connecting the former president's foundation and the State Department. (Daily Caller)

Department of Justice officials filed a motion in federal court late Wednesday seeking a 27-month delay in producing correspondence between former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's four top aides and officials with the Clinton Foundation and Teneo Holdings, a closely allied public relations firm that Bill Clinton helped launch.

If the court permits the delay, the public won't be able to read the communications until October 2018, about 22 months into her prospective first term as President. The four senior Clinton aides involved were Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Michael Fuchs, Ambassador-At-Large Melanne Verveer, Chief of Staff Cheryl Mills, and Deputy Chief of Staff Huma Abedin.

I guess when all of this adds up, it's clear why Lynch and her FBI agents were so intent on keeping this inappropriate meeting private.

[redacted] (DO) (FBI)

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI) b6 -1
Sent: Friday, July 01, 2016 1:24 PM
To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI); [redacted] (DO) (FBI); Quinn, Richard P. (DO) (FBI); Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI)
Subject: FW: FBI agents-no photos story

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 01, 2016 1:23 PM
To: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)
Subject: RE: FBI agents-no photos story b6 -1

Thanks [redacted] Doubt we would say anything, but for clarification will be good to know.

[redacted]

From: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)
Sent: Friday, July 01, 2016 1:22 PM b6 -1
To: [redacted] (DO) (FBI)
Subject: RE: FBI agents-no photos story

Rybicki just talked to DOJ. They are waiting to respond until they can talk to AGPD to determine exactly what happened. AGPD is traveling back to DC now.

-------- Original message --------
From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI)" [redacted]
Date: 07/01/2016 1:13 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (SECD) (FBI)" [redacted] b6 -1
Subject: FW: FBI agents-no photos story

Here's the local article – national NBC has picked it up and asked us about it. We are reaching out to DOJ OPA as well, but thank you for the contacts!

[redacted]

From: [redacted] (DO) (FBI) b6 -1
Sent: Friday, July 01, 2016 12:24 PM
To: Kortan, Michael P. (DO) (FBI); OPA-NPO
Subject: FBI agents-no photos story

FYSA,
ABC's Jack Date called to ask about this claim and we hadn't heard about it prior to his call. He's going to call

Reporter: FBI ordered 'no photos, no pictures, no cell phones' during Clinton/Lynch meeting

posted at 7:21 am on July 1, 2016 by Larry O'Connor

Reporter Christopher Sign of ABC 15 in Phoenix, AZ appeared on The O'Reilly Factor Thursday night to talk about his scoop involving that secret meeting between former President Bill Clinton and Attorney General Loretta Lynch.

"The former president steps into her plane. They then speak for 30 minutes privately. The FBI there on the tarmac instructing everybody around 'no photos, no pictures, no cell phones.'"

Interesting.

First of all, it isn't the FBI's job to tell journalists or private citizens they can't take photographs of a former president and the Attorney General. What were the agents going to do, arrest people for taking a picture or video?

Also, if there was nothing wrong with the meeting and it was totally innocent, why were federal agents instructed to demand no one take a picture?

Finally, let's stop focusing on the fact that this meeting was inappropriate because Clinton's *wife* is under investigation by Lynch's Justice Department. I mean, that's bad, but it's actually letting Lynch and Clinton off the hook a bit. By focusing on the appearance of conflict because *Hillary Clinton* is being investigated, we are willfully overlooking the very real conflict in the fact that *Clinton himself* is under investigation, as the Grand Poo-bah at the Clinton Foundation. (Fox News)

The FBI investigation into Hillary Clinton's use of private email as secretary of state has expanded to look at whether the possible "intersection" of Clinton Foundation work and State Department business may have violated public corruption laws, three intelligence sources not authorized to speak on the record told Fox News.

This new investigative track is in addition to the focus on classified material found on Clinton's personal server.

"The agents are investigating the possible intersection of Clinton Foundation donations, the dispensation of State Department contracts and whether regular processes were followed," one source said.

Yes, the investigation into the intersection of Clinton Foundation donations and the State Department slimes Hillary Clinton since it happened during her tenure as Secretary of State, but what about Bill Clinton? If the State Department and Hillary Clinton acted improperly or illegally by commingling staff and by granting favors to Clinton Foundation donors, isn't the Clinton Foundation, and Bill Clinton equally guilty of wrongdoing?

This may explain why the day after the surreptitious meeting in Phoenix, Lynch's Justice Department informed a judge they were going to drag their feet on the release of emails connecting the former president's foundation and the State Department. (Daily Caller)

Department of Justice officials filed a motion in federal court late Wednesday seeking a 27-month delay in

producing correspondence between former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's four top aides and officials with the Clinton Foundation and Teneo Holdings, a closely allied public relations firm that Bill Clinton helped launch.

If the court permits the delay, the public won't be able to read the communications until October 2018, about 22 months into her prospective first term as President. The four senior Clinton aides involved were Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Michael Fuchs, Ambassador-At-Large Melanne Verveer, Chief of Staff Cheryl Mills, and Deputy Chief of Staff Huma Abedin.

I guess when all of this adds up, it's clear why Lynch and her FBI agents were so intent on keeping this inappropriate meeting private.