

---

**From:** Axelrod, Matthew (ODAG)  
**To:** Burton, Faith (SMO); Colborn, Paul P (SMO)  
**Sent:** 4/5/2011 9:03:20 PM  
**Subject:** RE: ATF Emails and Reports

I do not believe that it is. But I will double check.

---

**From:** Burton, Faith (SMO)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 05, 2011 5:03 PM  
**To:** Axelrod, Matthew (ODAG); Colborn, Paul P (SMO)  
**Subject:** RE: ATF Emails and Reports

Is the investigation still pending? If so, not sure how we disclose these docs.

---

**From:** Axelrod, Matthew (ODAG)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 05, 2011 5:01 PM  
**To:** Colborn, Paul P (SMO); Burton, Faith (SMO)  
**Subject:** RE: ATF Emails and Reports

DP

---

**From:** Axelrod, Matthew (ODAG)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 05, 2011 4:57 PM  
**To:** Colborn, Paul P (SMO); Burton, Faith (SMO)  
**Subject:** RE: ATF Emails and Reports

My bad. You're right.

---

**From:** Colborn, Paul P (SMO)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 05, 2011 4:55 PM  
**To:** Axelrod, Matthew (ODAG); Burton, Faith (SMO)  
**Subject:** RE: ATF Emails and Reports

I quoted the subpoena.

---

**From:** Axelrod, Matthew (ODAG)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 05, 2011 4:54 PM  
**To:** Colborn, Paul P (SMO); Burton, Faith (SMO)  
**Subject:** RE: ATF Emails and Reports

No, Pat is correct – he is referring to the subpoena though, not the letter request. They're slightly different.

---

**From:** Colborn, Paul P (SMO)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 05, 2011 4:48 PM  
**To:** Axelrod, Matthew (ODAG); Burton, Faith (SMO)  
**Subject:** RE: ATF Emails and Reports

Cunningham misstated the document request. It is for “[d]ocuments and communications relating to complaints or objections by ATF agents about failure to maintain operational control over weapons purchased by known or suspected straw buyer.”

---

**From:** Axelrod, Matthew (ODAG)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 05, 2011 3:43 PM

**To:** Weiner, Robert (ODAG); Richardson, Margaret (SMO); Wilkinson, Monty (OAG); Schmalzer, Tracy (SMO)

**Cc:** Colborn, Paul P (SMO); Burton, Faith (SMO); Gaston, Molly (SMO)

**Subject:** FW: **ATF** mails and Reports

I already sent to OLA to ask them to review for potential production to Issa, but thought it made sense to share with the broader group as well.

---

**From:** Cunningham, Patrick (USAAZ)

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 05, 2011 2:26 PM

**To:** Axelrod, Matthew (ODAG)

**Cc:** Burke, Dennis (USAAZ); Scheel, Ann (USAAZ); Hernandez, Rachel (USAAZ); Weinstein, Jason (CRM); Morrissey, Mike (USAAZ)

**Subject:** **ATF** Emails and Reports

Matt and Colleagues: enclosed are the two **ATF** emails I spoke of last week on our call regarding the Issa letter, now subpoena.

In the **ATF** email of May 27 at the bottom of page 3, Dodson seeks authority to “walk” guns and specifically states, “The logic employed is that by authorizing the “walking” of a small amount of firearms that, ultimately we can cease the trafficking of a significant number. (i.e. walking 4 to 6 – prevent hundreds from being trafficked.)” The target in this case, **ATF**

**ATF**

As we discussed last week, this kind of cooperation was never planned or executed in Fast and Furious, yet somehow an ROI from the **ATF** case made it into a Senator Grassley letter.

**DP**

What do you think? PJC