

From: Axelrod, Matthew (ODAG)
To: [ATF] (ATF); Melson, Kenneth E. (ATF); Hoover, William J. (ATF)
Sent: 4/5/2011 3:38:38 PM
Subject: FW: [ATF] Emails and Reports - EXTENDED 573.64 KB
Attachments: MimosaStub.html

Fyi. I have a few follow up questions.

One, was [ATF] proposed investigation authorized? If so, were guns allowed to walk as he proposed?

And two, [ATF] proposal includes a sentence that states “[t]his request is predicated on ATF’s previous authorization of allowing firearms to be trafficked (‘walked’) in furtherance of investigations which target FTO’s as opposed to individuals.” Do you know what “previous authorization” [ATF] is referring to? Also, do you know whether [ATF] (or anyone else who saw this proposal) ever asked [ATF] what he meant by that sentence?

Thanks, guys.

Matt

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, [ATF] 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

[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