From: Cunningham, Patrick (USAAZ)

To: Scheel, Ann (USAAZ); Hernandez, Rachel (USAAZ)

Sent: 6/13/2011 7:00:05 PM
Subject: RE: La Opinion Clarification

We asked for a clarification that we were not the source that named **ATF** and that we spoke to her in March, and thus did not in any way retaliate against actions as a Congressional witness. As you might imagine Congress called Matt, who called me asking why we named ATF and why we spoke about F and F. I advised him we did not name ATF that it was a story about gun trafficking in general and that we were in no way retaliating.

From: Scheel, Ann (USAAZ)

Sent: Monday, June 13, 2011 3:46 PM

To: Hernandez, Rachel (USAAZ); Cunningham, Patrick (USAAZ)

Subject: RE: La Opinion Clarification

Why are we doing this and why did we ask for a retraction?

Ann Bírmíngham Scheel Fírst Asst. U.S. Attorney

Dist. of Arizona

Desk Privacy

From: Hernandez, Rachel (USAAZ)
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2011 3:21 PM
To: Cunningham, Patrick (USAAZ)

Cc: Scheel, Ann (USAAZ)

Subject: FW: La Opinion Clarification

Below you have Norma's version with Bill's corrections. If you want to disclose it, maybe Viviana can type it into a word document.

From: Solomon, William (USAAZ)
Sent: Monday, June 13, 2011 3:04 PM
To: Hernandez, Rachel (USAAZ)
Subject: RE: La Opinion Clarification

Sorry for the delay. I got caught up with something else. Norma's translation looks good. I made just a couple of changes below.

From: Hernandez, Rachel (USAAZ) **Sent:** Monday, June 13, 2011 2:12 PM **To:** Solomon, William (USAAZ)

Subject: FW: La Opinion Clarification

From: Sherwood, Robert (USAAZ) [Contractor]

Sent: Monday, June 13, 2011 1:47 PM **To:** Hernandez, Rachel (USAAZ) **Subject:** FW: La Opinion Clarification

Clarification is attached and Norma's translation is below.

From: Hernandez, Norma (USAAZ) Sent: Monday, June 06, 2011 11:51 AM

To: Hernandez, Rachel (USAAZ); Cunningham, Patrick (USAAZ); Sherwood, Robert (USAAZ) [Contractor]; Morrissey, Mike

(USAAZ)

Cc: Burke, Dennis (USAAZ)

Subject: RE: La Opinion Clarification

As part of a special series entitled "A country at arms," an article was printed last Thursday entitled "A constantly expanding business" where it said that Robbie Sherwood, a spokesperson for the U.S. Attorney of Prosecutor of the State of Arizona stated that a large part majority of weapons confiscated in crimes on the other side of the border came come from a small number of stores, including ATF By error, this information as was attributed to the Prosecutor's spokesperson from the U.S. Attorney's office, when in reality, the name of the store ATF, is mentioned in public records and corresponds to only a few number of weapons in one specific case and this store is not involved in other incidents of weapons trafficking observed by seen in the District of Arizona. Sherwood stated clarified that "he does not know the names of weapons distributors involved in the cases under investigation."

From: Hernandez, Rachel (USAAZ) **Sent:** Monday, June 06, 2011 11:35 AM

To: Cunningham, Patrick (USAAZ); Sherwood, Robert (USAAZ) [Contractor]; Morrissey, Mike (USAAZ)

Cc: Burke, Dennis (USAAZ); Hernandez, Norma (USAAZ)

Subject: RE: La Opinion Clarification

Norma said she would translate it. It is very short. Robbie: Please bring the copy to Norma. Thanks.

From: Cunningham, Patrick (USAAZ) Sent: Monday, June 06, 2011 11:32 AM

To: Sherwood, Robert (USAAZ) [Contractor]; Morrissey, Mike (USAAZ); Hernandez, Rachel (USAAZ)

Cc: Burke, Dennis (USAAZ)

Subject: RE: La Opinion Clarification

R: can we translate the clarification? We can then make a recommendation to Dennis as to whether we send to Axelrod. Thanks PJC

From: Sherwood, Robert (USAAZ) [Contractor] **Sent:** Monday, June 06, 2011 11:15 AM

To: Cunningham, Patrick (USAAZ); Burke, Dennis (USAAZ); Morrissey, Mike (USAAZ)

Subject: La Opinion Clarification

Attached is the clarification that La Opinion did at my request last week. It essentially admits the error of sourcing me to that material, says that info about ATF was part of public records specific to one case, and that I didn't know the extent of their involvement in other cases. Also, below is an email that the reporter sent me while reporting the story. As you can see it's dated March 14. She also notes that I told her I couldn't comment on F&F. I didn't find any responses from me to this email, which I most likely gave her over the phone. Obviously we didn't provide additional sources for her story, and I only gave her what I indicated (the Washington Post story, and F&F indictment) on background.

Robbie

From: Claudia Nunez [mailto:claudia.nunez@laopinion.com]

Sent: Monday, March 14, 2011 5:37 PM

To: Sherwood, Robert (USAAZ) [Contractor]

Subject: Interview Request

Hi Robert,

As we discussed over the phone today, I am working on a national multi-media project dealing with the trafficking of arms and I would like to obtain an interview with a specialist in your agency that can provide general comments on this issue. Some of the questions will be...the use of women as straw purchasers, the related offense for straw purchasers, and a general profile of the Arizona market for this illicit activity.

During the interview, we will not ask about specific cases or about "Fast and Furious", as you mentioned, you cannot comment on. The project is mainly an informative one about the illicit arms trade.

Regards,

Claudia Nunez, Reporter La Opinion.

Privacy | cell