

UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO

282B-WF-2896615

Continuation of FD-302 of Interview of [REDACTED], On 08/06/2013, Page 2 of 6

b6 -2,3
b7C -2,3

[REDACTED] moved to [REDACTED] group he made the decisions. [REDACTED] had a good relationship with both [REDACTED] is in the office four days a week.

[REDACTED] told her about Tea Party cases. These cases would be assigned to her for development. They called them "Tea Party cases". She knew they were conservative groups from stuff in the news in April 2010. Initially she was assigned 20 cases. She received instruction from either [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] to contact EO Technical, in particular [REDACTED] who goes by [REDACTED] had been assigned two cases, one 501(c)(3) and one 501(c)(4). [REDACTED] emailed her his development letters to help her work the cases. Most of [REDACTED] cases were 501(c)(4) organizations.

b6 -2,3
b7C -2,3

Once [REDACTED] started to create her own development letters, she would send them to [REDACTED] to review. He would call her with changes and she would not send them out until he reviewed them. [REDACTED] would also ask to see the 1024 application when he reviewed the letters. At first he was very timely in his responses. He would usually get back to her within a week. [REDACTED] had development letters out for all 20 cases within the first six weeks. She would contact [REDACTED] when she got a response and would fax a copy of what she received to him. This was time consuming because the responses could be quite lengthy and her fax machine was not very good. She would review the responses for her own knowledge but waited on [REDACTED] for his changes and approval. She wanted to develop cases in a consistent manner with [REDACTED]. On one occasion [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] wanted her to add something to a letter. It then started to take longer and longer for [REDACTED] to respond to her. He would tell her that the letters were under review. By September 2010 he did not get back to her at all. She found it very unusual to not get a response. [REDACTED] had conversations with [REDACTED] mostly [REDACTED] about this. She viewed [REDACTED] as a supervisor since [REDACTED] told her [REDACTED] had to approve letters before they could go out. Even though [REDACTED] would not respond, she kept sending him letters and responses. If she had been able to work the original 20 cases a few would have been denials as they were 501(c)(3) organizations involved in political activity. Several others would have been approved and several needed more information to confirm that they would probably be a denial.

b6 -2,3
b7C -2,3

There was a constant flow of new Tea Party cases as she worked the original 20 cases. She continued sending letters out. Tea Party cases involved Tea Party like activities such as rallies for conservatives, education on the constitution, limited government, smaller type government and focus on the founding fathers. She would receive advocacy cases that were not Tea Party specific and she would send them to general inventory or back to the revenue agent that sent it to her. [REDACTED] would send narrowly defined cases to her. She would receive cases like [REDACTED] other

b3 -1
b6 -2
b7C -2

UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO

14-cv-1239-FBI-47