



**Judicial
Watch**[®]
*Because no one
is above the law!*

December 7, 2017

VIA CERTIFIED MAIL

Federal Bureau of Investigation
Record Information/Dissemination Section
170 Marcel Drive
Winchester, VA 22602-4843

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request

Dear Freedom of Information Officer:

In the Second Declaration of David M. Hardy, which was filed on December 6, 2017 in *CNN v. Federal Bureau of Investigation*, Case Number 17-cv-01167, Mr. Hardy testifies, “The FBI is confident that it has identified and located the entire collection of documents comprising the ‘Comey Memos.’ To be sure, however, the FBI consulted with the Special Counsel’s Office and confirmed that the records we located and processed in response to this portion of plaintiffs’ requests represent the universe of ‘Comey Memos’ that exist. Also, as explained in our first declaration, the National Security and Cyber Law Branch (NSCLB) of the FBI’s Office of General Counsel was responsible for providing legal advice and guidance within the Bureau regarding the Russian interference investigation. Consequently, attorneys in NSCLB were able to confirm to staff members handling these FOIA requests that the collection of memos located ***within the larger collection of former Director Comey’s records*** comprised the universe of the ‘Comey Memos’ requested by some of the plaintiffs.” (emphasis added).

Pursuant to Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552 (“FOIA”), Judicial Watch requests copies of all records “located within the larger collection of former Director Comey’s records” as described in the Second Declaration of David M. Hardy.

Please determine whether to comply with this request within the time period required by FOIA and notify us immediately of your determination, the reasons therefor, designee. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(i). Please also produce all responsive records in an electronic format (“pdf” is preferred), if convenient. We also are willing to accept a “rolling production” of responsive records if it will facilitate a more timely production.

Judicial Watch also hereby requests a waiver of both search and duplication fees.

We are entitled to a waiver of search fees because we are a “representative of the news media.” See 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II); see also *Cause of Action v. Federal Trade Comm.*, 799 F.3d 1108 (D.C. Cir. 2015); *Nat’l Sec. Archive v. U.S. Dep’t of Defense*, 880 F.2d 1381 (D.C. Cir. 1989). For more than twenty years, Judicial Watch has used FOIA and other investigative tools to gather information about the operations and activities of government, a subject of undisputed public interest. We submit over 400 FOIA requests annually. Our personnel, which includes experienced journalists and professional writers on staff and under contract, use their editorial skills to turn this raw information into distinct works that are disseminated to the public via our monthly newsletter, which has a circulation of over 300,000, weekly email update, which has over 600,000 subscribers, investigative bulletins, special reports, www.judicialwatch.org website, *Corruption Chronicles* blog, and social media, including Facebook and Twitter, among other distribution channels. We have authored several books, including *Corruption Chronicles* by Tom Fitton (Threshold Editions, July 24, 2012), and another book, *Clean House* by Tom Fitton (Threshold Editions, Aug. 30, 2016), is forthcoming. In 2012, we produced a documentary film, “District of Corruption,” directed by Stephen K. Bannon. Our “news media” status has been confirmed in court rulings. See, e.g., *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. U.S. Dep’t of Defense*, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 44003, *1 (D.D.C. June 28, 2006); *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice*, 133 F. Supp.2d 52 (D.D.C. 2000). As a tax exempt, 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation, we have no commercial interests and do not seek the requested records for any commercial use. Rather, we intend to use the requested records as part of our on-going investigative journalism and public education efforts to promote integrity, transparency, and accountability in government and fidelity to the rule of law.

Judicial Watch also is entitled to a waiver of both search fees and duplication fees because “disclosure of the information is in the public interest.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). Disclosure of the requested records undoubtedly will shed light on “the operations or activities of the government.” *Cause of Action*, 799 F.3d at 1115 (quoting 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii)). Disclosure also is “likely to contribute significantly to the public understanding” of those operations or activities because, among other reasons, Judicial Watch intends to disseminate both the records and its findings to “a reasonably broad audience of persons interested in the subject” via its newsletter, email updates, investigative bulletins, website, blog, and its other, regular distribution channels. *Cause of Action*, 799 F.3d at 1116 (quoting *Carney v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice*, 19 F.3d 807, 815 (2d Cir. 1994)). Again, Judicial Watch does not seek the requested records for any commercial benefit or for its own “primary” benefit, but instead seeks them as part of its ongoing investigative journalism and public education efforts to promote integrity, transparency, and accountability in government and fidelity to the rule of law.

In the event our request for a waiver of search and/or duplication costs is denied, Judicial Watch agrees to pay up to \$300.00 in search and/or duplication costs. Judicial Watch requests that it be contacted before any such costs are incurred, in order to prioritize search and duplication efforts.

If you do not understand this request or any portion thereof, or if you feel you

FBI/FOIA Request
December 7, 2017
Page 3 of 3

require clarification of this request or any portion thereof, please contact us immediately at 202-646-5172 or bmarshall@judicialwatch.org.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Very respectfully,

William F. Marshall
Judicial Watch, Inc.