

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

JUDICIAL WATCH, INC.,)	
425 Third Street SW, Suite 800)	
Washington, DC 20024,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Civil Action No.
v.)	
)	
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,)	
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW)	
Washington, DC 20530-0001,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Judicial Watch, Inc. (“Plaintiff”) brings this action against the U.S. Department of Justice (“Defendant” or “DOJ”) to compel compliance with the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552. As grounds therefor, Plaintiff alleges as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(B) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.
2. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e).

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff Judicial Watch, Inc. is a not-for-profit, educational organization incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia and headquartered at 425 Third Street SW, Suite 800, Washington, DC 20024. Plaintiff seeks to promote transparency, accountability, and integrity in government and fidelity to the rule of law. As part of its mission, Plaintiff regularly requests records from federal agencies pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act

(“FOIA”). Plaintiff analyzes the responses and disseminates its findings and the requested records to the American public to inform them about “what their government is up to.”

4. Defendant is an agency of the United States Government. Defendant has possession, custody, and control of records to which Plaintiff seeks access. Defendant is headquartered at 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20530-0001.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

5. On June 12, 2019, Plaintiff submitted a FOIA request to the Special Counsel’s Office, a component of DOJ, seeking access to the following records:

1. **Any and all FD-302 forms or other records documenting all interviews of Mr. Felix Sater between January 1, 2015 and the present. For purposes of clarification, this request includes, but is not limited to, the two interviews of Mr. Sater in 2017 that are acknowledged on page 69, footnote 304 of the Department of Justice Office of Special Counsel’s “Report on the Investigation Into Russian Interference in the 2016 Presidential Election.”**
2. **Any and all proffer agreements, cooperation agreements, or similar documents relevant to Mr. Sater’s cooperation with the United States Government in any criminal or civil matter. This request includes, but is not limited to, the proffer agreement cited in the aforementioned footnote.**
3. **Any and all records of communication[s] between any official, employee, or representative of the Special Counsel’s Office and Mr. Sater.**

6. By letter dated July 9, 2019, Defendant acknowledged receipt of Plaintiff’s request on June 12, 2019. Defendant’s acknowledgment letter invoked FOIA’s ten-day extension of time provision for issuing a determination.

7. As of the date of this Complaint, Defendant has not: (i) produced the requested records or demonstrated that the requested records are lawfully exempt from production; (ii) notified Plaintiff of the scope of any responsive records they intend to produce or withhold and

the reasons for any withholdings; or (iii) informed Plaintiff that it may appeal any adequately specific, adverse determination.

COUNT I
(Violation of FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552)

8. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 7 as if fully stated herein.

9. Defendant is in violation of FOIA.

10. Plaintiff is being irreparably harmed by Defendant's violation of FOIA, and Plaintiff will continue to be irreparably harmed unless Defendant is compelled to comply with it.

11. To trigger FOIA's administrative exhaustion requirement, Defendant was required to make a final determination on Plaintiff's request within the time limits set by FOIA. Accordingly, Defendant's determination was due by July 25, 2019 at the latest.

12. Because Defendant failed to make a final determination on Plaintiff's request within the time limits set by FOIA, Plaintiff is deemed to have exhausted its administrative appeal remedies.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court: (1) order Defendant to conduct searches for any and all records responsive to Plaintiff's FOIA request and demonstrate that it employed search methods reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of records responsive to the request; (2) order Defendant to produce, by a date certain, any and all non-exempt records responsive to Plaintiff's request and a *Vaughn* index of any responsive records withheld under claim of exemption; (3) enjoin Defendant from continuing to withhold any and all non-exempt records responsive to the request; (4) grant Plaintiff an award of attorneys' fees and other litigation costs reasonably incurred in this action pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(E); and (5) grant Plaintiff such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: August 26, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Paul J. Orfanedes

Paul J. Orfanedes

D.C. Bar No. 429716

JUDICIAL WATCH, INC.

425 Third Street SW, Suite 800

Washington, DC 20024

Tel: (202) 646-5172

Email: porfanedes@judicialwatch.org

Counsel for Plaintiff