UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JUDICIAL WATCH, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,

Defendant

Civil Action No. 24-2172 (JMC)

PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE REGARING DEFENDANT'S PRODUCTION OF RECORDS

Plaintiff Judicial Watch, Inc., by counsel, respectfully submits this notice regarding the production of records ordered by the Court to begin today:

1. In its October 16, 2026 Minute Order, the Court stated:

   > MINUTE ORDER re 24 Notice: Defendant received Plaintiff's request in March 2024, ECF 1 ¶ 8, and, at one point, represented that it "anticipated beginning rolling productions no later than April 2025," ECF 23 at 2. Defendant did not meet that anticipated deadline after identifying additional necessary searches. ECF 23 at 2. The Court's September 24, 2026 minute order directed Defendant to identify a date certain on which it would begin rolling interim productions of responsive records. Defendant's 24 notice indicated that it will not process rolling productions and will instead produce non-exempt responsive material by May 24, 2027. Because Defendant did not provide a date certain to begin rolling productions as the Court ordered, and has offered no explanation for its position, the Court will set a date that it finds reasonable based on the record. Accordingly, the Court ORDERS Defendant to begin rolling interim productions of responsive records by November 16, 2026. Signed by Judge Jia M. Cobb on October 15, 2026. (lcjmc1) (Entered: 10/15/2026).

2. Contrary to the Court's order, Defendant did not begin production of records today.

3. Instead, after previously confirming that a significant volume of records had been located and even suggesting discussions to narrow the request, Defendant now, for

the first time, asserts that it cannot confirm or deny the existence of records. *See* Exh. 1 (Letter dated November 13, 2026).

4. The next status report in the case is due December 1, 2026. In light of the extraordinary shifting positions by agency, the lengthy delays in this case caused by the agency, and the important public interest in the requested records – namely the CIA's involvement in the events of January 6, Plaintiff requests an in-person hearing, or at least an earlier status report, to address the agency's failure to begin production of records as ordered.

Respectfully submitted,

JUDICIAL WATCH, INC.

/s/ *James F. Peterson*
JAMES F. PETERSON
425 Third Street, SW Suite 800
Washington, DC 20024
(202) 646-5175
jpeterson@judicialwatch.org

Counsel for Plaintiff

November 16, 2026

Central Intelligence Agency

Washington, D.C. 20505

13 November 2026

James F. Peterson
Judicial Watch, Inc.
425 Third Street SW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20024

Re: F-2024-01475; Civil Action 24-cv-02172

Dear Mr. Peterson:

This is a final response to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request dated 14 March 2024, which your client Chris Nelson and Judicial Watch, Inc. submitted for the following:

1. Shots fired inside the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021.
2. A person being shot inside the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021.
3. Requests for CIA support or assistance at the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021.
4. Bomb technician support or assistance to any potential or actual bombs or explosive devices in response to the massive protests in and around the Washington DC area on January 6, 2021.
5. Accelerant or explosives K-9s (bomb detection dogs) placed on standby or used in Washington, DC, in response to the massive protests in and around Washington, DC on January 6, 2021.
6. Any after action reports concerning the events that took place in Washington, DC on January 6, 2021.

We processed your request in accordance with the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552, as amended, and the National Security Act of 1947, 50 U.S.C. § 3141, as amended.

With regard to Items 1 and 2, after conducting a search reasonably calculated to uncover all relevant documents, we did not locate any responsive records.

With regard to Items 3-6, in accordance with Section 3.6(a) of Executive order 13526, as amended, the CIA can neither confirm or deny the existence or nonexistence of records to your request. The fact of the existence or nonexistence of such records is itself currently and properly classified and relates to intelligence sources and methods information protected from disclosure by Section 102A(h)(l) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, and Section 6 of the CIA Act of 1949, as amended. Therefore, these items of your request are denied pursuant to FOIA exemptions (b)(1) and (b)(3).

This completes our response to the above referenced case.

Sincerely,

Stephen Glenn
Information and Privacy Coordinator